

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

Office of Energy Projects

- - - - - x

TransCanada Hydro Northeast, Inc. :

Wilder : Project No. 1892-026 -

Bellows Falls : Project No. 1855-045

Vernon : Project No. 1904-073

New Hampshire/Vermont :

FirstLight Hydro Generating : Project Nos. P-1889-081

and

Company : P-2485-063

Massachusetts :

- - - - - x

CONNECTICUT RIVER PROJECTS

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS - Daytime Meeting

Great Falls Discovery Center

2 Avenue A

Turners Falls, MA 01376

Thursday, January 31, 2013

The daytime meeting, pursuant to notice, convened at
9:15 a.m., before a Staff Panel:

1 KENNETH HOGAN, Project Coordinator, FERC

2 MARY GREEN, Geology and soils, FERC

3 RALPH NELSON, Geology and soils, FERC

4 MARY McCANN, Endangered species and

5 macroinvertebrates, FERC

6 MICHAEL SEARS, Fisheries and aquatic resources,

7 FERC

8 BRETT BATTAGLIA, Terrestrial resources, FERC

9 ADAM BEECO, Recreation, land use and aesthetics,

10 FERC

11 ANGIE SCANGAS, Water resources, FERC

12 ROBERT QUIGGLE, Archaeological and cultural

13 resources, FERC.

14 With:

15 JOHN RAGONESE, FERC License Manager,

16 US Northeast Hydro Region,

17 TransCanada Accompanied by EDWIN NASON and EARL BRISSETTE,

18 TransCanada

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	LIST OF COMMENTERS	
2	Geology and Soils or Erosion Concerns	
3	NORMAN SIMS	8
4	DON PUGH	12
5	ANDREA DONLON	14
6	CHRIS CAMPANY	15
7	TED CASTRO-SANTOS	16
8	SHARON FRANCIS	18
9	JIM McCLAMMER	19
10	Water Resources - Water Quantity and Quality	
11	MELISSA GRABER	21
12	CHRIS CAMPANY	24
13	HERVEY SCUDDER	28
14	JOHN WARNER	29
15	JIM McCLAMMER	30
16	EVA BOOK	36
17	TED CASTRO-SANTOS	38
18	Fishery or Aquatic Resources	
19	ANDREA DONLON	48
20	KEN SPRANKLE	49
21	NORMAN SIMS	52
22	DON PUGH	54
23		
24		
25		

1	LIST OF COMMENTERS	
2		
3	Terrestrial Resources	
4	JIM McCLAMMER	55
5	MARK WAMSER	60
6	MELISSA GRABER	63
7	Threatened and Endangered Species	
8		
9	Recreation	
10	NORMAN SIMS	66
11	KEVIN MENDIK	70
12	Land Use	
13	KEVIN MENDIK	80
14	Aesthetics	
15		
16	Socioeconomic Resources	
17	KEVIN MENDIK	85
18	JIM McCLAMMER	85
19	ELISA CAMPBELL	86
20	ALICE MAYS	89
21	CARL MEYER	90
22	ANDREA DONLON	91
23	JOHN WARD	91
24		
25		

1	LIST OF COMMENTERS	
2	Cultural Resources	
3	JIM McCLAMMER	93
4	NORMAN SIMS	94
5	ANDREA DONLON	96
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

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

2 MR. HOGAN: I'm seeing a lot of familiar faces;
3 so good morning, everybody. Thanks for sticking us through
4 the week. I know it's been a pretty tedious schedule for
5 all of the independents, and particularly my team; and
6 really appreciate your participation. We really feel that
7 it's valuable, and important for the development of our NEPA
8 analysis.

9 My name is Ken Hogan, I'm with the Federal Energy
10 Regulatory Commission. We're going to go around the room.
11 I'm just going to have you guys shout out. I'll introduce
12 my team, starting with Adam.

13 MR. BEECO: My name is Adam Beeco, I am working
14 with recreation, land use, and aesthetics.

15 MS. GREEN: Mary Green, working with geology and
16 soils.

17 MR. NELSON: Ralph Nelson with geology and soils.

18 MS. SCANGAS: Angie Scangas, water resources.

19 MR. SEARS: Mike Sears, fisheries and aquatic
20 resources.

21 MR. QUIGGLE: Rob Quiggle, archaeological and
22 culture resources.

23 MR. BATTAGLIA: Brett Battaglia, terrestrial
24 resources.

25 MS. McCANN: Mary McCann, endangered species.

1 MR. HOGAN: So today's meeting is a unique
2 meeting for FERC. We haven't done this too many times. I
3 knew of one and learned of another one yesterday that I'm
4 aware of; it's a cumulative effects discussion; I'm hoping
5 to have more of a brainstorming type discussion that we can
6 have a give-and-take on particular issues that folks feel
7 are cumulatively affected by all of the five or any one of
8 the five Connecticut River projects.

9 I'm going to be asking for, if an issue is raised
10 that's cumulative effective, we're going to ask for why you
11 think it's a cumulative affected resources, and basically
12 some justification. Also, geographic scope. So what area,
13 how far downstream or upstream is appropriate for that
14 resource area to be analyzed in FERC's environmental
15 document.

16 So what I want to go is go through, resource by
17 resource basis. I'm not going to give the background that
18 all of you or many of you have heard throughout the week on
19 FERC and the licensing process, and that information. If
20 you haven't heard that yet and you want to hear it, we will
21 provide that tonight at our meeting on Turners Falls and
22 Northfield Mountain. But I want to just jump right into
23 what we feel are cumulatively affected resources in the
24 Connecticut River as it relates to the hydroelectric
25 projects.

1 So with that, I'm going to start with geology and
2 soils. Ralph?

3 Geology and Soils or Erosion Concerns

4 MR. NELSON: Just to go over again the initial
5 listings. We identified for geology and soil resources an
6 issue; the effect of projects' operation and maintenance on
7 riverbank erosion.including potential effects on protected
8 species, cultural resources, or the structural integrity of
9 adjacent facilities.

10 MS. McCANN: An example of the cumulative effect
11 of soils and geology is the effect of erosion of fine grain
12 soils containing silt and clays which increase turbidity,
13 which will persist through and downstream of the project.

14 MR. HOGAN: One thing I'd like to add, if you
15 think we got it wrong, I'd also like to hear that. If it's
16 not a cumulative effected resource, and we haven't
17 identified it as such, let us know.

18 So thoughts on geology and soils and cumulative
19 effects?

20 MR. SIMS: Norman Sims from the Appalachian
21 Mountain Club. I think the erosion issue is a cumulative
22 effect. I'm not sure what the effect is as you come
23 downriver from soil, silt washing down; but from the meeting
24 in West Lebanon on the Wilder Dam, I was surprised at the
25 number of comments you received from the public concerning

1 erosion. I just wasn't expecting that because I think I am
2 not familiar with that reach of the river.

3 But in all of these meetings that you've had so
4 far, there's always been somebody talking about stream bank
5 erosion; yesterday we heard that a lot.

6 My limited understanding of this is that there
7 are roughly three suggested reasons for that: One is
8 hydropower fluctuations, the second is weather events, and
9 the third is wakes from power boats on the river.

10 The discussion seems to be about what is the real
11 cause; is it all of these, is it one more than another, and
12 is there anything that can be done in the relicensing
13 process to affect that?

14 I think there should be a study done, river-wide,
15 of those erosional impacts. And just to be fair about this,
16 I would suggest that in that study you also include the
17 effects of canoe wakes on the erosion.

18 AUDIENCE: Just to be fair.

19 (Laughter)

20 MR. HOGAN: Katie.

21 MS. KENNEDY: I'm Katie Kennedy, Nature
22 Conservancy's Connecticut River program. Just to add
23 (inaudible) include looking at land use patterns and its
24 impact on waterways.

25 MR. HOGAN: Katie, do you have any specific --

1 well, I think we're going to get to land use.

2 MS. KENNEDY: Okay. I just wanted to make sure I
3 was on that list.

4 MR. HOGAN: You're referring to land use causing
5 erosion? Land use practices causing erosion?

6 MS. KENNEDY: Yes.

7 MR. HOGAN: Would you like to elaborate on that?

8 MS. KENNEDY: I'm not an erosion expert, so --
9 land use can have some impacts (inaudible).

10 MR. HOGAN: So agricultural practices. Roads?

11 MS. KENNEDY: Any kind of land use. So,
12 forestry, agricultural, development.

13 MR. HOGAN: Okay, thank you.

14 MS. McCANN: Katie, this is Mary McCann, are you
15 talking about just the loss of riparian area in general?

16 MS. KENNEDY: Like I said, I am not an expert in
17 this arena, but I think -- and I'm not sure about this --
18 but I think it's (inaudible) has an impact.

19 MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

20 MR. RAGONESE: Ken, I'm not sure I quite
21 understand what, the scope of what you're trying to capture
22 here is, but in a cumulative effects view of erosion on the
23 river, it would seem to me that you would want to make sure
24 you also encompassed hydrology. Future hydrology may be
25 adding to essential erosion in the river itself, and even

1 include un-dammed and tributary components of the watershed.
2 I mean, look at the last major forms and the deposition load
3 into the main stem, which does get either deposited or moved
4 downstream; but its primary from tributaries, whether they
5 be naturally flowing tributaries or Army Corps flood control
6 structures that modify the sediment movement into the main
7 stem.

8 I think it's a very, very big picture. It's the
9 geographic scope, but it's sort of like what you need to
10 contemplate in getting that, an analysis of the role
11 operational modifications of the reservoir discharge plays
12 within this very large sphere. I would add that, sort to
13 add on to Katie's comment, it's the land use policies,
14 agricultural practices, and essentially soils.

15 MR. HOGAN: Yesterday we heard a comment that was
16 in reference to the bypass reach of Turners Falls about
17 sediment and gravel recruitment in that reach. That's
18 potentially a cumulatively effected issue for all the
19 projects where the dams kind of block that gravel
20 recruitment from downstream reaches.

21 Do folks feel that that is an issue or not an
22 issue? I mean, we know we have lots of gravel recruitment
23 from the banks and sloughing of the erosion that's currently
24 occurring; and clearly the bypass reach is unique, is
25 different than the rest of the riverine reaches. So I'm

1 just kind of wondering, is that an issue that's specific to
2 the bypass reaches here at Turners Falls, or is that
3 something that we should be looking at throughout the
4 system?

5 Katie?

6 MS. KENNEDY: Katie Kennedy again.

7 I would suggest to look at it through the system.

8 MR. HOGAN: And give me some support for it.

9 MS. KENNEDY: Okay --

10 MR. HOGAN: Because I can argue both sides. I'm
11 raising it, and I want to hear the --

12 MS. KENNEDY: We would be interested in
13 understanding how did the dam impact the distribution of
14 sediment throughout the system -- below each of the
15 facilities.

16 MR. PUGH: Don Pugh. Another component of that
17 cumulative analysis would be looking at reservoir capacity.

18 MR. HOGAN: Can you --

19 MR. PUGH: In terms of how filled they are with
20 sediment, what the life span is of that particular reservoir
21 based upon sediment accumulation. And then if those
22 situations would be coming such that it's problematic, that
23 the reservoir is filling too much, how would that be
24 alleviated?

25 MR. HOGAN: Okay, and that's a cumulative effect

1 why? As opposed to a project-specific effect.

2 MR. PUGH: Because at some point it's going to
3 have to be released.

4 MR. HOGAN: Necessarily?

5 MR. PUGH: Well, I don't know necessarily, but I
6 know there's other rivers and other dams that have
7 significant sediment buildup problems, and they have a
8 life-span of that reservoir before it fills up such that
9 can't be used for, or its capacity to hold water for hydro
10 generation is so greatly reduced.

11 And you have the other issue that's a cumulative
12 issue, is high floods, high flow events that wash the fines
13 and none of other sediments out of each reservoir and move
14 it downriver.

15 MR. HOGAN: Yes, we've identified that particular
16 issue; but as far as -- and I'm playing devil's advocate
17 here, so bear with me -- as far as a cumulative effect, as
18 far as reservoir loading with sediment, or deposition, if
19 say there was a need to either sluice the sediment or dredge
20 it, that would be another public process here; unless we
21 found that it was necessary in the licensing proceeding.

22 Are any of the reservoirs at that point where
23 they've lost capacity and efficiency for generation because
24 of sediment loading?

25 AUDIENCE: The pump station.

1 MR. HOGAN: Well, the pump station, but that's
2 been taken care of.

3 MR. SIMS: I don't know the answer to your
4 question, but in terms of what Don was talking about -- Norm
5 Sims from the AMC again -- in terms of what Don was talking
6 about, it seems that that's a classic problem with dams,
7 that reservoirs tend to fill up. And any study of this
8 should probably look at what can be done in this particular
9 situation, river wide, to deal with that project.

10 I know on the Colorado River in the Grand Canyon
11 a number of years ago, they were trying to restore the
12 beaches in the Pelican Grand Canyon that had been eroded,
13 that there had never been a depositional flow to replace
14 that sand and silt.

15 So one year they released a huge flow; 100,000
16 cfs or 150,000, to try to see what would happen. And
17 they're no longer doing that. I don't know what the impact
18 with that flow was, but this is exactly what they were
19 trying to influence.

20 So a study would probably see what could be done
21 and what won't work in places.

22 MR. HOGAN: Andrea, right?

23 MS. DONLON: Yes. Andrea Donlon, Connecticut
24 River Watershed Council. I would like to voice support for
25 the recommendations that Katie and Don and Norman have

1 stated, and since erosion is an issue at every facility, I
2 think it would make sense to have one comprehensive study
3 done that both companies would fund or whatever, that would
4 be done by the same person or company, and would be done in
5 a comprehensive way that really set all the factors in the
6 same way. So rather than one company looking at one set of
7 things, another company looking at another set of things,
8 the study could be done in a uniform fashion.

9 MR. CAMPANY: Chris Campany with the Regional
10 Commission and Connecticut River Joint Commissions.

11 Along with the hydrologic study, it does seem
12 like it would be worth pulling together what's already been
13 done on straight geomorphic assessments, fluvial erosion
14 hazard assessments, and watershed plans that have been
15 developed throughout the watershed to try to develop not
16 only a good picture about what the current state of things
17 are, but project out what might be. Because increasingly it
18 seems that we're losing access to the flood plains in the
19 tribs, and you would think that you're going to get greater
20 pulses of sediment and water going forward. I don't think
21 that post-Irene, that the situations have been improved;
22 they may have been exacerbated.

23 MR. HOGAN: Can you elaborate what you mean by
24 losing access to the --

25 MR. CAMPANY: Yes. Our channel is getting

1 narrower and deeper, and so we're losing the storage
2 capacity in our flood plains. Also related to land use.
3 And so it just seems like, if we could look at some of the
4 work that's already been done, if we could get some idea
5 about what the future hydrologic profile is going to be;
6 also the sediment profiles, based on what's been going on in
7 the tribs.

8 MR. HOGAN: Other cumulative effect -- Yes, sir.

9 MR. CASTRO-SANTOS: Ted Castro-Santos with the
10 USGS. I don't think USGS sent a fluvial geomorphologist
11 here. Is there one in the room? No? Okay. I'm not, I'm a
12 biologist.

13 But a couple of things that I think are of
14 concern are, forecast has been mentioned at least
15 peripherally. There are questions of the habitat
16 influences, and this will be a cumulative effect as well; in
17 part because of the interruption of bed low transport, and
18 if the fate of the sediments is to imbed in among the
19 substrate, that's going to cause interstition; that's going
20 to alter the habitat, prevent certain species from breeding,
21 reproducing and so forth. I think that has relevance for
22 both native and endangered and migratory species, so there's
23 importance there.

24 But the overall habitat effects are not
25 restricted to the question of restoring a graded gravel

1 stream to be the original condition of the river; but also
2 there are the questions of, with the impoundments and
3 sediment accumulation in those impoundments; and what is
4 that -- how is that altering the habitat and species
5 composition in the impoundments at each of these dams.

6 MR. HOGAN: Do you have a suggestion for the
7 appropriate geographic scope of that cumulative effects
8 analysis on substrate and habitat?

9 MR. CASTRO-SANTOS: I think it's the river bed,
10 and I think it goes -- well, I don't mean it stops at
11 Holyoke, actually. So it's a longitudinal process, right,
12 so it is. It's moving down the river, so where are you
13 going to put a stop and start? Restrict it to the main
14 stem?

15 MR. HOGAN: Main stem to Long Island Sound?

16 MR. CASTRO-SANTOS: Again, I'm not a fluvial
17 geomorphologist. That's a question that maybe needs to be
18 addressed, is what is the geographic extent? I actually
19 don't know the answer.

20 MR. HOGAN: That's why I'm here.

21 So yes, if we have thoughts on the appropriate
22 geographic scope, and a justification for that, I'd like to
23 hear that.

24 MR. CASTRO-SANTOS: I'd go to the head of tide, I
25 guess that seems like a logical --

1 MR. HOGAN: Head of what?

2 MR. CASTRO-SANTOS: Head of tide, which is about
3 Hartford.

4 MR. HOGAN: Okay. Thank you.

5 Other comments associated with erosion or geology
6 and soils as far as cumulative effect?

7 MS. FRANCIS: Sharon Francis from Charlestown.
8 Prior association with Connecticut River Joint Commissions.

9 In 1990, '91 as the Joint Commissions were
10 forming under a direction of the legislatures of Vermont and
11 New Hampshire, they did a survey of all riverfront
12 landowners in both states adjacent to the river, seeking
13 identification of issues of concern to those landowners.
14 Riverbank erosion came out significantly the greatest
15 concern, and that finding of the public's interest led the
16 Joint Commissions to put a lot of effort into working to
17 better understand erosion in those places where it might be
18 mitigated and by which methods. Of course the causes, as
19 has been said here in the room, are many; fluctuating water
20 levels, wakes of speed boats, high water events, adjacent
21 land use, clearing, loadable soils right down to the water's
22 edge to get that extra yard for corn.

23 And it seemed much too difficult and contractual
24 to tease out which erosion site might have been -- which
25 practice -- there was one farmer who was sure a certain

1 power boater had caused the erosion of his riverbank --
2 anecdotal at best. Nevertheless, there are many places, and
3 this is a mitigation level, not necessarily a study level,
4 but there are many places where addressing erosion from the
5 riverbank by buffers and/or through specially engineered and
6 designed and scientifically informed tree planting can
7 stabilize those banks in a regime where there's fluctuating
8 water level issues.

9 Maybe some evaluation would be in order of those
10 erosion mitigation measures as they have been applied,
11 because they're now -- several decades of experience.

12 MR. HOGAN: Yes, I think FirstLight has
13 significant data on evaluation of their efforts to control
14 erosion.

15 Correct, John?

16 MR. RAGONESE: Yes.

17 MR. HOGAN: So yes, they're -- for decades now,
18 as I understand it. That evaluation has been done and is
19 ongoing.

20 Jim?

21 MR. McCLAMMER: Jim McClammer, Joint River
22 Commission, also put out that message.

23 It seems in my mind clearly the flow of the
24 water, the water regime basically effects erosion from the
25 banks. And cumulatively, this erosion that's occurring at

1 various places along the banks, and bulls-eye.

2 It is reducing our historic archaeological
3 resources, because the prehistoric occupation has always
4 been along the river banks. And particularly every time you
5 get involved in some kind of a bank stabilization project,
6 wow, you know, Phase 1A. You know, there's a potential --
7 of resources that are there. So cumulatively, basically,
8 it's impacting our historical resources there.

9 And in another sense and also, I know a number of
10 situations where indeed the banks are eroding and it's
11 cutting into agricultural land; we're actually losing lands
12 that have been farmed for a long time by erosion. So again,
13 cumulatively we're losing the area of agricultural land
14 because of this erosion. So I believe if we don't get it
15 under control, we're losing not only our current use, but
16 those storage uses.

17 MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

18 Other comments? Next, water resources.

19 Water Resources - Water Quantity and Quality

20 MS. SCANGAS: We have also identified water
21 quantity and quality that may be cumulatively affected.
22 John alluded to this a little bit, there's both unregulated
23 flow and very regulated flow going on; this was -- looking
24 at reservoir operations and storage, and dissolved oxygen
25 specifically, and as far as the geographic scope of that,

1 we've heard a couple of things this week, so we're
2 definitely hoping for your input on this.

3 MR. HOGAN: One of the comments, I think it might
4 have been yesterday, was that project effects on dissolved
5 oxygen, I believe Vermont Yankee was also mentioned, on
6 dissolved oxygen down to Long Island Sound; and for me it's
7 a little unclear why Long island Sound would be the
8 appropriate geographic scope for DO. A couple of questions
9 that I came up with were, "Well, do we know that we have, as
10 we move downstream, a continuing depletion of dissolved
11 oxygen all the way to Long Island Sound, or is there a spike
12 back up to near-saturation at some point in the river that
13 that would be the appropriate end point for the geographic
14 scope?"

15 So we're trying to get some feedback on that, and
16 of course any other water quality or water quantity-type
17 concerns folks may have.

18 Melissa.

19 MS. GRABER: Melissa Graber from Fish & Wildlife
20 Service. The cumulative impacts of each project's
21 impoundment, cumulatively they impound over 100 miles of
22 river. The atmosphere of boating and thermal loading that
23 occurs in each of those impoundments, along with the other
24 thermal inputs that occur into the main stem, including
25 Vermont Yankee, there's a pool downstream, there's Mount

1 Tom, there's --

2 MR. HOGAN: Hold up, slow down.

3 (Laughter)

4 MS. GRABER: Well, there's a lot of thermal
5 inputs to the system, right? Including the project
6 impoundments. And each of those not only is warming the
7 respective waters of the impoundment, but they also transfer
8 some portion of that heated water downstream to the riverine
9 portions of the river, also.

10 So to the extent that cumulatively there's an
11 overall warming of the river, and in the context of
12 predicted climate change, I think that should be evaluated.

13 MR. HOGAN: To the Sound?

14 MS. GRABER: I - (pause) - yes.

15 (Laughter)

16 MR. HOGAN: You mentioned there's lots or
17 multiple thermal loading points along the system. Are you
18 aware of any existing data that, whether it be from speedy
19 spur -- Speedy spur?

20 AUDIENCE: (inaudible)

21 MR. HOGAN: Thank you. -- that may indicate what
22 that temperature monitoring throughout the system may make -
23 - temperature monitoring throughout the system that could be
24 used in that type of analysis?

25 MS. GRABER: Not throughout the system, but

1 Vermont Yankee has collected temperature data as part of
2 their most recent 315A variance request back in 2003 or -5;
3 they did a hydraulic modeling of their thermal load to the
4 river. And Mount Tom probably had to do something, and
5 their lapse -- FirstLight would know because I believe it's
6 their project, so --

7 AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

8 MS. GRABER: -- but they have been doing ongoing
9 studies, so I don't know how -- John, do you know anything
10 about the last --

11 JOHN: No, I don't know -- impoundments on that
12 river.

13 MS. GRABER: There may or may not be for Mt. Tom.
14 I know there's recent entrainment information for that
15 project, but I don't know about thermal loading.

16 MR. HOGAN: Curiosity, what is Mt. Tom?

17 AUDIENCE: It's a coal plant.

18 MR. HOGAN: Coal-fired plant?

19 MS. GRABER: It's relatively small; relative to -
20 -

21 MR. HOGAN: And where is it?

22 MS. GRABER: It's in Holyoke.

23 MR. HOGAN: Holyoke?

24 MS. GRABER: Yes, on the Holyoke pool. There's
25 probably another -- I think there's one down in Springfield,

1 too. West Springfield Station is another generator.

2 MR. HOGAN: Carl.

3 MR. MEYER: Just to add to what Melissa is saying
4 -- Carl Meyer -- and Ted from USGS. but I believe there's
5 been a continuous temperature gauge at Conti Lab since 1992.
6 So that covers what's going through the Turners Falls canal;
7 it's not going through the bypass reach. Is that making a
8 little thermal sense of what's happening down there.

9 MR. HOGAN: Thank you, Carl.

10 MS. KENNEDY: Katie Kennedy, Nature Conservancy.

11 I would like to add to Melissa's comments; not
12 only temperature, but we could consider the cumulative
13 impacts of (inaudible) balances and how this might change
14 and alter the river.

15 I'm not exactly sure what the sum of that would
16 be, but I think either is the Hartford or the (inaudible).

17 And then we are also interested in how the
18 impacts of climate-altered hydrology on water quantity and
19 perhaps any other excess resources that are tied to the
20 flow. So the Nature Conservancy is working on a project,
21 MAPS USGS, and the (inaudible) U-Mass, with (inaudible)
22 hydraulic model. So that potentially could be used as input
23 to some of the operational models that the applicants will
24 be using.

25 MR. CAMPANY: Chris Campany. This may not be the

1 best place for this, but the idea of studying best
2 management practices in terms of operation and management to
3 address cumulative effects; in other words, like what kind
4 of operations or communications, coordination is there
5 currently between TransCanada and FirstLight. There are
6 other examples out there where, of best practices where
7 these cumulative effects that are eventually identified can
8 be better mitigated through better communications.

9 MR. HOGAN: Now you're talking mitigation.

10 MR. CAMPANY: Is that a bad thing?

11 MR. HOGAN: No, no. But once we identify the
12 effects, like you said, and that's what we're trying to do;
13 what are the solutions and opportunities?

14 MR. CAMPANY: Right.

15 MR. HOGAN: You're right.

16 MR. CAMPANY: So I'm not an expert on this, and I
17 didn't stay at a Holiday Inn Express last night --

18 (Laughter)

19 But it seems like ultimately it's going to be good to look
20 at maybe what's been done not only in the U.S. but also
21 elsewhere in the world -- so again, maybe it's premature,
22 but it seems like that, the cumulative effects of
23 operational decisions and processes, would it be worthwhile
24 to take a look at.

25 MR. HOGAN: Okay.

1 MR. CAMPANY: It seems like it would be of
2 interest to the companies.

3 MR. HOGAN: I haven't heard anybody mention water
4 quantity.

5 MR. RAGONESE: I'll mention water quantity.

6 MR. HOGAN: Okay, John.

7 MR. RAGONESE: I mean, it's illustrated in a
8 number of different comments in a way, and to some extent
9 probably throughout many of the resources, but it's --
10 rather than the geographic scope, which oftentimes is what
11 to me cumulative impacts really kind of tries to target,
12 confine itself to; add in and some consideration of area, I
13 do think there's a real need to reconstitute or evaluate the
14 context of project operations, quantity or flow within the
15 context of natural flows.

16 I mean, we heard examples of releases below the
17 canyon dams in Arizona. Well, those are large impoundments;
18 these are riverine projects. They do impound water, but on
19 the other hand the control capability of these dams is, in
20 some cases less than 10 percent of what are naturally
21 occurring flows that are on a fairly frequent basis. I
22 mean, it's nothing to see 70,000, 80,000 cfs flows every
23 year through some of these projects, and yet our capacities
24 are in the 8,000 or 9,000 cfs.

25 So it's this idea in my mind, we want to remind

1 ourselves of the context of the hydrology that occurs in
2 this basin, whether it's in the tribs or even how it effects
3 into the main stem that we would want to continually try to
4 understand. Are there larger cumulative effects associated
5 with the natural hydrograph versus what the operations do?

6 MR. HOGAN: I appreciate that and recognize that.
7 We also know that the projects basically operate in a
8 peaking mode. I believe that that's initiated at Fifteen
9 Mile Falls?

10 MR. RAGONESE: There's peaking and there's
11 storage in the headwaters, for that matter.

12 MR. HOGAN: But as far as the flows that are
13 within the Connecticut River that may be cumulatively --

14 MR. RAGONESE: Sorry?

15 MR. HOGAN: That may be cumulatively affected by
16 the projects, they initiate at Fifteen Mile Falls?

17 MR. RAGONESE: There are peaking operations at
18 Fifteen Mile Falls, yes.

19 MR. HOGAN: Okay. At what point downstream if at
20 any do we know that those peaking flows are attenuated?

21 MR. RAGONESE: Well, I think that that's a fair
22 statement to make. On the other hand, we heard last night,
23 for example, folks that are affected by the Bellows Falls
24 reach that were completely isolated from any upstream
25 operations; and they were affected by natural flows from

1 tributaries because of the spatial nature of storms; this is
2 not a longitudinally-spread system, this is a latitude-
3 spread system; and snow melts over the course of two months
4 in the Connecticut River Basin. So you have impacts that
5 might be associated or issues that might be associated with
6 flooding downstream that could be exacerbated by operations
7 upstream or could be prevented.

8 But mostly, what I'm trying to get at is that
9 there's a very, very dynamic natural hydrology that the
10 projects reside in, and that needs to be constantly in the
11 equation of cumulative effects because of this long river
12 system that is affected by very dynamic storms and precip
13 events on the water quantity. The drainage area is very
14 large, incrementally, at each one of these projects.

15 MR. HOGAN: Yes, I think we would be looking at,
16 in our analysis, the natural hydrograph and evaluate project
17 effects on that natural hydrograph.

18 MR. SCUDDER: Hervey Scudder. You just mentioned
19 communication, and I'm curious about the relationship
20 between the dam operators and the Corps of Engineers in
21 flood control.

22 MR. HOGAN: Would John or John like to address
23 that?

24 The question was, what kind of relationship do
25 you have with the Army Corps of Engineers in the operation

1 of your facilities and theirs regarding flood control?

2 MR. WARNER: At our project we get very little
3 information from the Corps when they release water. If
4 ever.

5 MR. RAGONESE: Actually, I'm going to let Edwin
6 follow up, but we have our procedures to try to coordinate;
7 these are primarily under high flow events; they're not
8 under typical normal operations. The only area that might
9 be, fall more in that line is we try to -- as we try to
10 maybe have operations that are reducing downstream flooding
11 where we're trying to attenuate the lower end of the high
12 water cycle, we're not -- we don't want to necessarily see
13 them dump on top of us. One might say 'Well, that's self-
14 serving because you don't want to spill water that you could
15 be generating with.' It's less about that, honestly, than
16 exacerbating flooding downstream.

17 Now they're in contact with the river control
18 center, so they're aware of what's going on in the river
19 just as much as we are. So there's a coordination that goes
20 on. But you do control centers and then coordinators do
21 communicate, but these are generally in high flow events.

22 MR. NASON: Yes, but I also want to add, it goes
23 both ways: We call them and also they call us; it's not one
24 way. We don't necessarily initiate it every time; sometimes
25 they do, first. Once the event gets going, though, it's

1 usually every three - six hours that we're in contact with
2 them.

3 MR. HOGAN: Hervie, does that answer your
4 question?

5 MR. SCUDDER: Thank you, yes.
6 Jim?

7 MR. McCLAMMER: Jim McClammer again. I remember
8 the meeting up in the Wilder Dam, the planning and zoning
9 administrator from the Town of Lebanon talked about even the
10 operation of their dams on the Mascoma River. And though
11 they're privately owned he thought that they should be
12 coordinated with the operation of the Corps dams as well as
13 the dams on the main stem for flood control. This is of
14 concern to them. So to get that system that is impacted to
15 not only maintain minimum flows in the river, but also given
16 that with flooding limits; and how the coordination of all
17 these dams that are on the tribs and also the main stem
18 should be undertaken.

19 MR. HOGAN: Other water resource related issues?

20 SPEAKER: One more, Michael concerning stream
21 bank erosion.

22 No one has mentioned the effect of sediment on
23 water quality, cumulative effect.

24 MS. McCANN: This is Mary McCann. I just want to
25 clarify, do you mean like sediment load?

1 SPEAKER: Yes. (inaudible)

2 Sediment suspended in the water.

3 MR. HOGAN: So turbidity and -- Okay.

4 Jim?

5 MR. McCLAMMER: One of the other things we heard
6 about were the discharges from the, you know the Public
7 Works Director at Hanover, of discharges from the wastewater
8 treatment facilities of nitrogen and other toxics. The
9 impact that they had on the river during low flow or high
10 flow, and what happens when there's a number of wastewater
11 treatment plants that are, you know, discharges that are
12 allowable under NPDES, but presuming a certain flow level
13 and in the future, about 50 years of fluctuating water
14 levels and precipitation events, what do we do during
15 periods of low flow? How do we let those wastewater
16 treatment facilities know when they can discharge or not so
17 they can stay in compliance with the NPDES requirement.
18 Point source discharges.

19 MR. HOGAN: John?

20 MR. WARNER: John Warner, Fish & Wildlife
21 Service.

22 I just wanted to make suer it was clear from
23 discussions that the issue of flow regulation and water
24 quantity really goes all the way through, obviously from the
25 inflows upstream all the way down through at least below

1 Holyoke.

2 Without the models run it's really unclear what
3 effects are from Falls to Wilder and how much Wilder affects
4 Bellows; we don't know those questions. But the model has
5 to be run to sort of explain and show what those
6 implications are, from one party to the next, and that what
7 we do know is that FirstLight's operation at Turners affects
8 Holyoke's operation; so that in turn conveys down past the
9 Holyoke discharge, plant. And so, from a geographic scope I
10 think, the model needs to be run through that whole area,
11 where there's impacts. If you want to know, you won't know
12 until you see the models run.

13 MR. HOGAN: That's a good point. So you'd be
14 looking for some type of analysis as far as the geographic
15 scope, at least through Holyoke?

16 MR. WARNER: Right.

17 MR. HOGAN: On full fluctuations.

18 AUDIENCE: And the safety would be upstream's
19 burden as well? The storage reservoirs?

20 MR. WARNER: If they could, the upstream
21 operation peaking and storage and airflow models.

22 MR. HOGAN: So just for clarification, John, the
23 discharges from the storage reservoir or including the
24 storage as well. Meaning, they're impounding and holding
25 seasonally a lot of water within the reservoirs.

1 MR. WARNER: I'm not sure the effects of each of
2 these projects are seasonal, really, from the standpoint of
3 fish & wildlife resources, but then those are control
4 issues. I'm not too sure about that. But certainly from a
5 fish standpoint, we're downstream looking at daily
6 operations, feeding operations. So to the effect that
7 peaking is really a factor and the system is initiated with
8 the way these (inaudible) run.

9 The storage part is in spring when there is very
10 high capacity; I'm not sure there's any effect on downstream
11 operations.

12 MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

13 Wow. Melissa?

14 MS. GRABER: I'm not sure it was clear in what I
15 said earlier, but the Fish & Wildlife Service is being
16 directed to view everything through the last climate change.
17 And so in the cumulative effect analysis for temperature, it
18 really needs to include the projected and predicted
19 increases in water temperature in addition to the flow that
20 occurs from all these different sources to really get an
21 idea what in the next 30, 50 years, any anticipated license
22 term, is going to be involved in that river warming, and
23 what that means to the biota, to the Connecticut River.

24 MR. HOGAN: It's clear now.

25 MR. HOGAN: Andrea?

1 MS. DONLON: Andrea Donlon, Connecticut River
2 Watershed Council.

3 In 2000, EPA did a comprehensive study of
4 contaminants in fish tissue in different river segments on
5 the Connecticut River. They found that there is mercury in
6 the fish, PBT, PCBs; and they did an analysis about if
7 somebody was going-- a risk assessment, essentially, that he
8 was going to eat fish as part of their diet, would they have
9 health effects. And in some segments it would be a problem.

10 I'm wondering if a river system, even if it
11 wasn't dammed, would still have these contaminants sticking
12 around for 30 years, or are the dams exacerbating the
13 problem and therefore just prolonging the period of time
14 that contaminants could be an issue in people who do sport
15 fishing, and then consume these fish?

16 MR. HOGAN: Last night at our public meeting for
17 Vernon, methyl mercury came up as a question. The answer we
18 got that sediment testing had been done at Vernon and no
19 elevated levels of mercury had been identified.

20 SPEAKER: It was clean.

21 MR. HOGAN: Any other facilities had any similar
22 type of sediment testing?

23 AUDIENCE: We did sediment testing after the 2010

24 --

25 we had and we came up non-detectable on everything with the

1 exception of chromium in the Connecticut and the sediment
2 samples from (inaudible), and nickel. Nickel ran around 20,
3 18, 17. I think the average was 18 parts per million. The
4 state's threshold for, below which is 20 for background. So
5 nickel is right around background in the Connecticut.

6 MR. HOGAN: So no elevated levels, I guess.

7 AUDIENCE: No.

8 MS. DONLON: I'm not concerned about contaminated
9 sediment; it's the fish tissues.

10 MR. HOGAN: Yes, if it's not in the sediment,
11 you're not going to be --

12 MS. DONLON: It's in the sediment, but a teeny
13 amount. It would be self-considered, but it might include
14 bioconcentrates up through (inaudible) And at least in
15 reservoirs, fluctuating reservoirs have been shown to have
16 higher fish tissue concentrations, having to do with
17 methylation of mercury and --

18 MR. HOGAN: I think what I was getting at though,
19 is I'm trying to tie this to a project effect, and if we
20 have sample data that demonstrates that there is not
21 elevated levels within the reservoir being caused by the
22 projects, then -- I understand your issue as far as
23 bioaccumulation, but we still have to tie it to a project
24 effect. So if we can identify that there were elevated
25 levels above background within the reservoir sediments, then

1 I can see going to a next step; but I don't know that --
2 with the deal I have now, that that next step is
3 appropriate.

4 MS. DONLON: Will somebody can take the data and
5 look at the different reaches to see if there is a
6 contaminant project effect? And if there's also a similar
7 river that isn't as --

8 MR. HOGAN: What was the title of the study, do
9 you know?

10 You said there was a study that had been done on
11 the Connecticut. Do you know the title of that study?

12 MS. DONLON: Yes. If you Google EPA Connecticut
13 River, Fish Contaminant study. I was dated 2000 because
14 that's when they did the sampling, but the study came out in
15 2006, I think.

16 MR. HOGAN: Okay, thank you.

17 MS. BOOK: Eva Book from U-Mass. So I haven't
18 done the studies, but a colleague of mine has been studying
19 contaminants in the sediments in the river, and he's mainly
20 focused on the estuary, but I think has looked up as far as
21 the Oxbow Lakes.

22 So I don't --

23 MR. HOGAN: Can I just get you to clarify where
24 the Oxbow Lakes are?

25 MS. BOOK: Near North Hampton.

1 So, and again, I'm not the expert; he is. So I
2 only have just sort of a gist from what he's done. But he's
3 found higher levels of mercury contamination in parts of --
4 it's mainly these side channels and side reaches where
5 things settle in high flow events, and then are not
6 remobilized until future high flow events; and he's found
7 higher contamination than exists elsewhere in the
8 literature.

9 He hasn't gone on now to look at the impacts of
10 flow coming down the river; he has found that in estuary
11 there's a big impact of the tidal fluctuations, the ability
12 to remobilize, to push that into those side channels; but I
13 think they're talking about beginning to look at what are
14 the impacts of the reduction of high flow events and
15 possibly maintaining those high contaminants in those side
16 areas.

17 So I guess maybe from the study two things; one -
18 - maybe I should ask him to sort of look at your scoping
19 document and just write some suggestions of things that
20 might be looked at potentially, or talk to Andrea about
21 that.

22 But then the other thing might be that rather
23 than just looking at the main channel, it might be really
24 important to look into these study areas that also might be
25 impacted by a change in flow.

1 MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

2 MR. CASTRO-SANTOS: Question. Ted Castro-Santos,
3 USGS.

4 The question is basically, you're talking about
5 the water quality here. There's this nexus with the
6 fisheries resources, and I just wanted to say, but I'll wait
7 if there's a more appropriate time.

8 MR. HOGAN: Well, we're kind of working into
9 fishery resources, so I think it's fine.

10 MR. CASTRO-SANTOS: It's hard to know where these
11 things separate out. Carl mentioned earlier that there's
12 long term dataset temperature at Conti; that's true.
13 There's actually a few of them that have been separately
14 maintained. Also there was a model, an energetics model
15 published by myself and Ben Letcher in 2010 on the effects
16 of -- well, migratory energetics of shad. It was about
17 migratory energetics of shad, and was looking at basically
18 the entire migration, the behavior, and the delays that they
19 incur as they try to pass the various dams, as well as the
20 effects of temperature and seasonality on that.

21 So there's a nexus there with the temperature in
22 particular question, and those cumulative effects. That
23 would fit very easily into this model. So there's an
24 existing structure in place that can be used to look at the
25 effects of temperature on energetics.

1 There are other things that are missing, though,
2 that we haven't looked at which are things like disease,
3 susceptibility, maturation rates, and behavior. And that
4 relates -- I'm talking about American shad here, but it
5 probably applies to other migratory species as well. That
6 relates to the temperature question and it also gets to some
7 of the hydro peaking issues as well; is how do these things
8 influence behavior maturation rates; spawning success,
9 migratory range, migratory success of these anadromus
10 species.

11 So there's this whole big thing -- this connects
12 to, on the fishery side. Now you've got it.

13 MR. HOGAN: It's certainly going to be a
14 complicated issue.

15 MR. CASTRO-SANTOS: And connecting it to
16 individual projects or cumulative effects -- there's clearly
17 a cumulative relationship here, and I think that it just
18 makes sense -- my pitch is that if these studies are being
19 done, they should include and consider the fisheries
20 resources and what we've got already; and maybe what needs
21 to be done next to improve some of that information.
22 Because there are some obvious gaps in what we have in terms
23 of our understanding of these impacts on our migratory
24 species.

25 MR. HOGAN: So is USGS preparing a study request

1 to fill those information gaps?

2 MR. CASTRO-SANTOS: Some of this is touched on in
3 some of the study -- the agencies; we've been working with
4 the agencies on developing study requests.

5 MR. HOGAN: Great. Thank you.

6 Yes, sir.

7 SPEAKER: In the nexus here between the two,
8 aquatic and water resources, one thing that Ted didn't
9 mention was -- well, he did mention reproductive success,
10 but juveniles are impacted by sediment, their inability to
11 seek --

12 MR. HOGAN: Juvenile shad?

13 SPEAKER: Juvenile shad.

14 AUDIENCE: And other species.

15 SPEAKER: Thank you. And other species.

16 And that certainly seems to fit into this
17 cumulative effect of turbidity, water quality, erosion,
18 should certainly be included in the analysis. It's
19 definitely going to have a population effect on shad.

20 AUDIENCE: Does that include sturgeon?

21 SPEAKER: No, I don't think we know so much, but
22 potentially, yes; except for slightly different type of
23 feeding mechanism.

24 AUDIENCE: But there was work done with shad back
25 in the Sixties about this question very specifically.

1 SPEAKER: Yes.

2 AUDIENCE: And they did find very powerful
3 influences of turbidity during the early larval stages of
4 juvenile shad, in particular, where it could actually drive
5 the entire population during those first few days of life.

6 MR. HOGAN: Juvenile shad, or sturgeon?

7 SPEAKER: Shad, not sturgeon. For example, there
8 was an intensive effort on shad. I don't think we've seen
9 that matched with any other species in the river, to my
10 knowledge.

11 AUDIENCE: What was that study?

12 SPEAKER: Marcy and also Krankel and Savoy (ph).

13 MR. HOGAN: Since we're into aquatic resources,
14 I'm going to go through -- we kind of identified
15 preliminarily and we'll jump right into the aquatic
16 resources.

17 Fishery or Aquatic Resources

18 MR. SEARS: So there's a section in error in
19 here; it's going to be corrected in the SD2, but all of the
20 project effects we identified are also going to be
21 considered as for cumulative effect as well.

22 These include the effects of project operation
23 and maintenance, including fluctuations in water levels and
24 downstream releases on aquatic habitat and resources in the
25 project's vicinity. For example, resident and migratory

1 fish populations, fish spawning and feeding, and
2 overwintering habitats as well as mussels and
3 macroinvertebrate populations and habitat.

4 The other ones are the effects of project
5 facilities and operations, including reservoir fluctuations
6 and generation releases on upstream and downstream fish
7 migration through and within project fishways, reservoirs
8 and the downstream riverine corridor.

9 The last one is the effects of entrainment on
10 fish populations at each project. So in reference to shad,
11 I think the geographic scope would from the head of tide to
12 Bellows Falls, the natural extent. And then for salmon, I'm
13 not sure what Fish & Wildlife is going to do with their
14 legacy population; that would include the extent of their
15 upstream stocking, so the downstream migrants would be
16 covered. So each project, that would include the cumulative
17 effects downstream to past Holyoke; as an example of fish
18 passage migration.

19 MR. HOGAN: Thoughts?

20 John.

21 MR. WARNER: Obviously, you're using those as
22 examples, right?

23 MR. SEARS: Yes.

24 MR. WARNER: So it wouldn't put (inaudible)
25 habitat and entrainment issues.

1 MR. RAGONESE: John, it's hard to hear you; I'm
2 sorry.

3 MR. WARNER: What I said is, he was using shad as
4 an example, geographically. You know, the operations on
5 habitat and entrainment and passage would -- in all stations
6 and would apply to geographic range of those species, so
7 (inaudible) reservoirs, migratory shad, the shad goes up to
8 Bellows Falls, but the lamprey and American eel, you know,
9 it would encompass (inaudible)

10 MR. HOGAN: Okay, so head of tide to Fifteen Mile
11 Falls, basically? For other than shad, the other migratory
12 species.

13 Other thoughts about fishery or aquatic resources
14 that could be cumulatively effected?

15 No? I thought this was going to be the big one.

16 MR. RAGONESE: I'm just curious; has there ever
17 been like, in the broader context of examination like in an
18 EIS of this scale -- considering either mandricals (ph) for
19 various species, particularly anadromous fish, including the
20 effects of -- you know, their ocean or salt water
21 environments and issues and population concerns and disease,
22 and fishing, or whatever it might be. Has there ever been a
23 broader analysis of the goals and the impact of the
24 operations within a larger picture of management challenges?

25 MR. HOGAN: We've been asked to, in the past,

1 complete life-cycle analysis and cumulative effects of
2 projects within a complete life-cycle analysis for Pacific
3 Salmon. We declined.

4 But we did carry that, or planned to carry that
5 analysis to the tide, to the estuarian environment.

6 Does that answer your question, John?

7 MR. RAGONESE: It clarifies it, yes.

8 SPEAKER: I had a question, too, about specific
9 study requests. I mentioned this yesterday about the
10 telemetry study; I know that that will be cumulative, it
11 will pass through multiple projects; and more specifically
12 to you is: How should this type of telemetry study request
13 be addressed? Project by project, company by company, or a
14 cumulative, single request?

15 MR. HOGAN: If it's the same -- that's your
16 question; how do I craft my study request if it's going to
17 apply for all of the projects and each of the licensees?

18 SPEAKER: Yes.

19 MR. HOGAN: That's basically it.

20 I don't care if you do five individual study
21 requests or one, as long as you put the subdockets and send
22 it to each of the -- as long as you put the dockets on -- if
23 you do one, I want you to identify each of the projects that
24 it applies to, and you can send it to each of the licensees.
25 If you do five you can send it to, send the appropriate ones

1 to the licensees, and it will be one docket. So whatever is
2 easier for you; the point is we want to understand what
3 you're asking for and get the information into the record,
4 the format -- as long as you address study criteria; but as
5 far as the -- I'm okay with lumping.

6 On that note, though, if there's a component that
7 doesn't apply to an individual project, I'd appreciate
8 teasing that out, too. I'm just going to use this as an
9 example; if you don't think you need to put telemetry
10 monitors up in Northfield Mountain, you know, that's -- I'm
11 talking about the upper reservoir, you know; make sure that
12 that's clear. You know, if it's just the four projects, not
13 Northfield, or if it is all five of them, that's fine. Tie
14 it to the projects that you're interested in, the study to
15 go to.

16 SPEAKER: So if the lumping part, I guess in the
17 methodology section, we describe as just the basic locations
18 where you would anticipate telemetry detection, and one of
19 those would be in the upper reservoir at Northfield.

20 MR. HOGAN: If that's what you want.

21 SPEAKER: Yes. Well, it's logical.

22 MR. HOGAN: Yes. If you choose to get into that
23 level of detail, yes. What I was getting more at is if
24 there's a component of the study or the study doesn't apply
25 to an individual project, whatever -- I know the telemetry

1 you are looking at, then just identify the projects it does
2 apply to.

3 SPEAKER: And that same sort of thing would
4 potentially be applicable to silver heel studies?

5 MR. HOGAN: Whatever studies you want, yes.

6 If you feel that the study you're requesting is
7 appropriate for every project, I'm fine with lumping.

8 Other aquatic resources that may be cumulatively
9 affected? We've heard quite a bit about migratory fish
10 species; we've identified native fish -- or populations
11 affected by entrainment through the system. Katie?

12 MS. KENNEDY: I think that John said this, but --
13 this is Katie Kennedy, Nature Conservancy -- but we'd be
14 interested in looking at all resident populations
15 cumulatively, because they don't exist. Populations that
16 exist independently of each other, so there's (inaudible) at
17 the very least. So at the very least looking at all
18 resident species. And then also macroinvertebrates,
19 mussels.

20 MS. McCANN: So Katie, I'd like to ask for
21 clarification. Mary McCann.

22 So are you talking about, are you looking for a
23 comparison of resident populations between projects or
24 reaches? Or I'm not sure I understand what you're asking.

25 MS. KENNEDY: So I think the point is that I'm

1 looking at cumulative impacts of all the facilities on a
2 whole population, an isolated population of whatever species
3 to look at (inaudible)

4 Doesn't that make sense?

5 MR. HOGAN: No.

6 MS. McCANN: I was thinking of hiding.
7 They get complicated with the -- you would have natural
8 upstream-downstream changes in communities, not an open
9 rivers. So I'm trying to go through in my head what you
10 were looking at.

11 MS. KENNEDY: So look at the whole population; so
12 in other words, get an estimate of the whole population.

13 MR. HOGAN: I think what Mary is saying is that
14 in an uncontrolled system, completely, you're going to have
15 population dynamics as you move through that system. And
16 her question is, you know, given that even in a natural
17 system, how do you want us to be looking at -- you know, as
18 we move from upstream to downstream, that dynamic is going
19 to change naturally. So how do we -- how are we looking at,
20 how are we doing a comparison when there's nothing to
21 compare?

22 Is that -- Mary?

23 MS. McCANN: Yes. So I would --

24 MS. KENNEDY: Just for example, let's say we're
25 looking at a bass population. So we want to get an estimate

1 of the whole population and then look at specific potential
2 impacts; see if we can look at, for example -- there may be
3 -- and I'm just (inaudible).

4 So you can look at extinction rates, how they
5 vary from one project to the other. This is the whole
6 population, an estimate of whole population, and this is how
7 it differs from project to project.

8 MR. HOGAN: Well, I think we would do that
9 analysis, anyway.

10 MS. KENNEDY: Yes.

11 MR. HOGAN: Okay.

12 MS. KENNEDY: It's looking at the whole
13 population rather than individual populations to get an
14 idea.

15 MR. HOGAN: Yes, but I guess I'm -- we're going
16 to try and wrap our heads around that.

17 MS. KENNEDY: Okay.

18 MR. HOGAN: Andrea.

19 MS. DONLON: Andrea Donlon, Connecticut River
20 Watershed Council.

21 I once heard somebody say at a conference that
22 the migratory fish, and they were talking about the shad or
23 another species, I don't remember; they just really don't
24 get beyond the second dam, like there isn't a river in the
25 world or something that has a successful migratory fish run

1 that's more than two dams.

2 I don't know if that's true or not, or whether it
3 is specific to a species, but somebody cited a study
4 yesterday that looked at three river systems, and that fish
5 passage just doesn't work, and I know that a lot of the
6 study requests will be related to what's -- how can we make
7 an individual site pass fish better? And I'm just kind of
8 curious if there's -- I don't know if the agency will do
9 this analysis or whether FERC does, or the companies do it,
10 but like what's the best we can really shoot for, given how
11 many dams there are in the river system that we've got?

12 MR. HOGAN: I think Fish & Wildlife Service has
13 some target goals for passage at each dam, and Ken Sprankle
14 has his hand up.

15 MS. DONLON: Is that based on other systems with
16 dams?

17 MR. SPRANKLE: So Ken Sprankle, U.S. Fish &
18 Wildlife Service. So currently the Connecticut River has an
19 improved shad management plan; it was approved in 1992. It
20 has targets in there, some of the figures I can quote is a
21 range of between 40 to 60 percent passage of the previous
22 dam's numbers; the subsequent dam. And then you take our
23 target management numbers of 1.5 to 2 million fish back at
24 the river mouth, you can do some extrapolations. What's a
25 little bit of a wild card is there's allowable in-river

1 harvest to occur. That number has been dramatically reduced
2 in recent years, to the point where it's almost negligible.
3 So you can do some mathematical calculations on that. So
4 you see Holyoke and you put that number a time or two, and
5 then as everyone is well aware, we have some serious issues
6 to deal with the Turners Falls project.

7 MR. HOGAN: Curiosity, Ken, how was the 40 to 60
8 percent at each subsequent --

9 MR. SPRANKLE: That's a good question. It's
10 based upon past historical population estimates to the lower
11 river that have been done throughout the 1900s; it's really
12 kind of a function on surface A bridge; it's really habitat.

13 It's not really broken out effectively by
14 habitat. That's where we're really lacking information.
15 That's one of the things that we'd like to address in some
16 of those study requests.

17 Many of the plans up and down the East Coast just
18 simply looked at a surface measure; it could be an 100 meter
19 squared area, acres, and then production on the --
20 corresponding production.

21 MR. HOGAN: Thank you, Ken.

22 MS. DONLON: Follow-up question. So it all sort
23 of depends a little bit on the success rate of Holyoke; like
24 how many -- I don't think we know -- we know how many fish
25 pass at Holyoke but we don't know -- well, what the

1 percentage of fish that are making it up, and everything
2 follows from there. the goals follow from there.

3 MR. CASTRO-SANTOS: Correct. That's something
4 we're working on, that I have been involved in studies;
5 we're hoping to improve it.

6 Again, a 50 percent value has been -- that's a
7 reasonable approximation. I mean, the preliminary data this
8 year is quite a lot worse; but we're working on -- there are
9 reasons to question it; we have to be careful. So we're
10 trying to be cautious here before we start releasing the
11 data from Holyoke. But don't assume Holyoke is working
12 perfectly. People thought Turners worked great until we
13 started studying it. And maybe it did.

14 Actually, since I'm talking, I had a follow up
15 point to Katie's comment, if I could. Ted Castro-Santos.

16 Katie, I think what she was saying was some sort
17 of study of the cumulative effects of the facilities in
18 species assemblages as you move down the stream. I think
19 that was -- so a community assemblage analysis of what's
20 going on, as you move down the stream.

21 Is that more or less what you're saying?

22 MS. KENNEDY: Essentially, yes.

23 MR. CASTRO-SANTOS: And then you chose as an
24 example a nonnative species.

25 (Laughter)

1 And so I just wanted to point that out; and I
2 think it's actually -- this is a species-poor system in its
3 native state. And I think it is possible that, in fact
4 likely that these projects are having a significant effect
5 on community structure and assemblage; and that may be to
6 the detriment, in some cases, of the native species. And I
7 suspect that that is something that should not get missed.
8 If this were to go forward, that would be an important
9 element of that.

10 MR. HOGAN: Norman.

11 MR. SIMS: Norman Sims from the AMC again.

12 I was trying to do the math as he was talking
13 about each facility having a target of 50 percent; and the
14 math is that by the time you get to Wilder, maybe you're
15 passing 3 percent of the fish that came in the system.

16 And that reminded me of a study that I just read
17 about on a U-Mass newsletter -- maybe my colleagues at U-
18 Mass would be familiar with this, about some U-Mass
19 researcher working with other people on the success of fish
20 passage in rivers. I don't think they were using it in
21 Connecticut. His estimate was that fish passage is
22 relatively unsuccessful and ends up passing only about 2
23 percent of the fish.

24 Are you aware of who did that work?

25 AUDIENCE: (inaudible)

1 SPEAKER: I saw and read the study. It's all
2 very secondary; it's not primary research that they're
3 talking about, and there was an awful lot of hand-waving
4 through that paper.

5 But there are --

6 AUDIENCE: (inaudible)

7 (Laughter)

8 SPEAKER: Yes, it's in Conservation Letters is
9 the journal that that came from, and it just came out and I
10 can't remember the first, the primary article.

11 (Simultaneous discussion)

12 AUDIENCE: Jed Brown and Don Waldman.

13 SPEAKER: It's going to -- that's going to be
14 subject to some critique, I think. I'm not saying I even
15 disagree with their conclusions, but they got to those
16 conclusions pretty quickly.

17 MR. HOGAN: Carl.

18 MR. MEYER: Yes, I just wanted to comment,
19 Andrea.

20 About the study, I was actually asked to comment
21 on that study before they published it. It's basically an
22 argument for dam removal, which I don't think is a
23 consideration on this river, to look at it realistically.
24 And also the rivers you look at, I don't think everybody
25 would agree, we've never had a successful fish passage

1 facility built at the second impasse on this river. So I
2 think it, as Ted would say, it's sort of -- it's a broad-
3 based study and it may not apply to this system.

4 We don't have working fish passage for fish here.
5 I think most of the fisheries people --.

6 SPEAKER: I'd also point out that that second dam
7 hypothesis doesn't necessarily apply on the Connecticut,
8 because fish do pass, whether we're reaching the 40 to 60
9 percent target I think depends on the year you look at; but
10 at Vernon. So I think painting that type of analysis with a
11 broad brush doesn't really do anybody any good; we just need
12 to figure out what's going on in our respective systems and
13 try to fix the problems; and we get the best outcome we can.

14 MR. HOGAN: I agree. Thank you.

15 MR. PUGH: Don Pugh. Looking at the first bullet
16 here on the cumulative effect on freshwater mussels, you
17 usually think of these things as pretty static, but when you
18 look at the survey that Ethan did, what he found was below
19 Vernon there was a much higher concentration of alewife
20 floaters as opposed to American shad or potentially blueback
21 herring, if you had any. And very low concentrations before
22 these fish are unable to pass the dam; and I hope that this
23 will be something that will be considered in terms of the
24 cumulative evaluation of mussels as the fish --

25 MS. McCANN: Tying the mussels to those fish --

1 MR. PUGH: Yes.

2 MS. McCANN: -- the passage --

3 MR. PUGH: A very dramatic survey, the
4 Kingfisher's density, the alewife floaters right below the
5 dam, where we know there's pretty poor passage of American
6 shad.

7 MR. HOGAN: Other cumulative effects concerns for
8 aquatic resources?

9 Terrestrial resources.

10 Terrestrial Resources

11 MR. BATTAGLIA: Brett Battaglia, with FERC.

12 Currently, the Commission has not identified any
13 cumulative effects associated with terrestrial resources.

14 If you look at SD1, all the terrestrial resources
15 do not have, currently no cumulative effects have been
16 identified. If you have any suggestions or comments, now's a
17 good time to discuss them.

18 MR. HOGAN: Really? (Chuckle)

19 Okay Jim.

20 MR. McCLAMMER: I guess somebody needs to say
21 something about that. First of all, we're talking about a
22 system that's been altered already, so a lot of our natural
23 or exemplary flood plain (inaudible) to a large extent have
24 been eliminated; but we could have some that are still out
25 there. And provide a lot of valuable functions.

1 But what we do worry about is, and I think even
2 the Nature Conservancy - U-Mass study is addressing this to
3 some extent; but I'm not sure exactly regionally, how far
4 geographically you're going with this. But clearly I think
5 these resources, these flood plain commuters -- okay, these
6 are the ones that have the individuals of plants and animals
7 that need to be clearly circumscribed; and indeed that the
8 floaters -- the water, you know, releases or impediments,
9 the impacts on these communities, be ascertain and
10 determined from a cumulative standpoint whether or not we're
11 going to be losing more of these relatively unusual flood
12 plains from these (inaudible) the ones that are actually now
13 still in existence, as perhaps a result of climate change in
14 terms of increased precipitation during these major flow
15 events.

16 So the effect of the water, the hydrology on
17 these flood plain communities should be ascertained, and
18 whether or not they have negative effects.

19 MR. BATTAGLIA: If we were to agree with that,
20 where would you say we look at these communities; in the
21 five project boundaries, or Wilder to Holyoke from Wilder to
22 the Atlantic Ocean, to -- what geographic scope would you
23 think we would look at these communities?

24 MR. McCLAMMER: I would say basically, you know,
25 I'd certainly say the area would be areas have not been

1 surveyed at this point in time. I know the Nature
2 Conservancy has done some work in the headwaters region in
3 Southern Massachusetts, but I know in the reach of the river
4 that I'm most familiar with, I don't think there's good
5 detailed studies on where these communities are. Nor what
6 impact that the fluctuating water levels will have on these
7 communities in the future. And indeed, when you start
8 impounding water for a long period of time, if indeed we
9 have increased flows, it could have an effect on these
10 communities that really haven't been identified in the past.

11 These are flood plain communities that really
12 can't withstand long, continuous periods of inundation. And
13 so geographically I would say anyplace above the Turners
14 Falls, Bellows Falls, up the reaches of any potential area
15 that could be flooded by the impoundments of the river.

16 MR. HOGAN: Katie.

17 MS. KENNEDY: Katie Kennedy, Nature Conservancy.

18 We hypothesized that the largest impact on the
19 flood plain communities is in the impoundments, but we are
20 still interested in understanding, it's largely understood
21 that in terms of impoundments that, other than the actual
22 impoundment itself, the downstream impact is larger on flood
23 control facilities. So we are interested in understanding
24 what potential cumulative effect there is by these
25 facilities, by these facilities on down to flood plains.

1 So we hypothesize that it's not that great, but
2 if there is any kind of flood protection offered by these
3 facilities, but -- I don't believe there is, but perhaps
4 there is; then you might understand what that impact might
5 be on flood plain communities downstream.

6 MR. HOGAN: So if the projects are influencing
7 the flood frequency that would inundate flood plains, that's
8 your question.

9 MS. KENNEDY: Yes.

10 MR. HOGAN: Okay.

11 MR. BATTAGLIA: Think it would be fair to say
12 that there would be a potential to tie in other activities;
13 for example, house development, agricultural activities,
14 where flood plain - are virtually removed. And as a result
15 of those actions as well, there's non-project impacts?

16 MS. KENNEDY: Yes, those impacts.

17 MR. BATTAGLIA: They have a serious impact.

18 (Laughter)

19 SPEAKER: If I could respond a little bit. I
20 think part of this whole, the study should be getting a very
21 refined hydrolyzing model. And since the data was on the
22 river is actually (inaudible) living in these days, and
23 either starving communities for water or flooding them for
24 periods of time.

25 We almost need to take into consideration --

1 activities and changes in surface and slopes and vegetation
2 actually from tributaries so that hydrological model can be
3 as robust as possible. So indeed, I think what we're trying
4 to do is to treat a hydrological model down at the base of
5 the -- and ensure that once we have some idea what these
6 communities need in terms of hydrological, that these
7 regimes can be at least enhanced by the operations to the
8 main stem, but also the tributaries to the Connecticut
9 River.

10 MR. HOGAN: I guess what I'm struggling with is,
11 I don't disagree that we ought to be looking at the
12 terrestrial communities within the, that are influenced by
13 the project, or projects. But I'm trying to understand how
14 this is a cumulatively effected resource that should be
15 looked at from a cumulative effects standpoint.

16 I don't disagree that we should be looking at --
17 so if you can provide me with why this was also a
18 cumulatively affected resource that we should be looking at,
19 beyond the direct effects of the projects, please.

20 SPEAKER: So basically we're looking at the
21 aerals that to date were took of for example flood plain
22 communities before the construction of the dams, and what we
23 have there now. Obviously we can't go back in history
24 before the dam; but we do have the aerals that are acres of
25 flood plain communities that are there now. That we want to

1 ensure that we don't reduce this total acreage. That being
2 the cumulative impact that we, to map flood plain
3 communities that we ensure that indeed is not a -- a
4 reduction in total cumulative area of flood plain community
5 because they are so valuable in terms of the interaction
6 with the aquatic species as well as sometimes in terms of
7 (inaudible); a lot of other functions and values.

8 So indeed we want to make sure we're not having
9 any loss of area cumulatively.

10 MR. HOGAN: Okay.

11 MS. KENNEDY: Katie Kennedy, Nature Conservancy.

12 The only thing I can think of, and that's the
13 reason I wasn't sure, but as it relates to hydrology, so
14 we've already talked about how water -- a cumulative impact,
15 so all this has been mentioned perhaps. So (inaudible)
16 components of that flow regime that impacts, and define the
17 structure of what flood plain communities.

18 So, and then the impact of flood control
19 facilities and hydropower. So that's the only connection
20 that I can see, perhaps, but it's potential.

21 MR. HOGAN: Your word is impact, my word is
22 effect.

23 MS. KENNEDY: Impact.

24 MR. HOGAN: Mark?

25 MR. WAMSER: Mark Wamser. I think what we have

1 to keep in mind is what the hydraulic capacity of the
2 projects are. Because when you're talking about flood
3 plains, this is beyond the capacity of a project, so it's
4 out of the utility company's control. So I'm not sure if I
5 understand, I guess, what the nexus of the project is
6 downstream and like for flood plain for us in Connecticut,
7 for example. I can see it within the project comments
8 themselves, but.

9 MR. HOGAN: And Katie did mention that. She
10 wasn't sure -- the hydraulic capacity -- will allow for --.

11 MR. WAMSER: And one other thing real quick is
12 the -- the impoundments at least for Turners Falls, we put
13 in the PAD, there's not storage capacity in a way that
14 people can give Army Corps of Engineers storage capacity; it
15 can be filled very quickly.

16 AUDIENCE: And the flow through is very quick.

17 MR. WAMSER: And the flow through is quick, yes.

18 MR. HOGAN: Jim.

19 MR. McCLAMMER: In sort of response to that, I
20 think really probably (inaudible) has this really for
21 increase of low flow in the Connecticut River; what we've
22 seen in the past and what we may anticipate in the future
23 and those periods of exceedingly high flow.

24 These are problems for you guys to get involved
25 in in trying to reduce the impact of that flow regime on

1 those identified communities. Basically when we have like
2 really reduced flows, should you be producing hydropower or
3 should you be impounding the water and (inaudible)

4 This is the kind of, where I see not in sort of
5 the normal operation, but during stream events. And we're
6 talking about 50 years in the future; and clearly what we're
7 looking at now is the projections of changes in
8 precipitation patterns.

9 They will surprise us all; not only during increased
10 precipitation, but also when we periods of fairly dry
11 periods as well. And so I think because you have to look at
12 something that is long term, you had to look at some very
13 extreme events. And I suspect, we're speaking probably 95
14 percent of the time without an unusual effect. But when we
15 do have these extreme events, this is when you need to
16 communicate so much.

17 MR. HOGAN: Should we move on?

18 SPEAKER: Just to make a real quick point. I
19 thought this was already covered but it might not have been.
20 Earlier you mentioned -- you used the term 'channel
21 degradation' or 'incision of the channel'; and one question
22 I've wondered about and maybe this has already been
23 answered; but as to whether the peaking, the hydro peaking
24 can contribute to channel degradation, and that would happen
25 downstream, at least at Holyoke, right? And if so, does

1 that channel degradation reduce the ability of the flood
2 plans to be inundated? If the channel gets degraded, then
3 the frequency and duration of inundation would go down as
4 well.

5 And that's something I've wondered about; maybe
6 somebody has already studied it or not; if not, it does seem
7 like a cumulative effect that belongs in this.

8 MR. HOGAN: Thank you. Katie?

9 MS. KENNEDY: (inaudible) I think that that would
10 aggravate the impact, the structure of the flood plain
11 community.

12 MR. HOGAN: Okay. Should we move on to --
13 Melissa?

14 MS. GRABER: This isn't a terrestrial resource
15 issue, but seeing as that's where invasive species is being
16 brought up here, and this kind of ties back into the water
17 quality issue of water temperature, it's my understanding
18 that the Asiatic clam has been found in the lower river, and
19 that right now conditions might not be favorable to its
20 expansions to upper portions of the river except but for
21 water temperature, and that so potentially if water has gone
22 up to a certain degree, then maybe they could survive it and
23 colonize these mid- to upper reaches of the watershed, so I
24 think to the extent that water temperature is a cumulative
25 effect, (inaudible) invasive species and potentially others.

1 MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

2 Jim.

3 MR. McCLAMMER: The comments I made about flood
4 plain communities would extend to all these other
5 communities as well. I am under the opinion that a lot of
6 flood plain communities are on actually (inaudible) but the
7 wetlands that are adjacent to the Connecticut River also
8 have the potential to be affected by it. Changes in the
9 hydrologic regime.

10 MR. HOGAN: Sure. Should we move on to
11 threatened and endangered species?

12 Threatened and Endangered Species

13 MS. McCANN: So for threatened and endangered
14 species, the preliminary issue that's been identified
15 similar to what we've already mentioned, for aquatic
16 resources and there's a great overlap with water resources
17 as well.

18 And that would be: The effect of project
19 operations, including reservoir and downstream flow
20 fluctuations on aquatic species listed as threatened or
21 endangered under the Endangered Species Act. And for
22 example, that would include the dwarf wedgemussel, jessup's
23 milk vetch and the Puritan tiger beetle.

24 Now, just to clarify, the Puritan tiger beetle
25 hasn't been identified within the project areas based on the

1 information in the PAD, but it does occur downstream of the
2 projects, so the fluctuating water levels are affecting them
3 downstream; that was something that would be a cumulative
4 effect that we will be looking at.

5 MR. RAGONESE: Just to clarify, the jessup's milk
6 vetch also is not in the project boundary; it's downstream.

7 MR. HOGAN: All the projects, or just the
8 TransCanada?

9 MR. RAGONESE: Well, I'm not -- I can't speak for
10 -- the four locations are out of the project boundary.
11 They're affected by property boundary.

12 MR. HOGAN: Okay.

13 MS. McCANN: Project area.

14 MR. HOGAN: Thoughts about project effects on
15 threatened and endangered species or habitats, cumulative
16 effects?

17 Okay. Recreation.

18 Recreation

19 MR. BEECO: Recreation. So originally there were
20 no cumulative effects identified; however, over the course
21 of the meeting we've identified two areas of cumulative
22 effects.

23 One would be the multi-day canoe, canoeing
24 opportunities to go across the entire stretch, and bypassing
25 each dams, as well as the loss of natural flow/whitewater

1 recreation opportunities.

2 MR. HOGAN: Other thoughts about recreational
3 opportunities that may be cumulatively affected?

4 Norman?

5 MR. SIMS: Norman Sims from the AMC. I'll keep
6 this brief because I've said it repeatedly at these
7 meetings.

8 The comments that Adam made about multiple-day
9 canoe and kayak trips is certainly a cumulative effect. I
10 think that the dams could be characterized as cumulative
11 obstacles to downstream navigation for canoes and kayaks.
12 But Kim Mendik from the National Park Service mentioned
13 something the other day that I think is also relevant in
14 that area of study; and that is to look at a survey study of
15 why people don't use the Connecticut River as a resource.
16 If these obstacles are discouraging to people, it might be
17 important to know that in terms of things that could be
18 mitigated.

19 I think particularly as you move downstream and
20 you face continuing obstacles, it becomes discouraging.
21 Maybe they don't get past the second fish ladder.

22 (Laughter)

23 I have also mentioned a study of the quantity,
24 quality and adequacy of the land-based facilities; meaning
25 portages, campsites and so forth. I think that's also a

1 discouragement to boating on the river and should be studied
2 with a look to the future or the term of the license,
3 whether it's 30 years or longer.

4 Another cumulative thing going on in the river
5 right now is the National Blueway System, which is a federal
6 program designating the Connecticut River and its 7.2
7 million acre watershed as the first National Blueway. This
8 involves a number of federal agencies, including the
9 Department of Interior, the National Park Service, the Corps
10 of Engineers, Department of Agriculture and states that are
11 involved with the river.

12 This could contribute to mitigation in the
13 relicensing if the Army Corps of Engineers or other of these
14 agencies were willing to cooperate. Just two other
15 comments: I think as people pass down the river, they don't
16 actually understand they're passing from one FERC-licensed
17 project to another. The Connecticut River paddlers trail,
18 for example, and the Connecticut River birding trail don't
19 really designate lines to indicate passage from one state to
20 another or one project to another. So these may be
21 cumulative interests for those parties.

22 And lastly, I would also like to say that the
23 Appalachian Mountain Club --

24 MR. HOGAN: Norm, could you explain that a little
25 bit more?

1 MR. SIMS; Well, the Connecticut River paddlers
2 trail, for example, will be extended from above Fifteen Mile
3 Falls down into the lower reaches of the river; and in
4 creating that organization and doing some good through that
5 organization.

6 They're not necessarily even aware of this
7 relicensing process or what the relicensing might contribute
8 to their efforts.

9 MR. HOGAN: So you aren't asking for boundary
10 markers on the trail to say "Hey, you're going from one --

11 MR. SIMS; Not at all.

12 MR. HOGAN: -- project to the next"?

13 MR. SIMS: It would be really helpful to have
14 some markers about where we could find a portage route or a
15 campsite, but boundary markers for projects aren't very
16 useful.

17 MR. HOGAN: Okay.

18 MR. SIMS; Lastly, the AMC is very interested in
19 trails there are trails on project lands in these
20 relicensings. We would like to see those trails extended,
21 the maintenance of them coordinated, and the opportunities
22 to link those existing trails with other existing trails.

23 Again, trails in the watershed cross project
24 boundaries and might be greatly benefited if there was some
25 mitigation where the licensees might purchase additional

1 land.

2 MR. HOGAN: As we had indicated, we -- based on I
3 believe your comments or others over the meetings, we
4 identified multi-day canoe trips as being cumulatively
5 affected by these projects.

6 Would you have a recommended geographic scope? I
7 mean, is it just these five, or as a paddler yourself, what
8 do you perceive is where people would like to put in on the
9 Connecticut River and take out on the Connecticut River?

10 MR. SIMS; I've never tried personally to do a
11 through trip on the river. I'm very discouraged when I
12 encounter a dam. But I may in the future.

13 I have talked to through paddlers. They start
14 very far up in the system, frequently from various lakes up
15 there, up above Fifteen Mile Falls. In the context of this
16 relicensing, there's a lot of miles of river included. If
17 you look at the forestry reach above Wilder, and the far
18 downstream reach beneath Turners Falls, you go from Fifteen
19 Mile Falls all the way to Holyoke Dam, and that -- I don't
20 know how many river miles that is, but that should certainly
21 be a focus for the study.

22 MR. HOGAN: Thank you, Norman.

23 SPEAKER: We talked earlier about fish resources;
24 fishing is a recreational activity.

25 MR. HOGAN: Yep.

1 SPEAKER: So it's a matter of access, it's a
2 matter of availability of fish to find. Some people fish by
3 boats, some people put on bleeders, some people put on
4 waders that may not be informed about releases, dams up the
5 stream.

6 MR. HOGAN: Okay.

7 SPEAKER: Lots of effects. The fundamental one
8 is the ability of the fish to be fished.

9 MR. HOGAN: I think that's part of our analyses;
10 the project effects on fish populations.

11 Kevin.

12 MR. MENDIK: Kevin Mendik, National Park Service.

13 I read the recent designation by the Secretary of
14 the Connecticut River Blueway --

15 MR. HOGAN: Can you speak up for me, please.

16 MR. MENDIK: Sure. The recent designation by the
17 Secretary of the Interior of the Connecticut River as a
18 Blueway has led to a broader view, sort of from my agency
19 about the -- source to sound. A lot of what I've heard in
20 the last couple days from the various members of the public
21 and interest groups seems to lead toward like a continual
22 displacement of recreational activities. It's known that
23 there are impoundment fluctuations; those have an effect on
24 recreational access both to and from the river. People know
25 about those situations and as a result may very well be

1 discouraged in the short term, or in the long term over time
2 from using the river.

3 And as a result, those facilities displace their
4 use to other facilities, maybe up and down the river, maybe
5 in other areas. So you have cumulative impacts up and down
6 the whole system as a result of segments of the system
7 having barriers, if you will, to recreational use on a
8 temporary or seasonal basis. I think that's something that
9 needs to be looked at, not only from impoundment
10 fluctuations and sedimentation, but the conditions of the
11 facilities at each of the access points.

12 Another element that Norm mentioned was the need
13 for a network of trails. I think uniform signage would go a
14 long ways, both from the TransCanada and FirstLight
15 projects. I personally find that it's helpful if I see an
16 indication of what the FERC project is; where we are now;
17 you have all various project facilities, it would help to
18 have some type of uniform signage for all these facilities.

19 MR. BEECO: So I have a question. We're quite
20 convinced that there's a cumulative effect on water-based
21 recreation. What I'm curious about is, is it a cumulative
22 effect or is it a project effect for water-based recreation?

23 MR. MENDIK: I think it's cumulative. I mean,
24 it's not coming from any one specific use; it's not
25 necessarily a terrestrial based, it's not necessarily river-

1 based; it's system-wide change in use patterns as a result
2 of limitations in certain areas. You have displacement in
3 one area, it's going to have an effect on another area or a
4 number of other areas.

5 In Baron Cove, people know that that facility
6 there is problematic. They're going to change their use
7 patterns, and that's over a pretty broad area. So those use
8 patterns are going to be affected maybe down at the Holyoke
9 pool, and may be affected over on the Deerfield, it may be
10 affected on the Housatonic up in Canada (ph) Lake. So
11 you're going to have a broader impact just from what we see
12 within the project area. And again, as was mentioned, the
13 project boundary is very different from the area of effects
14 of the project.

15 MR. SIMS: Could I add something to Adam's
16 question?

17 MR. HOGAN: Go ahead.

18 MR. SIMS: I think what we're talking about is a
19 study request; and mentioning land-based series for multi-
20 day canoe trips, we're talking about campsites, access
21 sites, portage routes, sanitary facilities, all of those
22 kinds of things.

23 And each project may contribute a different
24 number of campsites. I'm told by through paddlers that
25 campsites become very few and far between, quite scarce once

1 you cross the Massachusetts border. So the various projects
2 may differ, but it seems to me that a study should try to
3 establish what are the minimum qualities that campsites
4 should have. Should they have toilets, for example; pit
5 toilets or whatever? Should they have a water supply?

6 These are the kinds of things that are cumulative
7 as you come downriver, because if you're carrying all your
8 gear in a canoe and you have to portage it, you need to know
9 what to bring with you. Do you have access to fresh water?
10 All of those kinds of things. If there's some
11 standardization of the campsites throughout these regions,
12 it might -- I think that's a cumulative study question.

13 MR. HOGAN: So I think what I'm hearing is, you
14 know, we're going to be looking at the availability and the
15 functionality of each of the rec facilities that are being
16 provided; the need for rec facilities within each of the
17 projects; and then you would also like us to take a look at
18 cumulatively how are these rec facilities that are being
19 provided within the region meeting the demand within the
20 region, and is there a need to -- basically take that
21 regional look for all five projects together. So perhaps
22 TransCanada is providing a type of opportunity that may not
23 be available at FirstLight, but it meets the regional need
24 and vice-versa.

25 Is that --?

1 MR. SIMS: Well, yes, with two conditions.

2 Somebody coming down a river in a canoe is only
3 traveling a certain number of miles in a day. So if
4 TransCanada has provided a lot of campsites that are now
5 behind them, they're not served well.

6 MR. HOGAN: Well, but that would be part of our
7 look.

8 MR. SIMS: Yes. And the second thing is, these
9 relicensing periods are times to think not about what is the
10 demand and the need today, but what will the need be in 30
11 years? It's very important --

12 MR. HOGAN: And we typically take that approach.
13 Chris.

14 MR. CAMPANY: A study that may be useful would
15 also be surveys of users or potential users about what
16 information they actually would benefit from concerning the
17 flows and the operations of the projects and the river. I
18 think that's what -- so beyond even what facilities are
19 available. What information would be desirable, and how
20 would they look for that information? Is there a certain
21 aggregating place to know that 'Okay, these are -- given the
22 conditions today, given the likely power demands and other
23 things, this is what's likely to happen.' That level of
24 predictability might encourage greater use; and of course
25 that has not only recreational effects but economic effects

1 for the region as a whole.

2 MR. HOGAN: Absolutely. Good suggestion.

3 MS. BOOK: Eva Book, U-Mass. This is a curiosity
4 question. Is there anywhere that you're looking at -- and
5 we talk about fishing as a recreational activity? Fishing
6 can also be a livelihood activity, especially for poorer
7 populations, inner city populations, I've heard there's
8 quite a bit of fishing for minority, immigrant populations;
9 in Holyoke that is certainly true; and in the Portland,
10 Oregon area where I used to live. And many people have to
11 think about the river and the fishery resources in a
12 different kind of way versus recreation. But it was
13 actually, in some sense like an economic activity.

14 And if you're thinking about cumulative impacts
15 on fishing assets, the number of fishery resources
16 available, I'm wondering if that that can be considered in
17 your categories of resources?

18 MR. HOGAN: At this point in time, we haven't
19 heard from anybody in our public meetings that subsistence
20 fishing is an issue; but we haven't considered that until
21 right now.

22 MS. BOOK: So I'm a social scientist researcher
23 at U-Mass, and so one of the things a lot of social science
24 studies suggest is that a lot of people that need and use
25 those kind of resources the most are probably the least

1 likely to come to meetings like this and submit study
2 requests.

3 So anyway, to the extent that you can consider
4 that, it might be worth picking up.

5 SPEAKER: Yes, this is (cough) Mass Fish &
6 Wildlife, just a comment on that. From my point of view,
7 there shouldn't be any commercial fisheries going on in the
8 fresh waters of Massachusetts; there's a small commercial
9 bait fishery that we're trying to phase out. Any other fish
10 that are caught in fresh water in Massachusetts are for
11 recreational purposes only, and it's illegal to sell them.

12 So there may be people catching fish and eating
13 them; that's fine, we encourage that. But as far as
14 commercial activity goes, there shouldn't be any in the
15 waters of the state.

16 MR. HOGAN: Okay. Thank you, Joe.

17 Carl?

18 MR. MEYER: Just to add on to that, looking at
19 John Warner, but the Connecticut River fisheries restoration
20 for 1967 was to create a source of seafood for the public.
21 And that as far as I know, it still stands as policy. I
22 don't know if that has been gone back on, but they do fish
23 for shad from Adam somewhat northward, and there's no reason
24 to think that if you had a decent shad restoration there
25 might not be a commercial aspect to it; but it is a seafood

1 source, and that is still a part of the targeted mandate, as
2 far as I know.

3 SPEAKER: I'll just reiterate: It's illegal to
4 sell any fish that you catch in fresh water in
5 Massachusetts, so that would preclude any commercial
6 fisheries.

7 MR. MEYER: But is it still a creative source of
8 seafood for the public?

9 AUDIENCE: Yes, well, you catch a fish and eat
10 it. That's seafood, that's different from commercial
11 exploitation.

12 MR. HOGAN: We've got both points.

13 (Laughter)

14 And thank you for the inputs.

15 Anything else on recreational fishing? Or any
16 cumulative effects?

17 Land use.

18 Land Use

19 MR. BEECO: So on land use, on a couple other
20 resource issues, we've identified land use to have, or may
21 have cumulative effects on erosion and flooding.

22 Other than that, are there any land use
23 cumulative effects we may have missed?

24 MR. HOGAN: Curiosity with land use; does anybody
25 know of particular future construction-type activities that

1 are planned; you know, highways, roads that are within the
2 vicinity of the river that we may need to take into
3 consideration when looking at our license process. and
4 potential cumulative effects to associate with the
5 construction of that project and the operations of the
6 hydros? Or anything like that?

7 AUDIENCE: There's a, New Hampshire Department of
8 Transportation has a scheduled upgrade of Route 12
9 immediately adjacent to the river above Bellows Falls;
10 included in the area where, as a result of an ice jam some
11 years ago, there was a significant impairment to some
12 dwellings and to the roadway itself. So it's a fragile
13 area.

14 MR. HOGAN: Do you happen to know the schedule?

15 SPEAKER: It's in the ten year plan.

16 AUDIENCE: It's in the ten year plan.

17 MR. HOGAN: In ten years, okay.

18 SPEAKER: Money has been appropriated, in the
19 planning stages on construction in the next couple years.

20 MR. HOGAN: Because if it was occurring before
21 licensing -- ?

22 SPEAKER: Pardon?

23 MR. HOGAN: If it were to occur before the
24 licensing.

25 SPEAKER: You never know with funding these days.

1 MR. HOGAN: Got it.

2 AUDIENCE: Probably simultaneous.

3 MR. HOGAN: Other types of issues; it could be
4 wastewater treatment plants, things of that nature that we
5 should be taking into consideration; and I'm referring to
6 new facilities that -- land use along the river's edge, and
7 obviously would have other issues beyond land use and water
8 quality.

9 AUDIENCE: Well, the wastewater treatment plants
10 have conditions, each has its condition in terms of
11 nitrogen, for example;, and concentrations are affected by
12 operations of the dams. So it seems to me when water
13 quality is being assessed, that need of assimilative
14 capacity needs to be part of the--.

15 MR. HOGAN: I guess my question was more of, are
16 there new plants planned that folks know about that we
17 should be aware of. No?

18 Jim.

19 MR. McCLAMMER: I might comment. I think I read
20 the pre application document pretty quickly, but we actually
21 have a large wastewater treatment facility in Charlestown
22 which has a tremendous capacity. So what it has today it
23 discharges, which I don't think you guys know three-quarters
24 of the fact that we have one; but indeed, we have the
25 ability increase that discharge greatly; increase its

1 capacity. Now you probably know about the new plant and
2 down the road, and some of the others.

3 MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

4 John?

5 MR. WARNER: John Warner. On the land use side
6 of -- even though we're discussing it in meetings held at --
7 land use along the reservoir and whether it's agricultural
8 land or -- that's a cumulative thing down the river basin.

9 Doesn't change the analysis, but I think we need
10 to look at the entire length of the river; you know, through
11 these (recollect areas, to protect the lands, corridors.

12 MR. HOGAN: So similar to the recreation, if it's
13 being provided in one area and may not necessarily be needed
14 in another area, but we want to look at the whole picture.

15 MR. WARNER: Well, it's not just recreation, but
16 it would be --

17 MR. HOGAN: No, no, I'm saying -- similar to that
18 situation you want --

19 MR. WARNER: It's the same issue --

20 MR. HOGAN: Okay. Thank you.

21 Kevin.

22 MR. MENDIK: Recreational use is a function of
23 recreational access, so that the two are linked, and any
24 evaluation of recreational use needs to wrap in land uses,
25 both allowable and potential up and down the river. So it's

1 not just a function of what the power companies may own if
2 they are the project area, but lands adjacent to them if
3 developed or uses change that preclude potentially future
4 recreation. You may identify areas that are not currently
5 public access; might be desired, so again, changes in land
6 use to include those.

7 MR. HOGAN: Thank you, Kevin.

8 Other land use-type concerns, for cumulative
9 effects?

10 Aesthetic Resources

11 MR. BEECO: Aesthetic resources, we haven't
12 identified any cumulative effects for aesthetic resources.

13 SPEAKER: I think that's the aesthetics of what
14 you see from the river; obviously a function of land use --
15 changes in land use.

16 MR. HOGAN: Socioeconomics?

17 AUDIENCE: Just jumping back for a second to
18 scenic resources. The Connecticut River Scenic Byway,
19 National Scenic Byway goes parallel to the river and the
20 routes are identified, designated signage -- uniform signage
21 by the way -- and you have integrated that with your study
22 area.

23 And the reason is the attractiveness of the river
24 and the rural land use, and small, historic villages. This
25 is Vermont and New Hampshire.

1 Socioeconomic Resources

2 MR. HOGAN: Socioeconomic resources. Again, we
3 originally didn't identify any socioeconomic resources, but
4 based on our meetings, we've learned that there could be
5 socioeconomic project effects associated with recreational
6 access and opportunities and things of that nature.

7 So part of our analysis -- but as far as
8 cumulative effected, I'm going to step out on a limb here
9 and think that the folks with AMC would like to see it
10 looked at on a regional basis, from project -- for FERC to
11 look at it on a regional basis from project -- for all the
12 projects, not just individual projects.

13 MR. SIMS: Yes.

14 MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

15 MR. SIMS: I didn't hear the first part of what
16 you said; I couldn't agree with you.

17 I just wanted to mention that in terms of the
18 settings, as I had mentioned previously, the diversion
19 facilities such as Turners Falls and Bellows Falls have an
20 aesthetic problem that I consider is not cumulative but is
21 specific to those particular dams.

22 MR. RAGONESE: Ken, lacking anybody jumping
23 anybody on the social economic cumulative effects bandwagon,
24 I'm not sure if this is really the right location, but I am
25 sort of generally -- since you're at the end of the list,

1 and it isn't cultural unless it's a current cultural
2 resource.

3 But in the EIS and cumulative analysis, where
4 does the concept of hydropower, non-carbon-emitting resource
5 play into the cumulative effects or the regional energy
6 policy or the national energy policy or state energy policy
7 in terms of its role, its contribution, its -- if it were
8 reduced or if it was increased and the effect on that mix or
9 policy or direction or benefit; does that come into the EIS
10 analysis?

11 MR. HOGAN: That depends on what day it is.

12 (Laughter)

13 MR. RAGONESE: How about today?

14 MR. HOGAN: Right now, no. But we have had
15 environmental analyses where we look at -- you know, how
16 many tons of carbon is displaced by the hydro versus let's
17 say a coal fired plant or other form of generation; but the
18 current policy is not to do that comparison.

19 MR. RAGONESE: There may be another; Question B,
20 the effects of generation loss and not only to the energy
21 mix or to potential directions going into policy, but does
22 the EIS also take into that fact of a cumulative impact of
23 energy loss on such things as community investment,
24 taxation, you know, wealth to the local communities?

25 MR. HOGAN: Not so much taxation. What we do do

1 is look at projected energy demands and how any
2 recommendations that we may be making for either increasing
3 or decreasing generation would affect meeting that demand,
4 the projected demand for the region?

5 MR. RAGONESE: Just an energy demand, not
6 necessarily an economic impact.

7 AUDIENCE: Well, that is economic.

8 MR. RAGONESE: Well, I know it is, but I'm
9 curious about, is this in dollars or is it in megawatts?

10 MR. HOGAN: I think it's in megawatts. And we do
11 look at the recommendations that we're making, we do convert
12 that to dollars.

13 MR. RAGONESE: But you carry that through in
14 terms of a cumulative effect into the socioeconomic impact
15 in the communities in the project area versus project
16 boundary; you know, I'm just sort of curious.

17 MR. HOGAN: Would you like us to, John?

18 MR. RAGONESE: Well, I'm just curious what the
19 practice typically is. I think we would provide you what we
20 feel is appropriate in an application. I'm curious more
21 about what you do with an application; or do you conduct
22 that analysis.

23 MR. HOGAN: I want to --

24 MR. RAGONESE: You've not answered me; it's on
25 the record.

1 MR. HOGAN: I want to --

2 MR. RAGONESE: That's a lot of fun.

3 (Laughter)

4 MR. HOGAN: No, I -- I don't have a good answer
5 for you. Not my resource area. We do look at the economic
6 benefits of the projects, you know, we recognize that there
7 is a public interest, and when you go home and you flip the
8 light switch that the lights come on. And we basically do
9 our balancing of the environment and the value of the power.
10 And that value is not just an economic value, it is the
11 existence of it, so.

12 Kevin?

13 MR. MENDIK: I think one other aspect under
14 socioeconomic impacts would be the opening or expanding,
15 upgrading, relocating of existing facilities. That may
16 affect the commercial facilities and their current bottom
17 line, their future plans. But as I'm hearing now you have a
18 lack of public facilities, a lack of optimum conditions.
19 And if that changes, again that may displace the use from
20 existing commercial facilities back to public facilities.
21 Just an area that needs to be looked at in the overall
22 scope.

23 MR. HOGAN: As part of a socioeconomic analysis.

24 Jim.

25 MR. McCLAMMER: Jim McClammer again.

1 Again just looking at the impact of these big
2 reservoirs and the fact that they're providing recreational
3 opportunities for boaters and anybody else that uses the
4 river. What we do have in New Hampshire is basically, the
5 river has to respond to respond to boating, licensing the
6 docks that are out there and also monitoring the traffic of
7 boats out there. And it becomes quite a burden to the state
8 to have to do these things and not be compensated for; and
9 right now in most states, we have a financial crisis, and
10 there's not a lot of money being allocated to make sure that
11 the boats are not exceeding the speed limits and creating
12 additional problems such as wakes that are causing erosion,
13 and it's a safety hazard if you go out there in non-powered
14 watercraft.

15 So that's the sort of economic impact on the
16 states as a result of the recreational opportunities being
17 provided by the dams.

18 MR. HOGAN:

19 MS. CAMPBELL: Elisa Campbell. I'd like to come
20 back for a little bit to the issue of where our power comes
21 from, and I'm assuming that the decision as to whether,
22 looking at power from existing hydro dams, displaces how
23 much power that doesn't have to be generated some other
24 place is probably above your pay grade. But --

25 MR. HOGAN: I'm sorry?

1 MS. CAMPBELL: I'm assuming that the decision --
2 the way I heard it was that FERC does not currently do a
3 comparison of carbon from various forms of power. And so
4 I'm wondering, is that a decision by FERC or is that a
5 decision by Congress? Or is that a decision by
6 administration overall, or if we think that --

7 MR. HOGAN: It's a political decision.

8 MS. CAMPBELL: Yes. So if we would like to see
9 that changed, we contact our Representatives, Senators and
10 President? Question mark.

11 MR. HOGAN: Contact whomever you feel you need
12 to.

13 (Laughter)

14 MS. CAMPBELL: Politically.

15 MR. HOGAN: I am not going to tell you to contact
16 anybody --

17 MS. CAMPBELL: No, but it's -- no, no. I'm not
18 trying to trap you into a --.

19 MR. HOGAN: Norman first, and then we'll call up
20 front.

21 MR. SIMS: Norman Sims, AMC.

22 I just want to make a very small comment about
23 what John Ragonese said about non-carbon-based electric
24 generation. I think he's correct about that, and I think
25 there's a value to that. But we should be careful in how we

1 designate value.

2 As I understand contingent valuation studies, the
3 value of electricity generated by a hydro plant is reduced
4 by the amount that it charges the public to use that
5 electricity, in the same way that the value of a whitewater
6 trip by a commercial outfit that charges for that trip is
7 reduced. Whereas public use of the river has a large value
8 because there's no expense to obtain that experience.

9 The economic benefits are different. Power
10 stations generating -- and that's just separated from the
11 term 'value' as I understand it. I'm not an expert at this
12 kind of stuff.

13 MR. HOGAN: I wasn't trying to -- we recognize it
14 as a public interest in having the lights come on when you
15 flip the switch. Not a look at value in any way. When we
16 do look at the value of the power, we look at the next --
17 when we compare hydro, we look at the next -- to get a
18 dollar amount we look at the next cheapest form of power,
19 alternative source of power, whether it be coal or natural
20 gas or things of that nature, to provide us with a
21 comparison of the dollar value on hydro.

22 And I'm going to caveat this with: I have not
23 worked in hydro in a deregulated system yet in the country.
24 So this is my first one, so it may be a different situation
25 here; and I'm not sure how the economics work here.

1 MR. SIMS: Just one last comment before John
2 corrects me on this one.

3 (Laughter)

4 MR. RAGONESE: I don't correct you, Norm.

5 MR. SIMS: I just want to also mention that we
6 have to bear in mind that the fuel that hydro power stations
7 use is actually a public resource; it's the public river.

8 MR. HOGAN: We do.

9 John, before you respond, I told this young lady
10 here that she would be able to comment.

11 MS. MAYS: Alice Mays, Putney.

12 Just that there is a great deal of value in
13 keeping local dollars circulating locally, so that we get
14 more value, more wealth circulating in any community.

15 MR. HOGAN: I agree with that.

16 MR. RAGONESE: What I was trying to get, focus on
17 was, as you just described there may be a -- there's a
18 quantification, perhaps in displacement. So if we're
19 pulling out 100,000 megawatt hours a year as a result of
20 this relicensing, where's that going to come from? There's
21 usually some brief analysis of the impact of that.

22 What I'm actually asking is whether or not
23 there's a similar, only going in the other direction. If
24 there's policy that says "we want to be aiming for 25
25 percent" -- you know, energy on the renewable side. If we

1 pull this out what is the cost to meet that goal? From the
2 renewable side, which is -- perhaps others may be biomass,
3 maybe it's wind, maybe it's -- you know, what are the energy
4 costs -- what are those energy costs?

5 So it's like, sure there's a displacement for the
6 least cost, but there are also policies and directions --

7 MR. HOGAN: And incentives.

8 MR. RAGONESE: -- that are driving towards the
9 renewable goal, how do we meet the renewable? That's what I
10 was trying to capture in that same analysis; only in the
11 other direction.

12 MR. HOGAN: Okay, and I don't have a good answer
13 for you, John.

14 MR. RAGONESE: But you clarified really the focus
15 of what I was trying to get. So I just wanted to say that.

16 MR. MEYER: Carl Meyer.

17 On the opposite side of that, John, I wonder if
18 the FERC is taking into consideration a pumped storage plant
19 that operates on the spot market in a way that Northfield
20 Mountain operates, which is sort of like a day trader having
21 a party in the stock market at times. From my
22 understanding, having worked with people that work there and
23 having worked up there myself, this went from a plant that
24 used to operate in the mornings and for several hours in the
25 afternoons, so now they can turn on pumps; they don't rest

1 for more than 15 minutes. You can be selling one of those
2 four different turbines to one place -- I don't know if it's
3 hundreds of miles away or if it's five hundred miles away;
4 and this is -- so are you considering those considerations
5 in what's being done with the public's river to balance off
6 what John was talking about?

7 MR. HOGAN: Carl, as I just alluded to, I have
8 not worked in a deregulated -- none of the hydros that I've
9 worked on for relicensings have been in a deregulated energy
10 market. And I'm not the guy who does this analysis.

11 So I'm not certain what this economic analysis
12 looks like in a deregulated market; so I don't want to give
13 you false answers. I don't know.

14 MR. MEYER: There's considerations from both
15 angles. I know the power companies are not making money,
16 you know. So it's tough.

17 MR. WARD: John Ward, Gill Select Board.

18 I'd like to follow up on that a little bit. John
19 has made some good points; Carl also, and I'd like to
20 connect the dots a little bit when it comes to the
21 Northfield Mountain Pumped Storage Facility. Is, you can
22 talk about FERC looking at megawatts generated. And this
23 conversation has turned a bit into financials, the
24 socioeconomic aspect of it, where the pumped storage
25 facility, while it is being used as a revenue generator, is

1 actually a facility that consumes a lot more electricity
2 than what it in turn generates, to the tune of about 1.3
3 million megawatt hours per year, which is a lot more than
4 any of us can save through conservation or efficiency.

5 And that should be factored into the same type of
6 study, the same conversation that John brought up, about the
7 benefits of reduced carbon emissions and so on. And one of
8 the pieces with that, is that facility right now is not
9 actually a hydro facility; that is a nuclear facility.
10 Because what that is doing is that is taking excess base
11 load and converting that into peaking electricity.

12 And the day that Vermont Yankee shuts down, which
13 is the nearest nuclear facility, that whole relationship
14 between base load and peak load will change; and that should
15 be factored in when looking at that facility and the
16 cumulative effects of all five facilities put together. Do
17 you have a net generation or a net loss?

18 MR. HOGAN: I can promise you we won't be looking
19 at it as a nuclear facility. But we will look at the
20 economics and we do recognize that yes, it does consume more
21 megawatts than it generates; but pumped storage projects
22 also provide a lot of ancillary benefits to the grid and the
23 grid stability that are important and of the public
24 interest. So we consider all that when we do our review of
25 the facility.

1 MR. WARD: I agree that there are important
2 benefits to that facility. Grid stability is one, and I
3 don't know if it's being operated in this way, but grid
4 recovery would be another. I do think it would be worth
5 looking at what has historically been the reason for its
6 being, and could it be repurposed in some way when things
7 change.

8 MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

9 Shall I move on to cultural resources?

10 Cultural Resources

11 MR. QUIGGLE: At this time we have not identified
12 any cumulative impacts to archaeological, historic
13 resources. Those were presented in Scoping Document 1. So
14 we'd be interested to hear if there are any additional
15 comments regarding those resources.

16 MR. HOGAN: Jim.

17 MR. McCLAMMER: Jim McClammer again. And
18 something I said under bank erosion basically is, the same
19 thing sort of applies here, I guess. So I don't know if I
20 need to reiterate it.

21 The bottom line is because of the bank erosion,
22 we are losing our historical heritage, archaeological
23 resources; and that was a comment I made earlier.

24 So I believe there's a cumulative impact, because
25 we only have a finite amount of these historical resources,

1 and that they continue to be lost.

2 MR. HOGAN: Norman.

3 MR. SIMS: Norm Sims, AMC.

4 If I could just ask for a clarification from John
5 Ragonese and John Howard: When you did your archaeological
6 survey for the PAD, how far back from the riverbank did you
7 look?

8 MR. HOWARD: We haven't done one for the PAD.

9 MR. SIMS; Oh, I'm sorry.

10 MS. VERVILLE: But we're proposing to do one.

11 MR. SIMS: And how far back would you be looking?

12 MS. VERVILLE: That remains to be seen. We
13 haven't scoped a study yet; it's something that you
14 generally negotiate with the SHPOs. In this case, for
15 FirstLight, I think probably that would fall to the SHPOs.

16 MR. SIMS: I think TransCanada did a preliminary

17 --

18 (Simultaneous discussion)

19 MR. HOGAN: Folks, the court reporter is having a
20 difficult time --.

21 Can we get the response of the scoping --

22 MS. VERVILLE: Sarah Verville from TRC.

23 FirstLight has not yet done it's Phase 1A archaeological
24 surveys. It proposes to do so in its PAD proposals. We
25 haven't scoped the study yet; that's the next step. We will

1 be consulting with the three state SHPOs on the parameters
2 that they feel is appropriate for -- sort of the width of
3 the survey area.

4 MR. RAGONESE: Well, it's two stages. When
5 you're doing that archaeological research, you're really
6 focusing on areas that your project operations could be
7 impacted. So for example, we have a two foot -- generally -
8 - fluctuation zone and a reservoir, but we have a 5 foot
9 overall range. We would look essentially at that area where
10 our project could impact. So that's, let's just say -- I'm
11 not trying to limit it to 5 feet, but that would be how you
12 describe it.

13 Or similarly, if you had a recreation area that
14 has a trail, you look at impacts that that trail might have
15 on a resource; or if you were removing a piece of project
16 boundary from your project, you need to look at the impact
17 of removing that project boundary on historic and culture
18 resources.

19 So those are the kinds of things you do. Some of
20 those you during the survey, some of those, those are the
21 things you do in terms of what you have for an agreement to
22 deal with cultural resources going forward. So at some
23 point down the line we want to change the bronze door on the
24 powerhouse, we go through all kinds of analysis about
25 whether or not that bronze door is a contributing factor --

1 you know, the historic structure, and what are your options
2 for mitigating, needing to modify or fix the bronze door:
3 Do you buy a plastic one that looks bronze? Do you have to
4 make one out of bronze? You know, all those kinds of
5 logics.

6 But those are how you do. That's the treatment
7 aspect of the culture survey.

8 MR. SIMS; But you did do some sort of survey?

9 MR. RAGONESE: Correctly, we did.

10 MR. SIMS: And basically that was a riverbank.

11 MR. RAGONESE: It's the riverbank or any other
12 activities like, say, recreation.

13 MR. SIMS: Thanks. I was just asking for
14 information.

15 MR. RAGONESE: When we have project land that's
16 fee owned, we also look at any resources that are on the
17 project land, because you own it, it's part of the project.

18 MR. HOGAN: Andrea.

19 MS. DONLON: Andrea Donolon, Connecticut River
20 Watershed Council.

21 I would just encourage the companies to look a
22 bit beyond the water range. Although there are multiple
23 causes to erosion, you've heard a lot about the erosion
24 issue, and as described, the 30s, what change of bank over
25 the course of forty, 50 years.

1 So in a 40-year license, it may be affecting
2 quite a bit of range, I guess the operating range of the
3 river.

4 MR. RAGONESE: That's a good point, because
5 typically in a historic resources management plan you have a
6 monitoring requirement that goes through the course of your
7 license. So as things might change, you are typically asked
8 to follow those changes through the course of your license.

9 But generally speaking archaeologists, state
10 archaeologists, they don't want you disturbing things that
11 you don't --. So to project that you might impact this
12 field 30 years from now is not likely to want them to have
13 you digging in there.

14 MR. HOGAN: Anything that we didn't cover that
15 folks would like to raise as a cumulative effect concern?

16 No? I think this meeting was very helpful. I
17 really appreciate everybody's time. Hope we'll see you
18 tonight at 6 o'clock, same place, and we'll be talking about
19 the Turners Falls and Northfield Mountain projects tonight.

20 We've got a question in the back?

21 SPEAKER: I apologize for coming in so late and
22 missing the discussion, but did you talk very much about
23 recreational use of the river?

24 VOICES: Yes.

25 SPEAKER: May I just make comments?

1 MR. HOGAN: Yes, absolutely.

2 Folks, if we could be quiet for a while.

3 SPEAKER: I spend three, four, five days a week
4 on the river.

5 MR. HOGAN: Hold on a second, sir.

6 We have a court reporter, I want to make sure
7 that he can hear you, so your comment gets recorded. So if
8 we can get your name.

9 MR. McCOOL: My name is Donald McCool.

10 MR. HOGAN: Spell the last name for us.

11 MR. McCOOL: M c C o o l.

12 MR. HOGAN: Actually, could you step right up
13 here?

14 MR. McCOOL: Yes.

15 Sorry to keep you all here.

16 I do a lot of rowing on the river.

17 MR. HOGAN: Any particular reach?

18 MR. McCOOL: Between Sunderland Bridge and
19 basically the rail trail bridge here. So I'm there three,
20 four, five days a week from August and September into
21 October. And that's only when I can do it. There are many
22 times when I can row between say second island and third
23 island. There are always times when I can do a whole piece.
24 And of course there are other times when the river's
25 flooding and you can't do anything rowing.

1 But I don't know, this is something that is an
2 issue with you; it's really annoying to see the water come
3 up about four or five feet in the afternoon, and -- or go
4 down four or five feet over a period of time and not be able
5 to use the river recreationally for myself, and anyone else.

6 I just think that needs to be a consideration.
7 The fish and the riverbanks. There are also people who use
8 the river.

9 MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

10 MR. McCOOL: You're welcome.

11 MR. HOGAN: Will you be attending tonight?

12 MR. McCOOL: What time is it?

13 MR. HOGAN: At 6 o'clock, right here.

14 MR. McCOOL: Right here.

15 MR. HOGAN: That's up to you, but we are
16 certainly interested in hearing everybody's concerns and
17 issues; the whole purpose of these meetings is so that we
18 can craft our environmental analysis to address the issues
19 that are important to the local community.

20 Thank you very much.

21 (Whereupon, at 11:40 a.m., the hearing
22 concluded.)

23

24

25

Document Content(s)

Cumulative Effects Morning Meeting.DOC.....1-99