

## **Navigation Systems**

**August 21, 2006**

**10:00 am**

### **Participants:**

Teresa Rogers – Appalachian Power Company

Jack Hannula – Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Bill Kittrell – Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries

Fran Rooker – Friends of Claytor Lake

Shepard Zedaker – U.S.C.G. Auxiliary – Flotilla 83

John Smith – FERC (Conference Call)

Teresa Rogers reviewed the purpose of the workgroup. A handout was provided. ILP Flowchart and Claytor Relicensing Process Plan was distributed.

Navigation System Study Plan objectives were reviewed.

Question: Would it be beneficial to have facilitated workgroup meetings? This could make the process smoother. Response: At this time, a facilitator is not needed. It may be something to look at in the future.

Question: The question was asked whether workgroups are required? Response: FERC encourages workgroups. If there are unresolved matters, FERC may require them.

Question: The question was asked about whether we are capturing all the comments? Response: Notes are being taken. *(Note: In the review of the purpose of the workgroup, it was stressed that it is important to provide comments on the proposed study plan directly to FERC even if you are participating in the workgroup. This will ensure that FERC gets all comments.)*

Question: FERC asked if Appalachian would be willing to provide a revised study plan on website about a week before final comments are due. Response: Appalachian will attempt to provide a red-line revised study plan at least to the workgroup participants since they are the ones that will most likely comment.

Question: The question was asked about the source of existing markers – who installs markers, approves them and maintains them? What is the process? Do VDGIF makes recommendation and Pulaski County approves? Need to involve

Pulaski County with workgroup. Response: This is something that will be investigated.

Comment: Check with Pulaski County. Get them involved in the workgroup.

Comment: The need to develop approval process for markers to share with community was identified, from initial observation of need, approval, installation, inspection and maintenance.

Comment: Coast Guard Auxiliary patrols lake and does inspection of navigational markers.

Comment: Existing markers poorly anchored – need proper anchors to keep them in place. Guidelines should include assessment of anchoring.

Comment: A recommendation for a marker is made to Pulaski County Zoning and then the recommendation goes to Board of Supervisors for approval. Need to find county ordinance to find where their authority comes from.

Comment: A process for notifying of missing markers is needed.

Comment: The sufficiency of the existing markers needs to be assessed. Should another type of marker be used instead of floating markers? What type best marks the area?

Comment: The need for lighting of certain markers needs to be assessed.

Comment: The party responsible for maintenance of markers needs to be identified.

Comment: Bill Kittrell will check with law enforcement on their processes.

Comment: Coast guard auxiliary will be willing to check and maintain Aids to Navigation, but they will need funds.

Comment: Auxiliary is the civilian arm of coast guard – volunteers. They don't give tickets but can do all other things that regular patrols do on a lake. They staff lake on weekends during recreation season. They have no law enforcement capabilities, but they can make recommendations to boaters. They also perform boating safety checks if the boater is interested. Coast Guard Auxiliary is still

looking for a site for search and rescue detachment (SRDET) trailer. Site needs water access and road access.

Question: Can the field season be extended to incorporate fall drawdown in order to see underwater hazards? May can see things that aren't evident with bathymetry. Response: The field season can be extended. This workgroup will most likely need to have site visit, especially during drawdown.

Question: What is the existing sources for marker funding? Response: Existing markers are installed with private funds by those requesting markers. VDGIF pays for fish attractor buoys. Appalachian maintains all markers upstream and downstream of the dam.

Comment: FERC commented that Appalachian can charge fees for access, permits, etc. and can use these fees to pay for markers at recreation sites.

Comment: It was noted that the public boat ramps by VDGIF are funded by federal funds and they can't charge launch fee on federally funded boat access.

Comment: Lines crossing over the lake appear to have other cables that have been added to poles. Does this need to be added to the study? Response: Appalachian will follow-up with transmission/distribution to find information on cable heights now.

Comment: Height information needs to be published on lake maps. Look at NOAA map to see how these lines are typically marked.

Question: Does this workgroup need to be expanded to include other public safety issues such as marina electrical safety, marina spill response, fuel storage, dead animal removal, etc. Response: The Shoreline Management Workgroup may better address some of these items since they involve facilities built within the project boundary.

Question: Who should place emergency numbers at access points? Could be done through handouts and posters that provide this information. Response: FOCL is currently working on brochure. Need a more permanent placard. BoatUS has grants for this type of signage.

Comment: Check to see if VDEQ has requirements for marinas. Fire Departments may inspect marinas. Pulaski County Emergency Services may be the group that would be first responder. Are they available 24 hrs?

Comment: The workgroup should be expanded to include other Marine Safety issues – identify processes to address different safety related issues – spills, fuel storages, electrical, line crossings, dead animal removal, etc.

Next steps – proposed study plan will be revised and sent out to workgroup participants prior to Sept. 18<sup>th</sup> comment dates.