

**LOW IMPACT HYDROPOWER INSTITUTE
APPLICATION FOR THE
HAWKS NEST HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT (FERC No. 2512)
ADDENDUM**



January 2026

Prepared by:

Brookfield
Renewable N.A.

Contents

| | | |
|------------|--|---|
| 1.0 | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 2.0 | INFORMATION REQUEST | 1 |
| 2.1 | Background Information Review | 1 |
| 2.1.1 | Information Type: Hydrologic Setting | 1 |
| 2.1.2 | Information Type: Designated Zones of Effect and Selected Standards..... | 2 |
| 2.1.3 | Information Type: Agency, tribal, and stakeholder Contact Information | 2 |
| 2.1.4 | Information Type: Other | 2 |
| 2.2 | Criteria Information Review..... | 2 |
| 2.2.1 | Criterion A: Flow Regimes Standard | 2 |
| 2.2.2 | Criterion E: Shoreline and Watershed Standard | 6 |
| 2.2.3 | Criterion F: Threatened and Endangered Species Standard | 6 |
| 2.2.4 | Criterion G: Cultural and Historic Resources Standard..... | 6 |
| 2.2.5 | Criterion H: Recreational, Public, and Traditional Cultural Access Standard . | 6 |
| 2.2.6 | Evaluation of PLUS Standard Selection (Criterion F: Threatened and Endangers Species)..... | 8 |
| 3.0 | ATTACHMENTS | 1 |
| 3.1.1 | LIHI Intake Review | 1 |

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Hawks Nest Hydroelectric Project (Hawks Nest, Project) is an existing, licensed major hydroelectric facility owned and operated by Hawks Nest Hydro, LLC, (Hawks Nest Hydro), a subsidiary of Brookfield Renewable (Brookfield). The original license issued by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) for the project was issued on March 9, 1967, with an effective date of January 1, 1938. A new license was issued by the FERC on December 22, 2017, with a license term of approximately 46 years set to expire on January 31, 2064.

On November 7, 2025, Hawks Nest Hydro submitted for intake review an application to the Low Impact Hydropower Institute (LIHI). On November 7, 2025, LIHI responded to request additional information prior to undertaking the full Certification Review of the application. This addendum to the Hawks Nest LIHI application is intended to satisfy the information request and to allow for posting of the application for public comment and completion of the full review.

2.0 INFORMATION REQUEST

2.1 Background Information Review

2.1.1 Information Type: Hydrologic Setting

Missing Information: Average monthly flows and period of record used - Update period of record end date, (2014 to 2024).

The period of record used in the application was 1954 to 2014. This information was sourced from the Final Environmental Assessment for New Hydropower Licenses (FERC, 2017) which was compiled during the relicensing of the Hawks Nest Hydroelectric Project. The table below shows the average monthly flow for the previously reported period, as well as the requested period of record (2014 to 2024). The average median monthly flow for 2024 to 2024 now shown in the revised application package was calculated utilizing the USGS statistics tables for daily averages data at the New River at Thurmond Gage (WV - USGS-03185400).

| Table 1: Average Monthly Flows (cfs) | | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| Month | Median | Median | Mean | Min | Max |
| January | 8,526 | 10,014 | 11,666 | 5,711 | 20,881 |
| February | 10,898 | 18,526 | 18,154 | 5,507 | 32,223 |
| March | 13,524 | 12,916 | 14,931 | 8,512 | 26,030 |
| April | 11,295 | 15,756 | 15,441 | 6,108 | 23,676 |
| May | 8,700 | 10,986 | 14,096 | 5,993 | 30,884 |
| June | 5,042 | 6,987 | 7,713 | 3,425 | 19,740 |
| July | 3,681 | 4,920 | 4,704 | 2,473 | 7,250 |
| August | 2,954 | 3,601 | 4,419 | 2,687 | 8,404 |
| September | 2,380 | 3,098 | 4,880 | 1,924 | 15,869 |
| October | 2,723 | 6,031 | 6,485 | 1,778 | 15,483 |
| November | 14,051 | 4,895 | 7,042 | 1,919 | 16,595 |
| December | 20,972 | 9,265 | 10,384 | 2,599 | 25,527 |
| Period of Record: | 1954 - 2014 | 2014 - 2024 | | | |

Mean, minimum, and maximum flow data have been included in the Average Monthly Flows table above (Table 1) to show that there can be significant outliers in wetter or drier years which can meaningfully affect the monthly mean, making the median a better indicator of monthly average flow.

2.1.2 Information Type: Designated Zones of Effect and Selected Standards

Missing Information: Add mentioned "New River at Hinton, WV (No. 03184500)" to Hydrologic Setting stream gaging station list in Table 1.a

The following gage has been added to the list of USGS Upstream Gaging Stations in Table 1.a:

New River at Hinton, [WV - 03184500](#)

2.1.3 Information Type: Agency, tribal, and stakeholder Contact Information

Missing Information: USFWS contact is missing. Define "ACE" in the interested stakeholder list. FERC contact is not needed.

The following USFWS contact was added to the Agency Contact list:

| Agency Name | United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) | <input type="checkbox"/> Flows <input type="checkbox"/> Water Quality <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fish/Wildlife <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Watershed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> T&E Species <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural/Historic <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
|-----------------|--|--|
| Name and Title | Frankie Green, USFWS National Hydropower Coordinator | |
| Phone | (703) 358-1884 | |
| Email address | Frankie_Green@fws.gov | |
| Mailing Address | 5275 Leesburg Pike Baileys Crossroads, VA 22041 | |

The ACE in ACE Adventure Resort is not an acronym. ACE is synonymous with "Expert", "Skilled", "Professional", or "Specialist", and is used in this case to convey the impression that the company is very good at adventuring. The reason the word ACE is capitalized is unknown, but all branding for this company includes the word in uppercase lettering.

The FERC contact has been removed from the Agency Contact list.

2.1.4 Information Type: Other

Missing Information: Table 2.b. states the impoundment is at RM 13.8 and is listed as 11.2 elsewhere. Please confirm the river mile.

The impoundment starts at River Mile (RM) 11.2 and extends downstream to Hawks Nest Dam at RM 6.9. Table 2.b has been updated to reflect this.

2.2 Criteria Information Review

2.2.1 Criterion A: Flow Regimes Standard

Information Needed: "Describe the target fish and wildlife resources that were considered and how the resultant flow regime supports their habitats over their life cycles". One sentence provided, please add a more detailed description. (Applicable Zones of Effect: Bypass Reach; Tailrace)

Bypass Reach:

The current minimum bypass flows were developed during Project relicensing based on a number of factors including the findings of the Bypass Reach Aquatic Habitat Use/Instream Flow Study (HDR 2015a). The instream flow study found the bypass reach provides a variety of habitats to support aquatic resources (i.e., deep pools (45.8%), shallow pools (21.2%), runs (9.1%), shoals (12.5%), and cascades (11.4%)) and sustains a diverse warm water fishery and macroinvertebrate community. Shallow littoral zone areas with emergent and submerged aquatic vegetation, woody debris, and other naturally occurring structures are likely utilized by numerous fish species in the riverine sections of the Hawks Nest bypass reach, at various times throughout their life cycles (Stauffer et al. 1995). Sunfish and black bass (centrarchids) are often found in calm pool habitats on the stream margins where they prey on smaller fish species and invertebrates. These areas are also critical as spawning and rearing habitats, utilized by various cool and warm water species (Jenkins and Burkhead 1993). Channel catfish prefer pool habitats, which make up two-thirds of the overall bypass reach. Stonerollers and northern hogsucker (*Hypentilium nigricans*) adults prefer a swifter habitat found in shoal and run habitat types.

The Instream Flow Study evaluated habitat availability for the following species and species-guild representatives: smallmouth bass, rock bass, central stoneroller, northern hogsucker, flathead catfish, walleye, and eight guilds. In addition, the study included three target species to represent species from the Cyprinidae and Percidae families that were documented in the reach during the 2013 surveys (HDR 2015a). These include the state-listed rare and New River endemic bigmouth chub, shiner spp. (various species represented) and the greenside darter.

A total of eight species-guild representatives were selected for purposes of the Instream Flow Study. These include three shallow-slow, one shallow-fast, two deep-slow, and two deep-fast guilds. Guild representatives were selected from a variety of regionally representative sources, representing a wide range of habitat characteristics, and were selected to represent a wide range of species. In some cases, general non-species-specific criteria were used. In other cases, specific species were used to represent a guild category; these include redbreast sunfish, silver redhorse (*Moxostoma anisurum*), and shorthead redhorse.

Changing flows in the Bypass Reach have varying effects on different species, life stages, and guilds depending on preferences for water velocities and depths. For example, an increase in bypass flows may provide an increase of spawning habitat, with concurrent decrease of available fry habitat. Increases in flows and, therefore, velocities, generally benefit adult lifestages of most species concurrent with decreases in suitable fry habitat. The study also showed that the quantity of suitable habitat within the 0.44-mile-long Cotton Hill Bridge study reach does not change significantly with increasing flows.

Additional studies relevant to bypass reach minimum flow releases include the following:

- Bypassed Channel Minimum Flow Assessment (HDR 2011) – This combination field and desktop study, performed in advance of the relicensing, informed the development of the relicensing study through development of aquatic habitat mapping for the entire bypass reach.

- Bypass Reach Flow Study (HDR 2016) - This study effort included the development of a 2D hydraulic model of wetted area, water depths, and water velocities for the entire bypass reach. The model is capable of simulating reservoir storage, gate operations, and downstream flow behavior to provide estimates of travel times and water surface elevation response for different base flow and release flow combinations at various channel locations. The goal of the model development was, in part, to support the Licensee's evaluation of alternatives for enhancing public safety and potential development of a revised ramping rate/gate operating plan for emergency scenarios.
- Aquatic Species Composition and Abundance Survey (HDR 2015b) – This study described the freshwater fish, mollusk, hellbender, and benthic macroinvertebrate communities at the Project including baseline species composition and abundance information.
- Recreation Use and Needs Assessment Study (HDR 2015c) -This study identified recreational activities within the bypass reach and user preferences for recreational experiences.
- Recreation Flow Assessment Study (HDR 2015d) – This study assessed the range of optimal and acceptable bypass reach flows for recreational and commercial boating

The resultant flow regime (250 cfs from July through February and 300 cfs from March through June) sought to identify balanced opportunities for additional protection or enhancement of aquatic resources that occur in the bypass reach (i.e., through the release of additional minimum flow). The greatest gains in total wetted habitat (per unit increase in flow) in the bypassed reach (which benefit multiple species, including darters and bigmouth chub) occurs from 100 cfs to 300 cfs, after which the rate of habitat gain levels off (300 cfs to 1,000 cfs), then declines (above 1,000 cfs). There is also little increase in Wetted Usable Area (WUAs) for important fishery species such as smallmouth bass at flows higher than 250 to 300 cfs. Based on these findings from the analysis, a continuous minimum flow of 250 cfs from July through February and 300 cfs from March through June for the Hawks Nest bypassed reach was recommended in the Final Environmental Analysis by the FERC. Besides northern hog sucker, the species that benefit the most under these required minimum flows is smallmouth bass, which is the most sought after gamefish in the project area. Other benefits of the flow regime established during relicensing include:

During the spring spawning season in March through June (Minimum Flows: 300cfs),

- The 300 cfs flow provided a substantial increase in walleye spawning habitat (from 1,324 m² to 3,412 m²) on days when minimum flow is experienced, while balancing the concurrent decrease in walleye fry habitat (from 5,907 m² to 4,300 m²). Walleye spawning habitat consists of moderate to high water velocities in 2 to 5 feet of depth over larger substrate types, while fry prefer lower velocities. The available walleye fry habitat is more abundant than adult habitat at lower flows; thus the 300 cfs presents a balance in habitat changes.
- Smallmouth bass spawning typically starts in April (dependent on water temperatures), and the increase in minimum flow provides some increase in suitable spawning habitat. Additional increases in flow generally result in gradual decreases in suitable smallmouth bass spawning habitat.

- The increased early spring minimum flow also provides an increased amount of suitable habitat for adult lifestages of multiple species and all four of the Deep Guild lifestages.
- Higher flows (300cfs) provides a level of increase in spawning habitat for several additional species, including greenside darter, bigmouth chub, and northern hogsucker.
- Spawning habitat for greenside darter increased more than threefold. Increased bypass flows also increased greenside darter adult and fry habitat.
- Smaller but measurable increases are observed for bigmouth chub and northern hogsucker.
- Habitat for all four Deep Guild lifestages, shorthead redhorse, silver redhorse, and redbreast sunfish adults, increases substantially with small increases in flow (higher increases in flow result in no change or decreased habitat area) concurrent with decreases in suitable habitat for two of the generic Shallow Guild lifestages. However, habitat for the Shallow Guild lifestages is already fairly abundant compared to otherspecies/lifestages.

During the summer, fall, and winter (Minimum Flows: 250cfs),

- Flows serve to support fry and juvenile development and general adult habitat. Higher bypass flows generally decrease fry habitat due to increased water velocities, but small increases in flow enhance adult habitat, which is generally less abundant; thus, there is a net benefit from the higher flows.
- Minimum flow during the winter provides variable increases in suitable habitat for the adult lifestage for multiple species.
- Spawning habitat for walleye is limited in the bypass reach at low flows. February is the early spawning season for walleye and the increased minimum flow enhances the available habitat.

Tailrace:

The Hawks Nest powerhouse discharges directly into the mouth of the Hawks Nest bypass reach, with power generation backwater reaching and meeting the lowermost section of the bypass reach, and lentic waters near the head of the Glen Ferris reservoir. Large boulder outcrops and deep to moderately deep pools characterize the Hawks Nest tailrace area. The channel is relatively narrow at the tailrace and can become swift and turbulent during times of plant operation. Habitat complexity increases when moving upstream in both the lower bypass reach and lower Gauley River, where high-gradient cascades and turbulent rapids begin to occur. The lower sections of the Hawks Nest bypass reach and Gauley River are accessible to fish species occurring in the Glen Ferris reservoir (e.g. smallmouth bass, rock bass, sunfish species [*Lepomis* sp.], northern hogsucker, mimic shiner [*Cyprinella galactura*], whitetail shiner [*Notropis volucellus*], and walleye).

From the Hawks Nest powerhouse downstream to Glen Ferris, the habitat transitions from deep to moderately deep flowing pools with large rocky outcrops, to wider and shallower bedrock/boulder-dominated habitats. Littoral zone habitats providing significant habitat complexity are likely very important for many of the fish species found in the Glen Ferris reservoir (Stauffer et al. 1995; Jenkins and Burkhead 1993). Unlike the Hawks Nest reservoir, there is more shoreline development in the Glen Ferris reservoir in the form of bank stabilization, areas of fill, and manmade structures.

2.2.2 Criterion E: Shoreline and Watershed Standard

Information Needed: *“Describe any protections afforded the river or lands around the facility”. Please add reference to description of Cotton Hill Wildlife Management Area in recreation, section 4.8 of the application. (Applicable Zones of Effect: Impoundment)*

Criterion E: Shorelines and Watershed Standard is addressed in *Section 4.5* of the Hawks Nest LIHI Application. In *Subsection 4.5.1* of Criterion E, the Cotton Hill Site, including the Cotton Hill Wildlife management Area, is described as a Conservation and Recreation Measure to afford protection to the river and lands around the facility. The Cotton Hill Wildlife Management area exists within and is part of the greater Cotton Hill Site and is located at the downstream end of the Cotton Hill Site within Zone 2 (Bypass Reach). These sites are further described in *Section 4.8.1 - Criterion H: Recreational Public and Traditional Cultural Access Standard*. Reference to the descriptions of these sites in *Section 4.8* has been added to *Section 4.5* of the revised application package.

2.2.3 Criterion F: Threatened and Endangered Species Standard

Information Needed: *Please provide copy of IPaC DKey report mentioned on p.54 of the application. (Applicable Zone of Effect: Impoundment)*

The IPaC D-Key report has been appended in *Section 8.4.6* (Additional Attachments) and referenced in *Section 4.6* on Pg. 54.

2.2.4 Criterion G: Cultural and Historic Resources Standard

Information Needed: *American Indians in West Virginia. Please provide reference for language directly copied from source “not much is known about the Native Americans that inhabited West Virginia”. (Applicable Zones of Effect: Impoundment; Bypass Reach; Tailrace)*

<https://wvpublic.org/story/wvpb-news/wild-wondering-west-virginia-exploring-west-virginias-native-american-history/>

<https://eberly.wvu.edu/news-events/eberly-news/2017/01/05/archaeologist-examines-elusive-west-virginia-native-americans-in-new-book>

<https://www.nps.gov/neri/learn/historyculture/history-of-native-americans-in-the-lower-new-river-region.htm>

2.2.5 Criterion H: Recreational, Public, and Traditional Cultural Access Standard

Information Needed: *Please provide reasoning for whitewater release cancellations – will they or were they rescheduled? Similarly causes for the various closures impacting access – flow or operational issues? (Applicable Zones of Effect: Impoundment; Bypass Reach; Tailrace)*

Reasons for Recreational Release Cancellations:

Scheduled recreational releases in the Bypass Reach are primarily cancelled due to high or low flows. The flows required in the Bypass Reach to successfully complete a Recreational Release are 2,200 to 2,500cfs. This is contingent on 1,600cfs being first available for critical power generation provided to the Alloy

Plant. This means that incoming flows must be between 3,800cfs (1,600 for critical power + minimum recreational release flow of 2,200cfs) and 12,500cfs (Maximum recreational release flow of 2,500cfs + maximum intake capacity of the powerhouse) to successfully complete a release. These requirements for recreational releases are dictated by License Article 407, and the WVDEP Water Quality Condition (WQC) No. 13, and detailed in the Hawks Nest Recreation Flow Release Plan.

While most cancellations are due to high or low flows, it is possible for recreational releases to be canceled when incoming flows are within the release window of 3,800 to 12,500cfs. This can occur if the Powerhouse has a generating unit offline due to mechanical issues or maintenance, reducing the maximum intake capacity of the powerhouse. However, this is rarely the cause for recreational release cancellation. A more common cause is a furnace at the Alloy Plant goes offline resulting in a trip at the Hawks Nest Powerhouse. Because the project is operated in a run-of-river mode and there is very little storage capacity at the Dam, this results in a release in excess of the maximum 2,500cfs for recreational releases.

The number of required recreational releases is nine (9): Two (2) in the spring during the last two weekends in March, and seven (7) in the summer between the last weekend of June to the end of August. Releases are typically scheduled as early as possible in each period (spring/summer) to allow any canceled releases to be made up later in the season. Hawks Nest attempts to conduct recreational releases every Saturday and Sunday within the release period until the release quota is met or the period is over. However, if two (2) spring releases are not completed by the end of March, or seven (7) summer releases are not completed by the end of August, there are no additional make-up days.

Reasons for Closures (Hawks Nest Portage/Hike-Bike Trail):

This second part of this information request references a post on the Brookfield Renewable Safewaters Website which notifies the public about the closure of the Hawks Nest Portage/Hike-Bike Trail. Condition No. 5 of the WQC allows for closure of this trail with good cause and with 30-day advance notice to the WVDNR of the closure. In 2023, Hawks Nest Hydro started a spillway gate rehabilitation project. At a completion rate of approximately one (1) gate per year, the project is expected to continue into 2035. In the interest of public safety, Hawks Nest must close the dam bypass section of the portage trail when contractors are present, resulting in multiple trail closures each year. Hawks Nest and the WVDNR agreed that instead of sending trail closure notifications each time the trail is closed, Hawks Nest would send a single annual notification in December of each year with an estimated closure schedule for the following year. Hawks Nest also agreed to maintain closure information for the public, both on signage at each end of the trail and on the public Safewaters website.

During closures of the Hawks Nest Portage/Hike-Bike Trail for the Gate Rehabilitation Project, when contractors are on site, Hawks Nest closes the downstream security gate on the west side of the dam just above the #3 Trailhead, and the upstream gate on the east side of the dam, effectively stopping trail access past the dam. The Hawks Nest Portage/Hike-Bike Trail from Rt.16 at the Cotton Hill Bridge Day use Area, to the security gate at the #3 Trailhead just west of the dam, remains open during this work, as does the portion of the trail upstream of the dam connecting to the Hawks Nest State Park. This allows

anglers and boaters to access the trails and river upstream of Cottonwood Bridge as far as the dam. While portage of the dam is not available during the closures, boaters have access to the entirety of the river both upstream and downstream of the dam.

2.2.6 Evaluation of PLUS Standard Selection (Criterion F: Threatened and Endangers Species)
Information Needed: Please provide a copy of the Running Buffalo Management Plan itself, and a summary of what the annual reports indicate. (Applicable Criterion and Zone of Effect: Threatened and Endangered Species, Bypass Reach)

In summary, the 2024 Running Buffalo Clover (RBC) Annual Report states that during the 2024 inspection, zero (0) rooted crown of RBC were observed and counted. The number of rooted crowns seen in 2024 at this site is a decrease from the previous year's count of one (1). John Burkhart, WVDNR State Botanist, notes in a letter to report the annual survey findings that RBC was formally delisted as an endangered species in September of 2021 and is currently within a 5-year post delisting monitoring period. He further states that, while the occurrence of RBC at this site is historically important, "the population will not be viable without sustained, frequent management attention, and even with those efforts the population might remain small and vulnerable. Within the context of statewide occurrences of the species, the DNR's perspective is that the population at Cotton Hill does not contribute significantly to the viability of the species statewide, is distant from known centers of distribution of the species within the state, and appears to be intrinsically vulnerable". The letter clarifies that Hawks Nest's core activities of maintaining hydroelectric production and associated maintenance activities are unlikely to adversely impact the species and have had no demonstrated impact on the population to date. In conclusion, Mr. Burkhart recommends that Hawks Nest not be required to coordinate annual surveys and report those results moving forward. Additional information about the findings of the 2024 inspection are included in the letter provided by the WVDNR. The report discusses Hawks Nest consultation with USFWS, who recommended continuation of the monitoring requirements of the RBC Management Plan through the end of the post-delisting monitoring period. Hawks Nest confirms its commitment to continue to work with the WVDNR and USFWS on a year-to-year basis to determine the study and management plan needs for RBC at the Hawks Nest Project.

The Hawks Nest Running Buffalo Clover Management Plan has been appended in *Section 8.4.6* (Additional Attachments) and referenced in *Section 4.7* on Pg. 57. Because the location of the RBC occurrence is protected from the public, the report is submitted to the FERC as a "Private" filing. Hawks Nest is willing to provide the annual report to LIHI separate from the application upon request.

3.0 ATTACHMENTS

3.1.1 LIHI Intake Review



68 Harrison Ave, Ste 605, PMB 113938 | Boston, MA 02111
www.lowimpacthydro.org

November 7 2025

Katie Lester, Sr. Compliance Manager
Brookfield Renewable Energy Group
PO Box 12, 126 Lamberton Lane
Hawley, PA 18428

Via email: kathleen.lester@brookfieldrenewable.com

Subject: Intake Review for the Hawks Nest Hydroelectric Project

Dear Ms. Lester:

I am writing to let you know that LIHI has completed our intake review for the Hawks Nest Project. This initial review is the first step in LIHI's review process for new applications for Low Impact Hydropower Certification. A copy of the completed intake report is attached. The review was performed by Kayla Smith who reviewed your application to determine if any information is missing needed to complete the full review. The intake review indicates that a small amount of additional information is needed at this time, which you can send via email to me.


There will be an additional review fee of \$8,000 due before we can undertake the full Certification Review of your application. Our review fees are based on the level of effort required to conduct the full review. We will issue an invoice for the full review fee upon your decision to proceed.

When we receive the full review fee and supplemental information, we will conduct the full review. We will also contact potentially interested parties on our email list and included in the LIHI application to alert them that the application is undergoing a full review by LIHI and solicit any additional comments they may have. You will be notified of any public comments received, and you will have a chance to respond to those if you wish. Comments and any responses will also be posted to our website.

At the close of the public comment period, the reviewer will issue a report including a recommendation whether to certify the project based on the full review. LIHI staff will review the report and issue a preliminary certification decision as to whether or not the project meets the Low Impact criteria. If the decision is to certify the project, there will be a 30-day appeal period during which any public commenters may appeal that decision to an independent appeals panel. If the preliminary decision is not to certify, you will have an opportunity to appeal the decision or to correct any deficiencies in the application.

On behalf of the LIHI Governing Board, I want to reiterate LIHI's appreciation for your interest in the LIHI Certification Program. Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns about any of this. I can be reached at (603) 842-5834 or at mfischer@lowimpacthydro.org.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Maryalice Fischer". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Maryalice Fischer
LIHI Certification Program Director

cc: Shannon Ames, LIHI Executive Director
Kayla Lester, LIHI reviewer
Dustin.droege@brookfieldrenewable.com
Clint.Henry@brookfieldrenewable.com
sandeep.mascarenhas@brookfieldrenewable.com
sean.faulds@brookfieldrenewable.com

encl. Hawks Nest Intake Review Report



LOW IMPACT HYDROPOWER INTAKE REVIEW

| | |
|--|---|
| Name of Project/Facility: | Hawks Nest Hydroelectric Project |
| FERC License or Exemption # (or N/A): | P-2512-WV |
| Date Application Submitted to LIHI: | 10/10/2025 |
| Name of Reviewer: | Kayla Smith |
| Date Review Completed: | 11/7/2025 |

Note to applicant: This intake review is a preliminary review only. The application reviewer may have additional questions or request additional information to fill data gaps identified during the full application review.

General Review Comments:

The Hawks Nest Hydroelectric Project (Hawks Nest, FERC Project No. 2512) is located at River Mile (RM) 6.9 on the New River between the towns of Ansted and Gauley Bridge in Fayette County, West Virginia. Hawks Nest Hydro, LLC is owned and operated as a subsidiary of Brookfield Renewable. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) issued a license term of approximately 46 years on December 22, 2017 to expire on January 31, 2064.

This intake review indicates some missing information as described below that is needed, however all supporting documentation is provided. The application is sufficiently complete despite minor needed revisions to allow posting of the current application for public comment, prior to completion of the full review. The requested information can be submitted via an application supplement emailed to mfischer@lowimpacthydro.org.

I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION REVIEW

| <i>Information Type</i> | <i>Complete? (Y, N, NA)</i> | <i>Missing Information</i> |
|--|---------------------------------|--|
| <i>Name of the Facility</i> | Y | |
| <i>Location</i> | Y | |
| <i>Facility Owner</i> | Y | |
| <i>Regulatory Status</i> | Y | |
| <i>Characteristics of the Power Plant</i> | Y | |
| <i>Characteristics of the Dam or Diversion</i> | Y | |
| <i>Characteristics of Conduit if applicable</i> | NA | |
| <i>Characteristics of Reservoir and Watershed</i> | Y | |
| <i>Hydrologic Setting</i> | N | Average monthly flows and period of record used: Update period of record end date, (2014 to 2024). |
| <i>Designated Zones of Effect and Selected Standards</i> | N | Add mentioned “ <i>New River at Hinton, WV (No. 03184500)</i> ” to Hydrologic Setting stream gaging station list in Table 1.a |
| <i>Facility Contact Information</i> | Y | |
| <i>Agency, tribal, and stakeholder Contact Information</i> | N | USFWS contact is missing. Define “ ACE ” in the interested stakeholder list. FERC contact is not needed. |
| <i>Photographs of the Facility</i> | Y | |
| <i>Map/aerial of facility and location of nearby dams</i> | Y | |
| <i>Other (describe)</i> | N | Table 2.b. states the impoundment is at RM 13.8 and is listed as 11.2 elsewhere. Please confirm the river mile. |

II. CRITERIA INFORMATION REVIEW

A. Flow Regimes

| Zone of Effect | Standard selected | Complete? (Y or N) | Information needed to complete the review | Initial issue identification and standards recommendations |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| 1. Impoundment | 1 | Y | | |
| 2. Bypass Reach | 2 | Y, but... | Describe the target fish and wildlife resources that were considered and how the resultant flow regime supports their habitats over their life cycles. One sentence provided, please add a more detailed description. | No issue expected with additional information |
| 3. Tailrace/Downstream Reach | 1 | Y, but | same as above | |

B. Water Quality

| Zone of Effect | Standard selected | Complete? (Y or N) | Information needed to complete the review | Initial issue identification and standards recommendations |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--|
| 1. Impoundment | 1 | Y | | |
| 2. Bypass Reach | 2 | Y | <i>“and release at minimum 250 cfs at all times (WQC Condition No. 2; FERC License Article 402)”</i> Technically correct, will use 250/300 cfs in reference to WQC condition language. | Per WV Water Quality Certification Conditions 08/15/2017, “The licensee will maintain a minimum flow of 300 cubic feet per second (cfs) flows into the Hawks Nest bypass reach beginning March 1 through June 30, and a minimum of 250 cfs for all other months.” |
| 3. Tailrace/Downstream Reach | 2 | Y | | |

C. Upstream Fish Passage

| Zone of Effect | <i>Standard selected</i> | <i>Complete? (Y or N)</i> | Information needed to complete the review | Initial issue identification and standards recommendations |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|
| 1. Impoundment | 1 | Y | N/A | |
| 2. Bypass Reach | 1 | Y | | |
| 3. Tailrace/Downstream Reach | 1 | Y | | |

D. Downstream Fish Passage

| Zone of Effect | <i>Standard selected</i> | <i>Complete? (Y or N)</i> | Information needed to complete the review | Initial issue identification and standards recommendations |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|
| 1. Impoundment | 1 | Y | N/A | |
| 2. Bypass Reach | 1 | Y | | |
| 3. Tailrace/Downstream Reach | 1 | Y | | |

E. Shorelines and Watershed

| Zone of Effect | Standard selected | Complete? (Y or N) | Information needed to complete the review | Initial issue identification and standards recommendations |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| 1. Impoundment | 3 | Y, but... | Describe any protections afforded the river or lands around the facility Please add reference to description of Cotton Hill Wildlife Management Area in recreation, section 4.8 of the application | No issue expected with additional information |
| 2. Bypass Reach | 3 | Y | | |
| 3. Tailrace/Downstream Reach | 3 | Y | | |

F. Threatened and Endangered Species

| Zone of Effect | Standard selected | Complete? (Y or N) | Information needed to complete the review | Initial issue identification and standards recommendations |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--|
| 1. Impoundment | 2 | Y, but... | Please provide copy of IPaC DKey report mentioned on p. 54 of the application | No issue expected with additional information |
| 2. Bypass Reach | 2, PLUS | Y | | |
| 3. Tailrace/Downstream Reach | 2 | Y | | |

G. Cultural and Historic Resources

| Zone of Effect | Standard selected | Complete? (Y or N) | Information needed to complete the review | Initial issue identification and standards recommendations |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| 1. Impoundment | 2 | Y, but... | <p>2.3. American Indians in West Virginia. Please provide reference for language directly copied from source <i>“not much is known about the Native Americans that inhabited West Virginia”</i></p> <p>Suggested reference: https://www.nps.gov/neri/learn/historyculture/history-of-native-americans-in-the-lower-new-river-region.htm </p> | No issue expected with additional information |
| 2. Bypass Reach | 2 | Y, but... | Same as above | |
| 3. Tailrace/Downstream Reach | 2 | Y, but... | Same as above | |

H. Recreational, Public, and Traditional Cultural Access

| Zone of Effect | Standard selected | Complete? (Y or N) | Information needed to complete the review | Initial issue identification and standards recommendations |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--|---|
| 1. Impoundment | 2 | Y, but... | <p>Please provide reasoning for whitewater release cancellations – will they or were they rescheduled?</p> <p>Similarly causes for the various closures impacting access – flow or operational issues?</p> | <p>Website (https://safewaters.com/facility/hawks-nest) lists recreational releases planned (per Article 407 of the FERC license) and cancelled.</p> <p><i>“Please be advised that the Hawks Nest portage/hike-bike trail will be temporarily closed while work crews perform maintenance. The closure will be on weekdays from August 7, 2025 through December 31, 2025. ”</i></p> |
| 2. Bypass Reach | 2 | Y, but... | Same as above | |
| 3. Tailrace/Downstream Reach | 2 | Y, but... | Same as above | |

Evaluation of PLUS Standard Selection

| Criterion and Zone | Complete? (Y or N) | Information needed to complete the review | Initial issue identification |
|---|--------------------|---|--|
| 1. Impoundment | N/A | | |
| 2. Bypass Reach, Criterion F. Threatened and Endangered Species | N | Please provide a copy of the Running Buffalo Management Plan itself, and a summary of what the annual reports indicate. | The full review report will evaluate whether the PLUS standard is met. |
| 3. Tailrace/Downstream Reach | N/A | | |