Yadkin Project Relicensing (FERC No. 2197)
Recreation, Aesthetics, and Shoreline Management IAG
May 5, 2004

Alcoa Conference Center
Badin, North Carolina

Final Meeting Summary

Meeting Agenda

See Attachment 1.

Meeting Attendees

See Attachment 2.

Introductions, Review Agenda

Jane Peeples, Meeting Director, opened the meeting with a welcome and introductions. She reviewed the three stages of the Yadkin Project relicensing process. She said that the IAG would be moving from defining and conducting studies (Stage 1) to reviewing study results (Stage 2). Jane reviewed the meeting norms established early in the process during the first IAG meetings. She described the study report review process. The draft study will be e-mailed to the appropriate IAG for review and comment. At the same time, Yadkin will provide a media release and post a summary of the study report on the Yadkin website. Jane explained that the draft study report will not be posted on the website because it is a draft that will not have been reviewed by the IAG. She said that final reports will be posted on the website.

Larry Jones, High Rock Lake Association, expressed concern about how comments on study reports would be reflected in the relicensing record. He asked that rather than footnoting the comments in the report, forcing the reader to correct the report him/herself, that the report be edited to reflect comments received. Jane said that how the draft report is edited will depend on the comments. She said that achieving consensus on the draft study report is not an objective of the review process. Rather an objective of the review process is to determine whether the purpose of the study has been met. Larry said that at the May 4 Water Quality IAG meeting he questioned the accuracy of the retention time for water in each of the four Project reservoirs. He said that he expected the misinformation to be corrected in the final report. Jane agreed with Larry that an objective of the review process is to correct misinformation. She clarified that personal opinions would not be included in the report. Larry asked if the IAG would have a second opportunity to review and comment on the revised report. Jane answered no; the revised report will become the final report. She explained that the traditional licensing process does not require the licensee to provide an opportunity for stakeholders to review study reports. She said that APGI added a study report review component as an enhancement to the traditional process.

Chris Goudreau, NC Wildlife Resources Commission, stated that the first round of comments is typically factual corrections of errors. He said that once a report is finalized and filed with FERC, there is then an opportunity for interpretation and opinions. Larry asked if the NCWRC would be satisfied if a study report did not recognize the presence of crappies in High Rock Reservoir and only had a NCWRC letter appended to it refuting the information included in the report. Chris said that he would have commented on the omission during the first round of review with the hope that the misinformation would be corrected in the revised report. Larry said that his concern is that the reports be read accurately. Wendy said that all final reports would include a discussion of the comments received on the draft report, how each comment was addressed, and where any changes were made.

Larry said that he was also concerned about Yadkin's recurring messages that the Yadkin Project relicensing is a traditional licensing process. He said that in the beginning, the process was described as an alternative licensing process (ALP). Jane said that there is a misconception about the type of relicensing process being used. Pete Petree, SaveHighRockLake.org, commented that the phrase "communications-enhanced" in front of "traditional licensing process" obscures the message. He said that the process is actually an ALP. Randy Benn, Yadkin counsel, clarified that Yadkin is not engaging stakeholders in an ALP. In fact, an ALP has to be first approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). Jane added that settlement negotiations, discussed at the May 4, 2004 joint IAG meeting, are not required by the traditional licensing process (or any process for that matter), but that the decision to pursue settlement negotiations with the stakeholders was made by APGI. Randy said that the relicensing record supports the fact that the Yadkin relicensing has been described as an enhanced traditional process from the beginning. He agreed that settlement negotiations make the process more ALP-like. Randy stated that Yadkin could walk away from the IAG meetings and not violate any rules. He added that that Yadkin is encouraged by the work of the IAGs and that Yadkin believes it can have fruitful settlement negotiations with the stakeholders.

Jane Peeples reviewed the relicensing projected timeline presented at the May 4, 2004 joint IAG meeting. She said that interest identification should enable a move toward settlement negotiations. She acknowledged the requests received at the May 4 meeting to move the interest identification and clarification up in time and to also offer some training. She said that APGI will consider these requests. She reiterated the fact that Yadkin must file a license application no later than April 20, 2006.

Jane explained that at the conclusion of today's meeting, the consultant would revise and finalize the SMP Comparison Study Report based on comments received and then the report would be posted on the Yadkin website, included in the Public Reference Room, and included in Yadkin's license application. Jane asked again if the IAG was okay with Yadkin only posting final study reports on the Yadkin website. She asked if there was agreement among the IAG members to keep draft study reports within the group until the reports are finalized. Pete Petree asked if Yadkin was requesting that he remove the SMP Comparison Study Draft Report from his website. Gene Ellis, APGI Yadkin Division, asked if Pete could post the study report summary rather than the draft study report itself. Pete said that a copy of the SMP Comparison Study Report Summary was not e-mailed to him. He said that the study report posted on SaveHighRockLake.org's website is clearly marked as a draft. Pete expressed his need to

communicate with the thousands of members that he is representing in the relicensing process. Jane solicited feedback from the other members of the IAG. Randy Benn said that he preferred Pete to post the study report summary. Pete said that he has encouraged his constituency to review the draft report and e-mail him with their concerns/questions. He can then sift through the e-mails and present a compilation of comments to Yadkin. Jane commented that Yadkin is not trying to stifle information; rather it is more a question of process.

John Ellis, US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), commented that a report summary is probably more valuable for more technical studies and reports. Todd Ewing, NCWRC, said that he had concerns about draft study reports being distribution for consumption by the general public because it increases the chances for misinformation. Specifically, he was concerned that the public would read inaccurate information that the NCWRC had not had the opportunity to correct and that he would begin receiving calls.

Chris Goudreau said that what Pete is doing by distributing the draft report to his constituency is really no different from what the NCWRC does when it sends the draft report to others within the agency for review. He added that the NCWRC is a bit different because the agency can control how the information is used. Chris said it would become an issue if someone in Pete's group took the report and misused the information because there is no real recourse or if the NCWRC or SaveHighRockLake.org (or others) took the report to the media.

Pete Petree said that the study report was covered by the Lexington Dispatch but he did not think the Dispatch got the report from his website. He said that he needs to post the draft study reports on the web so that he can get feedback from his constituency.

Ray Johns, US Forest Service (USFS), asked if Yadkin would be willing to provide the draft study report upon request. He said that as a federal agency, the USFS could probably be petitioned to share the report with the public. Larry thought the idea was a good one. He said that it is very important to provide daylight on the proceedings so that the process does not fail in the end.

Chris Goudreau said that it is important that any comments on draft study reports come back to the IAG and not the outside world. Chris thought that as long as comments came back to the IAG through Pete, as SaveHighRockLake.org's designated representative, it would be okay to share the report. He asked that draft study reports not be argued through the media or elected officials. Jane Peeples said that the question was really not about sharing information, but building trust among the IAG members. Jane concluded that Yadkin will post the report summary on the website and provide the full draft study report upon request. Gene Ellis asked why Yadkin would not also post the full study report if it is going to be posted on other websites. Jane replied that it was her understanding that everyone would move toward posting only the report summary and providing the full report upon request. Pete objected to not being permitted to post the full report on his website. Coralyn Benhart, Alcoa, said that APGI would discuss the issue further internally.

Larry Jones said that is concern with only posting the report summary is that the summary is written like an Alcoa media release with Alcoa's spin on the information.

John Ellis suggested that it might be time to develop some sort of media or communications protocol. Jane agreed.

Review and Discuss SMP Comparison Study Report

Wendy Bley, Long View Associates (LVA), introduced Brad Knisley, LVA, as the one who would present the results of the SMP Comparison Study. She noted that at the February 4, 2004 Recreation, Aesthetics, and Shoreline Management IAG meeting Brad had described the 12 hydropower project and project shoreline management plans (SMPs) included in the study and had outlined the many issues to be reviewed as part of the study. She said that Brad would not review this information in any detail; rather he would summarize the findings of the study based on the report summary included in the draft report. She said that during the question and answer period she would be recording all comments received on the flip chart (see comments recorded in Appendix 4). Wendy said that there would be an additional comment period after the meeting.

Brad briefly reviewed the purpose of the study, the list of SMPs included in the study, and a list of SMP elements included in the study. Working from the table included in the report summary, Brad described the SMP issue, Yadkin's specifications with regard to the issue, the number of other SMPs that address the issue, and the SMP range for the issue (see Attachment 3). In conclusion, Brad stated:

- All SMPs similar in objectives, structure, and content
- Specific requirements highly variable
- For three issues with numeric standards, Yadkin's requirements are at the protective end of the range (minimum lot width, minimum water depth, shoreline buffer)
- For all other issues, Yadkin's policies were similar to or fell within the range of the requirements at the other Projects

Brad solicited comments on the draft study report. Ray Johns commented that the federal projects included in the study (TVA and USACE projects) are sometimes influenced by things other than the SMP (e.g. a USFS management plan). He suggested that it might be worth going back to see if this is the case. Wendy Bley explained that the study was designed to review the content of the project SMPs. She said that if the SMP did not address a particular issue, there were no inferences made. She thought that it would be necessary to take the study a step further and to talk to reservoir managers why things were handled a certain way or not handled at all, which she was not sure would be worthwhile. Ray suggested that at a minimum, language be added to the study report, which recognizes that there are laws and regulations that may preclude the SMP at federally owned and operated hydropower projects.

Ray Johns also recommended expanding the conclusions in the draft study report to include a discussion of the rationale behind the decisions to do things differently at the various projects (i.e. the study report includes a discussion of why Yadkin is on the far end of the range for minimum lot width, water depth, and shoreline buffer – something similar should be done with the other projects for these three issue areas at a minimum). Ray said that it might take some extra research, but understanding why the SMPs are different would be useful information.

Wendy said that many of the SMPs do not discuss a rationale for why uses and activities are regulated as they are.

Pete Petree thought that the rationale for Yadkin being on the extreme end of water depth (to enable the mooring of boats) was questionable. He said that there are some living around High Rock Reservoir that cannot reach 8-ft of water depth but who might want a pier to sit on or fish from. Wendy said that if this type of information is available in the SMP it could be included in the report.

Chris Goudreau said that reservoir operations and reservoir level fluctuations influence water depth and are probably not specified or discussed in detail in any of the SMPs. Chris asked if a SMP did not address an issue was it included in the "no" category under SMP Range in the summary table. Brad Knisley said that it would be dependent on the wording in the first column of the table. Chris said that the detailed tables in the study report itself categorized the SMPs as addressing the issue as "yes", "no" or "not specified". He said that by not including the "not specified" category in the summary table it loses some important information. Larry agreed that the SMP Issue as described in the first column of the table is written differently for various issues so that a "yes" or "no" in the second and fourth columns do not always mean the same thing. Wendy Bley agreed that there are ways to improve the summary table so that valuable information is not lost.

Larry Jones stated that the original purpose of the SMP Comparison Study was to compare management practices at southeastern hydropower reservoirs to determine if Yadkin's SMP was more restrictive. He said that other items and issues were added to the study that were not requested. Larry also stated that the study summary was written by the author of Yadkin's SMP. For these reasons, Larry commented that the conclusions of the study are very misleading.

Larry distributed two tables (see Attachment 5), which summarize the data included in the draft study report differently. When asked, Larry stated that all of the information included in his tables was taken directly from the draft study report. Whereas the SMP Comparison Study Draft Report compared the SMPs for various projects, Larry's tables listed each reservoir with a surface area of 3,000 acres and larger separately. Larry said that he assumed that if the SMP does not address a particular issue then it is not prohibited or regulated.

Donley Hill, USFS, said that in the interest of objectivity, the tables (see Attachment 5) should not report the maximum permitted pier length at TVA reservoirs as "unlimited". Donley said that he is certain that TVA will not permit a 1,000-ft long pier on a TVA reservoir. He asked that rather than using "unlimited" the table use "not specified".

Larry Jones said that he his also concerned that the Yadkin SMP duplicates other regulations (e.g. the Yadkin SMP does not need to address electrical codes because this is something addressed in the county's building codes). He said that the draft study report does not address this concern.

John Ellis thought that the types of users at the reservoirs be given some consideration. He said that the users on the Georgia Power reservoirs near Atlanta, Georgia may use the reservoirs very differently than reservoirs at other projects.

Pete Petree commented that the tone of the report summary is very defensive. He said that there are several pages dedicated to justifying why the Yadkin SMP is more restrictive in certain areas than other SMPs.

Larry Jones opined that the report conclusions are not fairly stated. He said that when the information is boiled down as in his tables, extreme differences, other than the three identified in the study report, become apparent. Wendy Bley asked Larry if there were any inaccuracies in the tables included in the study report. Larry responded no and said that he had used the data included in the study report to develop his tables. Larry suggested that all of the rationale for why the Yadkin SMP was written the way it was be deleted from the study report.

Randy Benn stated that there had been several references made to the "authors of the SMP" being LVA. Randy clarified that LVA certainly had a role in the development of the Yadkin Project SMP but that there were others who also worked to develop the document. Randy added that the Yadkin SMP has been approved by FERC. Randy said that in the context of interest identification and settlement negotiations, Yadkin clearly understands that there are stakeholders interested in a less restrictive SMP and therefore, he suggested that less time be spent disputing what are matters of interpretation anyway.

Larry Jones stated that the High Rock Lake Association had not asked for environmental considerations to be included in the study. Jane recognized that the High Rock Lake Association and SaveHighRockLake.org requested the SMP Comparison Study, but she said that all stakeholders have the opportunity for input into the study plan development and should benefit from the work once it is completed. John Ellis said that a lot of the SMP elements addressed in the study report impact water quality. He said that it would be difficult to discuss the elements separate from their impact on the environment.

Chris Goudreau said that the NCWRC approaches SMPs as comprehensive documents, not documents designed for just environmental or recreational reasons. He said the various SMPs are trying to do a lot of different things. He recognized that it would be difficult to write a report that explains all the rationale behind the development of each SMP. Chris said the study report captured a lot of good information. He said that the NCWRC is not just interested in the larger reservoirs (3,000 acres and larger). He said that he was not comfortable limiting the amount of information according to the size of the reservoir. He also questioned the approach of splitting out all the reservoirs, when there is really only one SMP that addresses a group of reservoirs at a project.

Larry Jones said that to simply say that Yadkin's SMP is one of 11 plans, it does not sound like the plan is impacting a lot of people. Larry stated that the number of users impacted by a given SMP is also important. Larry said that he wants to understand how High Rock and Narrows reservoirs compare to other lakes (e.g. Lake Lanier). Larry asked again that the rationale for why the Yadkin SMP was written the way it was be deleted from the study report. He said that

conclusions appeared to be an endorsement of the SMP by the SMP author. Chris Goudreau disagreed. He thought that the rationale for the Yadkin SMP being on the extreme end of a range was useful. He suggested that the rationale for the other SMPs in the three areas where Yadkin is at the extreme end of the range be added to the report, if available. Wendy agreed to try to add the rationale behind the other SMPs to the extent that the information is available. In the sense of fairness, Larry asked that all rationales be taken out of the study report. He said that leaving the rationales out of the report would not impact the factual integrity of the report.

Chip Conner, Uwharrie Point Community Association, referred to page five of the report, which says that the concern about overcrowding and the recreational carrying capacity of High Rock and Narrows reservoirs were reasons for requiring a minimum lot width for a new pier, and asked if there exists any scientific evidence to support that this is an issue. Gene said that the ongoing Recreational Use Assessment being conducted by ERM would address the issue. Gene said that carrying capacity is also addressed in the FERC Form 80 report, which is filed with FERC every six years. Gene mentioned that the NCWRC had also expressed an interest in carrying capacity as an issue.

John Ellis noted that one of the objectives of the study is to "understand the similarities and differences between the Yadkin SMP and other southeastern SMPs". He said if this objective was agreed to by the IAG, then the rationale discussion in the conclusion section should remain.

Pete Petree said that he had asked that the study examine Yadkin's authority to regulate what happens above the normal full pool elevation of High Rock Reservoir (the 655-ft contour). He said that the study report, as written, did not address this issue. Pete also asked that "on-pier structures" such as an enclosed structure versus a gazebo not be lumped together, but addressed separately. Brad Knisley explained that while some SMPs refer to gazebos, others use the terminology "enclosed structures". Pete said that he thought very few SMPs would allow enclosed structures on a pier for aesthetic reasons. Gene Ellis said that Yadkin would try to address the issue.

Chris Goudreau asked if the entire SMP (i.e. all the supporting documentation in addition to the permitting guidelines) for each project was reviewed as part of the study. Brad Knisley answered yes.

Gene Ellis noted that since the SMP Comparison Study Draft Report was distributed at the end of March 2004, Duke had changed the buffer requirement at Lake James. He said this type of information would not be captured in the Duke-Catawba SMP, as written.

Elizabeth Wilson, High Rock Lake Business Owners Group, asked that the final study report include a table like one of the ones that Larry Jones distributed. Wendy Bley asked Larry to provide his tables in an electronic format to Yadkin so that they can be built upon in the final report.

Update on Status of Recreation Use Study

Jody Cason, Long View Associates, provided a brief update on the Recreational Use Assessment being conducted by ERM. After reviewing the study objectives, Jody said that the spot counts and visitor use surveys at the public access recreation areas will be complete on May 9, as will the canoe registry; the last resident use survey was mailed on May 1; the last private community survey for the months of March, April, and May will be mailed on June 1; the tailwater use survey will be complete on May 9; and the private organization/clubs/campgrounds phone survey is complete. Jody reviewed the dates of the aerial photographs, which were taken to document instantaneous peak use at each of the Project reservoirs. Jody said that a draft study report is anticipated in the third quarter 2004.

Larry Jones asked when the last resident use surveys were mailed. Jody responded that the last surveys were mailed to the reservoir residents on May 1. There were no other questions or comments.

Review and Discuss Regional Recreation Evaluation Draft Study Plan

Wendy Bley reviewed the original study request for the Regional Recreation Evaluation with the IAG – "Evaluate regional recreation opportunities to determine if the Yadkin Project recreation facilities/opportunities are adequate from a regional perspective". Jody Cason reviewed the draft study plan, which was distributed in advance of the meeting by e-mail (see Attachment 6). Jody reviewed the study objectives:

- Identify and inventory the publicly available (governmental and private) recreation sites/facilities at other reservoirs in the study region
- Provide a general characterization of the recreational opportunities and experiences available at these reservoirs and sites
- Evaluate how recreation opportunities available at the Yadkin Project compare with those available elsewhere in the study region.

Jody noted that a fourth study objective, "Identify unique recreation opportunities that could be used to promote tourism to the region" will be added to the study plan. She noted that the study will rely primarily on existing information from tourist guides, maps, brochures, the internet, other recreation and tourism studies, and direct communication with site managers. Larry Jones suggested that county tourism officials would be good sources of information.

Jody said that the evaluation would include the Yadkin Project reservoirs, the Progress Energy reservoirs (Tillery and Blewett Falls), Harris Lake, Duke's Catawba-Wateree Project (James, Rhodiss, Hickory, Lookout Shoals, Norman, Mountain Island, and Wylie), and several US Army Corps of Engineers projects (Wilkesboro, John H. Kerr, Hyco, Falls, B. Everett Jordan). She said that national and state forests; national, state, and local parks; wildlife refuges and nature preserves; game lands; wilderness areas; and trail systems would also be included in the evaluation.

Continuing, Jody said that the evaluation will include a characterization of the types of recreational opportunities available regionally (e.g. fishing, boating, swimming etc.), as well as a characterization of the recreational experience at each of the major reservoirs in the region. She

explained that generally, the "experience" of a reservoir would be characterized by the amount of development associated with it. Each reservoir would be categorized as either "Natural" (0-10 % of shoreline developed), "Limited Development" (11-50 % of shoreline developed), or "Developed" (51-100 % of shoreline developed.

Ray Johns said that the characterization of the recreational experience at the major reservoirs should consider more than just the amount of development at the reservoirs. He said that the recreational experience at a reservoir depends on not only the level and type of development, but also the level and type of use of the reservoir (e.g. there may be high recreational use of a reservoir with many public access areas, but little to no shoreline development). He suggested that the characterization of recreational experience also consider recreational use and project operations (drawdowns). He suggested using standards for recreational carrying capacity set by the USACE to determine if crowding is an issue at the various reservoirs. Larry Jones noted that "crowding" is a subjective standard. He said that some people enjoy a crowd. Ray said that the USFS is interested in providing a range of recreational opportunities. Ray also suggested using some of the more detailed Project information included in the SMP Comparison Study Report to help characterize the recreational experience and working with professionals to collectively categorize the reservoirs as "Natural", "Limited Development", or "Developed" based on best professional judgment.

Continuing, Jody explained that tourism will be generally evaluated in terms of the amount of tourism generated by the recreation site and the opportunities available at each reservoir. She noted that the study will also include a review of other regional management plans such as the Davidson County Tourism Plan.

In conclusion, Jody said that a draft study report is anticipated in the third quarter 2004. There were no other comments or questions on the draft study report. Jody said that she would redistribute the draft study plan for additional review and comment with an established deadline for comments.

Reservoir Level Alternatives for Use in the Recreation Economic Assessment

Wendy Bley said that at the last IAG meeting (February 4, 2004), ERM had discussed the Recreation Economic Assessment. She said that both the Recreation Economic Assessment and the Surrounding Counties Economic Impact Analysis require the consultants to evaluate the economic impact of alternative water level scenarios, using IMPLAN, an economic input output model. Specifically, ERM will use IMPLAN to determinate how recreational use of the Yadkin Project reservoirs is contributing economically to the five counties surrounding the Project and RTI may use IMPLAN to look at economic impacts on reservoir-related businesses and property values. Wendy explained that in order for ERM and RTI to progress with their evaluations, they would need to know what alternative operating scenarios to consider, in addition to the baseline scenario (existing condition). Recognizing that it is too early in the relicensing process to understand actual alternative operating scenarios because the resource studies and the OASIS model are not complete, Wendy proposed several alternative operating scenarios that could be used in the context of the studies to represent the range of alternatives that will ultimately be evaluated as part of the relicensing process:

Existing Condition – based on actual operating data for 1986 – 2003, the operating guide at High Rock is the average monthly water level for 1986 – 2003; the operating guide at Narrows is again, the monthly average water level for 1986 – 2003 (drawn as a flat line for illustrative purposes)

Alternative 1 (Reservoirs Full Year Round) – High Rock Reservoir and Narrows Reservoir operated at full or near full pool year round

Alternative 2 (Arithmetic Mean of Existing Condition and Alternatives 1 at High Rock) – High Rock Reservoir is operated based on the arithmetic mean of the existing condition and full year round condition (Alternative 1) combined with existing operation of Narrows Reservoir, calculated as the monthly average water level for 1986 – 2003

Alternative 3 (Using Storage at Narrows) – includes using more storage at Narrows Reservoir to offset the need for storage at High Rock and/or to augment downstream flows in combination with another alternative or alone

Wendy said that she would have to discuss Alternative 3 with Yadkin's operations staff to get a more realistic idea of what is actually possible. She said that the proposed alternatives are very conceptual and meant only to bracket the range of potential alternative operating scenarios.

She explained that ERM would have expenditure information, collected as part of the Recreational Use Assessment, that could, using IMPLAN, be equated to an economic impact on the counties that will serve as the existing condition at both reservoirs. ERM will then evaluate how the economic impact on the counties would change (or not) based on the alternative operating scenarios.

Pete Petree commented that the Yadkin Project has one of the shortest recreation seasons (May 15 – September 15). He asked if Alternative 2 could also include an extension of the recreation season from March 1 – October 31.

John Ellis asked if the full or near full alternative (Alternative 1) meant that the reservoirs would be operated within inches or feet of full pool. Wendy asked if those using the reservoirs would really differentiate between inches and a couple of feet down. She thought that it would be very difficult to interpolate use between these very similar alternatives. John Ellis said that he has an interest in large mouth bass spawning and the water level dropping so quickly that fish beds are exposed. Larry Jones doubted that recreation use would change much if the reservoir was 1, 2, or 3-ft down.

Chris Goudreau clarified that the alternative operating scenarios used in the studies conducted by ERM and RTI should not restrict the actual alternatives considered later in the process. He said that the better the operating scenarios can be identified for the studies, the better the data will match the actual alternatives considered later on, thereby minimizing interpolation. Chris suggested that rather than using the average monthly water level for the 18-year period 1986 – 2003 to characterize the existing condition, that Yadkin plot the 18 individual years to get a

better idea of the range of variability or that Yadkin chose one of the 18 years that is representative of the year that the recreation use data was collected. Larry asked that extreme years such as 2002 be thrown out.

Chris Goudreau asked if when the IAGs started negotiating alternatives and actually using OASIS to evaluate the alternatives there would be an opportunity to loop back to IMPLAN or other models to answer specific questions about the actual alternatives. Wendy said that the opportunity would exist if it was worthwhile to loop back.

Donley Hill asked if the minimum water levels that occurred during the month is more useful than the mean monthly water level.

Based on all the feedback received, Wendy agreed to draft something up for further review and comment by the IAG.

Closing

In closing, Wendy said that Yadkin would redistribute the SMP Comparison Study Draft Report and the Regional Recreation Evaluation Draft Study Plan for a period of time for any additional comments. Wendy noted that there will be no June 2004 IAG meetings and that if meetings are necessary in July 2004, Yadkin would look for alternative meeting dates other than the week of July 4. The meeting adjourned at about 12:15 p.m.

Attachment 1 – Meeting Agenda

Yadkin Project
(FERC No. 2197)
Communications Enhanced Three-Stage Relicensing Process

Recreation, Aesthetics and Shoreline Management Issue Advisory Group Meeting

Wednesday, May 5, 2004
Alcoa Conference Center
Badin, North Carolina

9:00 AM – 12:00 Noon

Preliminary Agenda

1. Introductions, Review Agenda
2. Review and Discuss SMP Comparison Study Report
3. Update on Status of ERM's Recreation Use Assessment
4. Review and Discuss Regional Recreation Evaluation Draft Study Plan
5. Preliminary Discussion and Identification of Reservoir Level Alternatives for Use in Recreation Economic Assessment and County Economic Study (IAG)
6. Schedule and Agenda for Next Meeting

Attachment 2 – Meeting Attendees

Name	Organization
Bob Smet	APGI Yadkin
Chip Conner	Uwharrie Point Community Association
Chris Goudreau	NC Wildlife Resources Commission
Coralyn Benhart	Alcoa
Donley Hill	US Forest Service
Elizabeth Wilson	High Rock Lake Business Owners Group
Gene Ellis	APGI Yadkin
Gifford DelGrande	Yadkin Pee Dee Lakes Project
Greg Scarborough	Rowan/Salisbury Association of Realtors
Jody Cason	Long View Associates
John Ellis	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Larry Jones	High Rock Lake Association
Lee Hinson	Concerned Property Owners High Rock Lake
Libby Saunders	Badin Lake Association
Marshall Olson	APGI Yadkin
Randy Benn	Yadkin counsel
Ray Johns	US Forest Service
Robert Petree	SaveHighRockLake.org
Roy Rowe	Piedmont Boat Club
Steve Padula	Long View Associates
Terry Bargy	Concerned Property Owners High Rock Lake
Todd Ewing	NC Wildlife Resources Commission
Wendy Bley	Long View Associates

Attachment 3 – SMP Comparison Study Draft Report Presentation

Shoreline Management Plan Comparison Study

Purpose

- To understand the differences between the Yadkin Project Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) and other southeastern US SMPs
- To provide additional necessary information regarding SMP issues for consideration in the relicensing process
- To provide a common base of knowledge about other SMPs

SMPs Reviewed

- APGI – Yadkin
- AEP – Smith Mountain
- Duke Power – Nantahala Area
- Duke Power – Catawba-Wateree
- Dominion – Lake Gaston and Roanoke Rapids
- Georgia Power – North Georgia Project
- Progress – Lake Tillery
- Santee Cooper Lakes Project
- SCE & G – Lake Murray
- Tennessee Valley Authority
- USACE – Lake Lanier
- USACE – Hartwell Lake

Reviewed Elements

- Shoreline Facilities Classifications
- Special Environmental Shoreline Classifications
- Private Pier Minimum Requirements
- Private Pier Dimensions
- Private Pier Configuration
- Pier Materials
- Private Boathouses
- Private Boat Ramps
- Multi-Use Facilities Specifications
- Excavation and Dredging
- Shoreline Stabilization/ Erosion Control
- Shoreline Cleanup
- Shoreline Buffers
- Shoreline Vegetation Management
- Other Vegetation Guidelines
- Permitting Procedures and Requirements
- Fees
- Environmental Considerations
- Aesthetic Considerations
- Cultural Resource Issues
- Miscellaneous Issues

Summary
Reservoir Shoreline Classification

SMP Issue	*Yadkin SMP Specifications*	*Number of other SMPs with specifications that address this issue*	*SMP Range (including Yadkin)*
Environmental Shoreline Classification	**Yes – 40.8%**	**8**	**9.4% - 41.5%**

Summary
Private Pier Minimum Requirements

SMP Issue	*Yadkin SMP Specifications*	*Number of other SMPs with specifications that address this issue*	*SMP Range (including Yadkin)*
Private Pier Minimum Lot Width	**200 ft**	**8**	**50 – 200 ft**
Private Pier Minimum Water Depth	**8 ft – within 75ft of shoreline**	**4**	**4 – 8 ft**
Private Pier Setback Requirements	**None**	**9**	**10 – 50 ft**

Summary
Private Pier Specifications

SMP Issue	*Yadkin SMP Specifications*	*Number of other SMPs with specifications that address this issue*	*SMP Range (including Yadkin)*
Private Pier Maximum Square Footage	**1100 sq ft**	**6**	**450 – 1500 sq ft**
Private Pier Maximum Length	**75 ft**	**11**	**50 – 150 ft**
Private Pier must end in floating section	**Yes**	**6**	**4 – yes 3 – no**
Prohibits types of "on-pier" structures	**Yes**	**11**	**4- yes 8 - no**
Requires new private piers be constructed of wood	**No**	**11**	**3 – yes 9 – no**

Summary
Other Private Facilities

SMP Issue	*Yadkin SMP Specifications*	*Number of other SMPs with specifications that address this issue*	*SMP Range (including Yadkin)*
Allows new private boathouses	**No**	**7**	**5 – yes 3 – no**
Allows new private boat ramps	**No**	**8**	**5 – yes 4 – no**

Summary
Multi-Use Facilities

SMP Issue	*Yadkin SMP Specifications*	*Number of other SMPs with specifications that address this issue*	*SMP Range (including Yadkin)*
Multi-use Facility Specifications	**Yes**	**11**	**8 – yes 4 – no**
Multi-use Facility Maximum Lengths	**Yes**	**11**	**5 – yes 7 – no**
Multi-use Facility Maximum square footage	**No**	**11**	**7 – yes 5 – no**
Multi-use Facility Density Specifications	**No**	**11**	**6 – yes 6 – no**
Multi-use Facility Setback Requirements	**Yes**	**11**	**5 – yes 7 – no**

Summary
Dredging/Excavation

SMP Issue	*Yadkin SMP Specifications*	*Number of other SMPs with specifications that address this issue*	*SMP Range (including Yadkin)*
Dredging and/or Excavation Allowed	**Yes**	**11**	**12 – yes**
Conditions on when and how excavation/ dredging can be done	**Yes**	**11**	**10 – yes 2 – no**

Summary
Shoreline Stabilization

SMP Issue	*Yadkin SMP Specifications*	*Number of other SMPs with specifications that address this issue*	*SMP Range (including Yadkin)*
Shoreline stabilization allowed	**Yes**	**11**	**12 - yes**
Restrictions on, or prioritization of types of stabilization allowed	**Yes**	**7**	**6 – vegetation (preferred) 2 – rip rap (preferred)**

Summary
Shoreline Cleanup

SMP Issue	*Yadkin SMP Specifications*	*Number of other SMPs with specifications that address this issue*	*SMP Range (including Yadkin)*
Shoreline clean-up, debris removal allowed	**Yes**	**1**	**2 – yes**
Restrictions on woody debris/ lap tree removal	**Yes**	**6**	**7 - yes**

Summary
Shoreline Buffers

SMP Issue	*Yadkin SMP Specifications*	*Number of other SMPs with specifications that address this issue*	*SMP Range (including Yadkin)*
Shoreline buffer designated	**100 ft**	**8**	**25 – 100 ft (4 SMPs designate variable width buffers that may be less than 25 ft or more than 100 ft in width)**
Vegetation removal restrictions in buffer	**Yes**	**8**	**9 – yes**
Limb pruning restrictions – maximum height	**Yes – 8 ft**	**9**	**Head height (~6') - 1/3 the height of tree**
Tree removal restrictions – tree diameter	**Yes – 2 inches**	**4**	**2 – 4 inches**

Summary
Other Vegetation Requirements

SMP Issue	*Yadkin SMP Specifications*	*Number of other SMPs with specifications that address this issue*	*SMP Range (including Yadkin)*
Approval required before planting in buffer?	**Yes**	**5**	**6 – yes**
Prohibits use of non-native plants in buffer?	**Yes**	**11**	**8 – yes 4 – no**
Replacement plantings required in certain circumstances?	**Yes**	**11**	**6 – yes 6 – no**

Summary
Permitting Process

SMP Issue	*Yadkin SMP Specifications*	*Number of other SMPs with specifications that address this issue*	*SMP Range (including Yadkin)*
Permitting application process requires basic information?	**Yes**	**11**	**7 – yes 5 – no**
Applications must include sketch or diagram?	**Yes in 3 instances**	**11**	**11 – yes 1 – no**
Permitting process requires on-site meeting?	**Yes**	**11**	**2 – yes 10 – no**

Summary
Environmental Measures

SMP Issue	*Yadkin SMP Specifications*	*Number of other SMPs with specifications that address this issue*	*SMP Range (including Yadkin)*
SMP provides information on environmental protection measures	**Yes**	**11**	**7 – yes 5 – no**
SMP establishes programs or requirements for protection of certain species?	**Yes**	**11**	**2 – yes 10 – no**
SMP provides a recommended list of plants?	**Yes**	**11**	**8 – yes 4 – no**

Summary
Aesthetic Measures

SMP Issue	*Yadkin SMP Specifications*	*Number of other SMPs with specifications that address this issue*	*SMP Range (including Yadkin)*
SMP has specific restrictions or requirements solely for aesthetic considerations?	**No**	**3**	**3 – yes** **9 – no**

Summary
Cultural Resource Protection

SMP Issue	*Yadkin SMP Specifications*	*Number of other SMPs with specifications that address*	*SMP Range (including Yadkin)*
Project has made an assessment of cultural resources	**Yes**	**11**	**5 – yes** **7 – no**
SMP requires consultation on cultural issues under certain circumstances?	**Yes**	**11**	**6 – yes** **6 - no**

Summary
Miscellaneous Issues

SMP Issue	*Yadkin SMP Specifications*	*Number of other SMPs with specifications that address this issue*	*SMP Range (including Yadkin)*
SMP has policies on sea planes	**Yes**	**3**	**4 – yes 8 - no**
SMP has policies on houseboats	**Yes**	**3**	**4 – yes 8 - no**
SMP has policies on permit transfers	**Yes**	**2**	**3 – yes 9 - no**
SMP has policies on ski courses	**Yes**	**2**	**3 – yes 9 - no**
SMP has policies on electrical installations	**Yes**	**6**	**7 – yes 5 – no**
SMP has policies on access pathways	**Yes**	**8**	**9 – yes 3 – no**

Conclusions

- All SMPs similar in objectives, structure, and content
- Specific requirements highly variable
- For three issues with numeric standards, Yadkin's requirements are at the protective end of the range (minimum lot width, minimum water depth, and shoreline buffer)
- For all other issues, Yadkin's policies were similar to or fell within the range of requirements at other projects

Attachment 4 – Comments on SMP Comparison Study Draft Report from Flip Chart

USFS – Requirements for vegetation removal on federally operated reservoirs should be footnoted to explain that other federal agencies may have other requirements that go beyond those outlined in the SMPs.

USFS, NCWRC, others – report should provide rationale as to why certain SMP standards were set for the three issues where Yadkin represented one end of the range. OR take the rationale for Yadkin's requirements in these areas out of the report.

SHRLO – distinguish between on-pier and land-based boathouses, if possible.

HRLA – modify summary tables to be more "useful". See example tables prepared by Larry Jones. Others noted that summary tables should 1) not exclude smaller reservoirs and 2) include all the other issues that the study evaluated.

HRLA – issues should be re-worked so that a "no" response always means the same thing (i.e. is bad from a development perspective).

NCWRC and others – modify the final summary table so that it accounts for "no information given" category as well as "yes" and "no". Do not use "no" to represent no information given.

Attachment 5 – SMP Comparison Tables Developed by Larry Jones, High Rock Lake Association

Shoreline Management Plan Comparison Data

Primary Legend

Lakes with Surface Area of 3,000 Acres and Larger

Prohibits or Significant Restriction of Feature

Comparison of the Major Features of Present Alcoa SMP that were Requested to be Studied by the High Rock Lake Association and Other NGO's

No Restriction or Prohibition of Feature

System	Lake	Total Lake Area (acres)	Total Shoreline (miles)	Min. Lot Width for Pier	Minimum Water Depth (ft) Required for Pier	Max. Permitted Pier Length	Maximum Pier Area (Sq.Ft.) Allowed	Prohibit Pier Superstructure	Prohibits Boathouses	Prohibit materials other than wood without special approval	Prohibits Launch Ramps	Prohibit Fixed Boat Lifts (not floating type)	Shore line Buffer Zone Width Specified	Prohibits Tree Removal >2"	Prohibits Removal of Woody debris and Dead Trees without Permit	Charge Engineering Fee to Consider Shoreline Stabilization	Annual Pier Permit Fee
TVA	Kentucky Lake	######	2,064	50	None	Unlimited	1000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Santee-Co	Lake Marion	######		None	4	50	Unlimited	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	None	No	No	No	No
TVA	Guntersville	67,900	890	50	None	Unlimited	1000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
TVA	Wheeler	67,070	1,027	50	None	Unlimited	1000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Santee-Co	Lake Moultrie	60,400		None	4	50	Unlimited	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	None	No	No	No	No
ACOE	Hartwell	55,900	592	82	6	Unlimited	Unlimited	No	No	No	No	No	None	Yes	No	No	Yes - $ 6
SC Electri	Lake Murray	48,000	650	100	None	75	450	No	No	No	No	No	75	Yes	Yes	No	No
TVA	Pickwick	43,100	490	50	None	Unlimited	1000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
TVA	Watts Bar	39,090	772	50	None	Unlimited	1000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
ACOE	Lake Lanier	38,000	540	82	6	Unlimited	Unlimited	No	No	Yes	No	No	None	Yes	Yes	No	No
TVA	Chickamauga	36,240	784	50	None	Unlimited	1000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
TVA	Norris	33,840	809	50	None	Unlimited	1000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Duke-Cata	Lake Norman	32,475	520	75	None	120	1000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
TVA	Cherokee	28,700	400	50	None	Unlimited	1000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
TVA	Douglas	28,420	513	50	None	Unlimited	1000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
American	Smith Mountain	26,000	500	100	None	100	1500	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	Yes	No	No
Dominion	Lake Gaston	20,300	329	None	None	Unlimited	1250	No	No	Yes	No	No	None	No	Yes	No	No
Duke-Cata	Lake Keowee	18,500	300	75	None	120	1000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
TVA	Tellico	15,560	357	50	None	Unlimited	1000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
TVA	Wilson Reservoi	15,500	166	50	None	Unlimited	1000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Yadkin	High Rock	15,180	360	200	8	75	750	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100	Yes	Yes	Yes - $500	Yes - $30
TVA	Fort Loudoun Re	14,600	379	50	None	Unlimited	1000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Duke-Cata	Lake Waterree	13,864	242	75	None	120	1000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
Duke-Cata	Lake Wylie	13,443	325	75	None	120	1000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
TVA	Nickajak	10,370	179	50	None	Unlimited	1000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Duke-Cata	Lake Jocassee	7,500	175	75	None	120	1000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
Duke-Cata	Lake James	6,812	150	75	None	120	1000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
TVA	Melton Hill	5,470	193	50	None	Unlimite	1000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Yadkin	Badin	5,353	115	200	8	75	750	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100	Yes	Yes	Yes - $500	Yes - $30
Progress E	Lake Tillery	5,260	118	None	None	100	1200	No	No	No	Yes	No	30	Yes	Yes	No	No
Dominion	Roanoke Rapids	4,600	40	None	None	Unlimited	1250	No	No	Yes	No	No	None	No	Yes	No	No
Duke-Cata	Lake Hickory	4,223	105	75	None	120	1000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
Duke-Cata	Mountain Island	3,281	61	75	None	120	1000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
Duke-Cata	Fishing Creek	3,112	61	75	None	120	1000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
Duke-Cata	Lake Rhodiss	3,060	90	75	None	120	1000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
American	Leesville Lake	3,040	100	100	None	100	1500	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	Yes	No	No

Shoreline Management Plan Comparison Data

High Rock Lake Association Inc.

May 4, 2004

Chart Listing All Lakes Reviewed by Longview Associates

Comparison of the Major Features of Present Alcoa SMP that were Requested to be Studied by the High Rock Lake Association and other "NGO's"

Lake	Min. Lot Width for Pier	Min. Water Depth for Pier	Max. Permited Pier Length	Max Pier Area (Sq.Ft.)	Prohibit Pier Super structure	Prohibits Boathouse	Prohibit materials other than wood without special approval	Prohibits Launch Ramps	Prohibit Fixed Boat Lifts (not floating type)	Shore line Buffer Zone Width	Prohibits Tree Removal >2"	Prohibits Removal of Woody debris and Dead Trees without Permit	Charge Engineering Fee to Consider Shoreline Stabilization	Annual Pier Permit Fee
Alcoa - APGI														
High Rock	200	8	75	750	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100	Yes	Yes	Yes-$500	Yes-$30
Tuckertown	200	8	75	750	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100	Yes	Yes	Yes-$500	Yes-$30
Badin	200	8	75	750	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100	Yes	Yes	Yes-$500	Yes-$30
Narrows	200	8	75	750	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100	Yes	Yes	Yes-$500	Yes-$30
American Electric														
Smith Mountain	100	None	100	1500	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	Yes	No	No
Leesville Lake	100	None	100	1500	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	Yes	No	No
Duke-Natahala														
Nantahala Lake	None	4	75	Unlimited	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	None	No	Yes	No	No
Glenvile Lake	None	4	75	Unlimited	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	None	No	Yes	No	No
Bear Creek Lake	None	4	75	Unlimited	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	None	No	Yes	No	No
Wolf Creek Lake	None	4	75	Unlimited	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	None	No	Yes	No	No
Cedar Cliff Lake	None	4	75	Unlimited	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	None	No	Yes	No	No
Duke-Catawba														
Lake James	75	None	120	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
Lake Rhodiss	75	None	120	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
Lake Hickory	75	None	120	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
Lookout Shoals	75	None	120	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
Lake Norman	75	None	120	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
Mountain Island Lake	75	None	120	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
Lake Wylie	75	None	120	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
Fishing Creek	75	None	120	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
Lake Dearborn	75	None	120	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
Lake Waterree	75	None	120	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
Lake Greenwood	75	None	120	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
Lake Keowee	75	None	120	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
Lake Jocassee	75	None	120	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	None	No	No	No	No
Dominion														
Lake Gaston	None	None	Unlimited	1,250	No	No	Yes	No	No	None	No	Yes	No	No
Roanoke Rapids	None	None	Unlimited	1,250	No	No	Yes	No	No	None	No	Yes	No	No
Georgia Power														
Small Ga. Lake	100	None	50	Unlimited	No	No	No	No	No	25	No	No	No	No
Small Ga. Lake	100	None	50	Unlimited	No	No	No	No	No	25	No	No	No	No
Small Ga. Lake	100	None	50	Unlimited	No	No	No	No	No	25	No	No	No	No
Small Ga. Lake	100	None	50	Unlimited	No	No	No	No	No	25	No	No	No	No
Small Ga. Lake	100	None	50	Unlimited	No	No	No	No	No	25	No	No	No	No
Small Ga. Lake	100	None	50	Unlimited	No	No	No	No	No	25	No	No	No	No
Progress Energy														
Lake Tillery	None	None	100	1,200	No	No	No	Yes	No	30	Yes	Yes	No	No
Santee-Cooper														
Lake Marion	None	4	50	Unlimited	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	None	No	No	No	No
Lake Moultrie	None	4	50	Unlimited	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	None	No	No	No	No
SC Electric														
Lake Murray	100	None	75	450	No	No	No	No	No	75	Yes	Yes	No	No
US Army Corps of Engineers														
Hartwell	82	6	Unlimited	Unlimited	No	No	No	No	No	None	Yes	No	No	Yes-$6
Lake Lanier	82	6	Unlimited	1,264	No	No	Yes	No	No	None	Yes	Yes	No	No
Tennessee Valley Authority														
Apalachia Reservoir	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Cherokee	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Chickamauga	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Douglas	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Fort Loudoun Reservoir	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Guntersville	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Kentucky Lake	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Nickajak	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Norris	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Pickwick	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Tellico	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Watts Bar	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Wheeler	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Wilson Reservoir	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Bear Creek Lake	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Beaver Creek	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Beech	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Blue Ridge	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Boone	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Cedar Creek	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Chatuge	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Clear Creek	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Dogwood	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Fort Patrick	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Henry	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Great Falls	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Hiwassee	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Little Bear Vcreek	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Lost Creek	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Melton Hill	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Normandy	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Ocoee 1	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Ocoee 2	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Ocoee 3	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Racoon Mountain	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Redbud	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
South Holston	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Tims Ford	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Upper Bear Creek	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Watauga	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No
Wilburn	50	None	Unlimited	1,000	No	No	No	No	No	50	No	No	No	No

Attachment 6 – Regional Recreation Evaluation Draft Study Plan

Alcoa Power Generating Inc.
Yadkin Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 2197)

Regional Recreation Evaluation Draft Study Plan
April 2004

Background

Alcoa Power Generating Inc. (APGI) is the licensee for the Yadkin Hydroelectric Project. The Yadkin Project is currently licensed by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) as Project No. 2197. This license expires in 2008 and APGI must file a new license application with FERC on or before April 30, 2006 to continue operation of the Project.

The Yadkin Project consists of four reservoirs, dams, and powerhouses (High Rock, Tuckertown, Narrows, and Falls) located on a 38-mile stretch of the Yadkin River in central North Carolina. The Project generates electricity to support the power needs of Alcoa's Badin Works, to support its other aluminum operations, or is sold on the open market.

As part of the relicensing process, APGI prepared and distributed, in September 2002, an Initial Consultation Document (ICD), which provides a general overview of the Project. Agencies, municipalities, non-governmental organizations and members of the public were given an opportunity to review the ICD and identify information and studies that are needed to address relicensing issues. To further assist in the identification of issues and data/study needs, APGI has formed several Issue Advisory Groups (IAGs) to advise APGI on resource issues throughout the relicensing process. IAGs will also have the opportunity to review and comment on Draft Study Plans. This Draft Study Plan has been developed to provide additional necessary information for consideration in the relicensing process.

1.0 Study Objectives

Based on the recommendations of the Recreation, Aesthetics, and Shoreline Management IAG, the purpose of this study is to compare the outdoor recreational opportunities and experiences afforded by the Yadkin Project reservoirs to those afforded by other regional reservoir related recreation sites. The specific objectives for the study are:

- Identify and inventory the publicly available (governmental and private) recreation sites/facilities at other reservoirs in the study region
- Provide a general characterization of the recreational opportunities and experiences available at these reservoirs and sites

- Evaluate how recreation opportunities available at the Yadkin Project compare with those available elsewhere within the study region

2.0 Technical Approach

2.1 Data Collection

The information used for this study (to the extent available) will rely entirely on existing information and consultation with regional recreation site managers. Information that is anticipated to be utilized in this study includes:

- Tourist guides
- Maps
- Brochures
- The Internet
- Recreation and tourism studies
- Literature from recreation providers
- Direct consultation with regional recreation providers, site managers and local officials

2.2 Regional Recreation Review

Existing recreation information will be reviewed to compile a general inventory of major regional recreation sites found at the Yadkin Project and at other locations within the "study region". For purposes of this study, the "study region" is defined as the area within a 100 mile radius of the Yadkin Project. The inventory will focus on the outdoor water-based recreational opportunities afforded by other reservoirs and lakes within the study region. Currently, the major reservoirs/lakes to be evaluated are listed below:

- Yadkin Project (High Rock, Tuckertown, Narrows, and Falls)
- Tillery Project (Tillery and Blewett Falls)
- Harris Lake
- Catawba-Wateree Project (James, Rhodiss, Hickory, Lookout Shoals, Norman, Mountain Island, Wylie)
- Corps of Engineers Projects (Wilkesboro, John H. Kerr, Hyco, Falls Lake, B Everett Jordan)

The inventory of reservoir recreation sites will include all pertinent information on each of the reservoirs, including reservoir owner/operator/manager, reservoir location, reservoir setting, size, reservoir operating regime (including seasonal water level changes) and the general character of the reservoir shoreline.

While the primary focus of the evaluation will be water-based recreation opportunities associated with regional reservoirs, the study will also consider (to a lesser extent) any other **major** recreation facilities or sites in the study region that provide other types of

outdoor recreation opportunities. Types of outdoor recreation sites to be included in the inventory are listed in the following categories:

- National and state forests
- National, state, and local parks
- Wildlife refuges and nature preserves
- Game lands
- Designated recreation areas
- Major rivers and streams
- Wilderness areas
- Trail systems
- Other notable outdoor recreation sites

The inventory of recreation sites within the study region will include information such as location, type of recreation area, and managing agency.

2.3 Characterization of Regional Recreation Sites and Opportunities

After inventorying the major recreation sites in the study region, a characterization of the types of recreational opportunities available at each site will be made using existing information.

2.3.1 Types of Activities

Each site will be characterized by the types of recreational activities afforded by that site. The characterization will focus on traditional categories of outdoor recreation. Types of recreational activities to be characterized for each site include:

- Fishing
- Boating
- Canoeing/Kayaking
- Swimming
- Hunting
- Wildlife observation
- Bicycling
- Hiking/Backpacking
- Camping
- Picnicking
- Rock Climbing
- OHV use
- Horseback Riding/Trails

The characterization of each activity type will include activities available and their supporting facilities, trends in use, and other available information.

2.3.2 Recreational Experience

Each of the major reservoirs in the study region will also be characterized according to the recreational experience offered by that site. Generally, the "experience" of a reservoir will be characterized by the amount of development associated with it. This characterization will be dependent primarily upon the percentage of developed shoreline and characterizations of development garnered from reservoir owner/operators to the extent such information is available. Ultimately, the

experience afforded by each reservoir will be categorized as "Natural" (little to no development), "Limited Development" or "Developed." Where good estimates on the level of shoreline development are available, the categorizations will be determined as follows:

Percentage of Shoreline Development	***Categorization***
0 – 10%	Natural
11 – 50%	Limited Development
51 – 100%	Developed

In instances where such information is not available, the recreational experience characterization will be made by the consultant's best professional judgment with information gathered through discussions with the reservoir owner/operator, as well as consideration of other factors that influence development such as distance from major metropolitan areas or population centers.

2.3.3 Tourism

In addition to specific recreation opportunities and experiences available, each reservoir will be characterized using existing information with respect to tourism. Tourism will be generally evaluated in terms of the amount of tourism generated by the recreation site(s) and opportunities available at each reservoir. For purposes of this study, tourism will generally be distinguished from local use by considering multi-day visits as "tourism", and single day use as "local use". Local officials (i.e. county planners) and recreation site owners or operators will be contacted and asked to provide a general characterization of tourism at each reservoir. The information sought from requisite officials will be standardized to include general tourism information such as any estimates they may have on type of use, volume of use, and seasonal use patterns and activities by tourists at each reservoir. Local officials will also be asked if they actively promote reservoir related tourism, and whether they have information or data that suggests that their promotional efforts have increased tourism use.

2.4 Comparison of Yadkin Recreational Opportunities and Experiences with Other Regional Sites

After the inventory and characterization of the regional recreation sites is completed, the types of recreation facilities, recreation opportunities and recreation experiences afforded by the Yadkin Project reservoirs will be compared to the other recreation sites in the study region. The comparison will generally characterize the similarities and differences in the recreational opportunities and experiences provided at the Yadkin Project to those available elsewhere in the region.

2.5 Review of Yadkin Area Recreation Plans and Future Opportunities Reporting

An inventory of recreational facilities at the Yadkin Project is being completed as part of a separate study. However, as part of the regional recreation evaluation, additional information on future recreational sites and facilities planned for the Yadkin Project area will be gathered and reviewed. Specifically, each of the 5 Counties surrounding the Yadkin Project and will be interviewed to determine what plans the Counties have for adding recreational sites or facilities to the 5 county region over the next 10-20 years. The Counties will also be queried about their assessment of recreational needs that exist in the region, that are not currently being met at the Yadkin Project or elsewhere within the 5 County region. Information obtained from the Counties concerning recreation facility plans and needs will be incorporated into the overall regional recreation assessment.

3.0 Study Reports and IAG Meetings

3.1 Reporting

A Draft Study Report will be prepared and distributed to the IAG for review and comment. After meeting with the IAG to review and discuss the draft report a final study report will be prepared.

4.0 Proposed Study Schedule

It is anticipated that the draft study report will be completed in the 3rd quarter of 2004.