

**Recreation, Aesthetics and Shoreline Management IAG
February 4, 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 introductions and a review of the agenda. Wendy Bley, Long View Associates, explained that the purpose of the meeting is to update the Issue Advisory Group (IAG) on the progress of several of the recreation and aesthetics studies.

Recreation Use Assessment

Wendy introduced David Blaha, ERM, who presented an update on the Recreation Use Assessment. David said that ERM began collecting recreational use data in May 2003. Data collection will continue through April 2004. David noted that the data presented at the meeting was collected May through December 1, 2003.

David outlined the various components of the Recreation Use Study: spot counts; visitor use survey; canoe registry; resident use survey; private community use survey; tailwater survey; and private organizations phone survey (see Attachment 3). He reported that ERM has completed about 5,200 spot counts and has about 2,200 more to do.

David said ERM collected 856 completed visitor use surveys as of December 1, 2003 (High Rock – 324; Tuckertown – 201; Narrows – 314; and Falls – 17). He mentioned that several of the public access recreation areas receive little use. Gene Ellis, Yadkin, asked if David had a sense for how these areas are used, despite the low use. David said that he should have a sense for how the areas are used from the recreational activity data that was collected as part of the use survey.

Chip Conner, Uwharrie Point Community Association, asked if 856 completed surveys is good. David explained that from a statistical standpoint, the response rate is great. He said that his goal is to collect enough surveys from each of the 40 recreation areas to make statistical conclusions about each area. He said that this probably would not be possible at some areas, where there is very little use.

David Wright, US Forest Service, commented that a couple of the USFS recreation areas, Cove Boat Landing and Badin Lake Campground, were closed in fall 2003. He asked how ERM planned to account for these closures in their use assessment. David said that ERM was able to collect some use data at these areas before they were closed. He said that it would be very hard to extrapolate an estimate of use with only one year of data. He suggested that ERM work with the USFS to accurately estimate use at these areas.

Greg Scarborough, Rowan/Salisbury Association of Realtors, asked if there is any correlation between recreational use and water levels. David said that ERM has collected use data when the reservoirs have been down (first, during the drought and now, during the drawdowns). David noted that one of the objectives of the study is to determine the effects of varying water levels on recreational use.

Larry Jones, High Rock Lake Association, noted that there are personal safety concerns at some of the recreation areas, such as the Rowan County Pump Station and the York Hill Access Area. He said that the list of available recreation areas at the Yadkin Project, as published, is misrepresentative of the actual access to the Project. Similarly, he said, some of the areas provide only river access, not reservoir access (e.g. the Highway 601 Boat Access Area).

Continuing, David reported that aerial photographs were taken on nice weather days during the peak time of day to document instantaneous peak use at all four reservoirs.

David said that registry boxes were placed at all four canoe take-outs and so far, ERM has received three responses.

David explained that a resident use survey is being mailed to all waterfront permit holders to capture resident use of the Project reservoirs. He said that of nine mailings, six have been completed, with a total of 1,182 responses - a 49 percent response rate (High Rock 46 percent response rate and Tuckertown/Narrows 57 percent response rate). Larry asked that for the remaining mailings, ERM enclose the survey in an envelope with an Alcoa label, so that those receiving it do not mistake it as junk mail. Gene Ellis said that he could make Alcoa envelopes available to ERM, but noted his concern about changing how things are done part way through the process. Chris Goudreau, NC Wildlife Resources Commission, asked if David would be concerned about this change skewing the data. David did not feel that changing envelopes would skew the data. David suggested stamping the envelopes with something like "Alcoa Resident Use Survey – Please Complete and Return" to address Larry's concern.

Larry Jones asked if the use data collected during the winter period would be skewed because of the habitat drawdowns at High Rock and Narrows reservoirs. David said that the data collected would reflect actual use. David said that the drawdowns occurred in a lower use period (winter), so he felt that overall effect on the use estimate would be negligible. Larry disagreed. He said that December was beautiful and there would have been more recreational use during this time if the reservoirs were full. Larry commented that the drawdowns jeopardized the validity of the recreation surveys. David stated that ERM is collecting data May 2003 through April 2004. He agreed to acknowledge anything atypical (e.g. the drawdowns, the USFS closures etc) in the study report.

David explained that surveys are being mailed to those living in private communities on a quarterly basis. A total of 1,680 surveys will be mailed. To date, two of the four mailings are complete. David said that the response rate to the first mailing was 32 percent.

David said that tailwater use surveys are being distributed by land and by boat. To date, ERM has received 160 completed tailwater use surveys.

David said that ERM identified 30 private organizations, clubs, and campgrounds that provide access to the Project reservoirs. ERM conducted phone surveys with 23 of the 30. David explained that the remaining seven either did not respond or appear to be out of business. Roy Rowe, Piedmont Boat Club, asked David to list the seven organizations, clubs, and campgrounds that have not responded. The following have not responded: Fosters Point Campground, Kesler Camping, Pops Carolina Campground, J.T. Morgan Campground, Elks Lodge, South Yadkin Campground, and Boat Dock Marina. Gene Ellis offered assistance with contacts for these organizations.

In conclusion, David said that ERM plans to complete the use surveys by early May, complete data analysis by late June, and draft a report in late summer.

Project-Wide Aesthetics

Next, David Blaha provided an update on the Project-wide Aesthetics Study. He said that the key observation points, chosen in consultation with the IAG, were photographed under summer and winter conditions, and also during the Narrows Reservoir drawdown. Also, as part of the visitor, resident, and private community surveys, ERM has collected aesthetic opinions. David explained that ERM is also conducting aesthetic surveys in the Uwharrie National Forest (UNF). He noted that the response rate for the UNF aesthetic surveys has been much lower, most likely due to the late start (around Labor day) and lower than normal visitation to the forest.

Recreation Economics Study

David said that the expenditure data from the visitor, resident, and private community surveys would be used to quantify the economic contribution of recreational use at the Yadkin Project to the surrounding area. David mentioned that ERM is coordinating the use of the IMPLAN model with RTI (Research Triangle Institute).

David Blaha asked if there were any questions on any of the studies. David Wright recognized that it may be too early, but he asked David if he could make any preliminary conclusions about recreational use at the Project. David Blaha responded that he has not analyzed any of the data to date, but that he is pleased with the overall response rate. David Wright said he was pleased with the good work. Roy Rowe wondered if ERM had received any comments about duck weed impeding recreational use, especially in Abbots Creek. David said that he has not had the opportunity to review all comments received. To understand why recreationists are not using High Rock Reservoir, Larry Jones suggested that ERM go to Lake Norman and ask recreational users there why they did not go to High Rock.

Andy Abramson asked if the recreation use data would be estimated by reservoir. David explained that the study report would first describe use at the individual recreation areas, then sum recreational use by reservoir, and then finally, sum recreational use Project-wide.

Shoreline Management Plan Comparison Study

After a short break, Wendy Bley said that at the October 2003 IAG meeting, Long View committed to reporting on the status of the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) Comparison Study at the February 2004 meeting, although it recognized that the study would not be complete. She said that Long View continues to review the 12 southeastern SMPs outlined in the study plan and therefore, is only prepared to share some background information and some very preliminary results. Wendy reviewed the study objectives: to understand the differences between the Yadkin SMP and other southeastern SMPs, to provide information for consideration in the relicensing process, and to provide a common base of knowledge (see Attachment 4). Wendy introduced Brad Knisley, Long View Associates, who reviewed the study methodology and preliminary results (see Attachment 4).

Brad listed the 12 SMPs included in the study:

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

Brad stated that 10 of the 12 SMPS were obtained or are available online. He noted that the Santee Cooper guidelines and the Georgia Power guidelines were obtained at the 2003 National Hydropower Association conference and the Georgia Power Land Management Office, respectively. He said that he made several follow-up phone calls for clarification and also consulted the National Inventory of Dams and the National Atlas of the United States for additional geographic information.

Next, Brad described the physical characteristics (number of developments, location, drainage area, total shoreline miles, and total surface area) and discussed the status of the SMP for each of the 12 projects (see Attachment 4). Continuing, Brad reviewed the list of SMP issues, developed by the IAG for consideration in the study. He proceeded to describe the details of each issue and to report how many of the 12 SMPs addressed each issue (see summary below).

Issue	Addressed in SMP
Special Environmental Shoreline Classifications	9 of 12
Private Pier Minimum Requirements	11 of 12
Private Pier Dimensions	All 12
Private Pier Configuration	All 12
Pier Materials	All 12
Private Boathouses	All 12
Private Boat Ramps	9 of 12

Multi-use Facilities Specifications	All 12
Excavation and Dredging	All 12
Shoreline Stabilization/Erosion Control	All 12
Shoreline Cleanup	7 of 12
Riparian Buffers and Shoreline Vegetation Management	All 12
Other Vegetation Guidelines	All 12
Permitting Procedures and Requirements	All 12
Fees	8 of 12
Environmental Considerations	9 of 12
Aesthetic Considerations	3 of 12
Cultural Resource Issues	10 of 12
Shoreline Facilities Classifications	10 of 12
Miscellaneous Issues	10 of 12

Specific to “pier materials” Larry Jones asked if Long View is also looking to see if materials other than wood are allowed. Brad replied yes.

For clarification, Gene Ellis, defined “multi-use facility” as a common-use facility, such as a marina.

Chris Goudreau noted that about half of the issues were addressed in all 12 SMPs. He asked if there is a pattern that is evident among the SMPs that did not address a particular issue (e.g. were the SMPs that did not address certain issues the non-FERC projects). Brad answered that there were no obvious patterns. As far as he could tell the SMPs and the issues they addressed are all over the board. He also noted that the shoreline management plans for the non-FERC projects compared really well to the FERC projects.

In conclusion, Wendy said that a draft report would be distributed by the end of March for review by the IAG in advance of the next IAG meeting. The report will include an introduction, description of the other projects and SMPs, a description of the issues, a detailed comparison of the policies on each issue, and a summary and conclusion.

Schedule and Agenda for Next Meeting

The IAG members tentatively scheduled the next meeting for May 5, 2004 with a 9:00 a.m. start.

Attachment 1 – Meeting Agenda

**Yadkin Project
(FERC No. 2197)**

Communications Enhanced Three-Stage Relicensing Process

Recreation, Aesthetics, and SMP Issue Advisory Group Meeting

Wednesday, February 4, 2004

Alcoa Conference Center

Badin, North Carolina

9:00 AM – Noon

Preliminary Agenda

1. Introductions, Review Agenda
2. Update on the Recreation Use Assessment
3. Update on the Project-Wide Aesthetics Assessment
4. Review of Preliminary Information from the Shoreline Management Plan Comparison Study
5. Schedule and Agenda for Next Meeting

Attachment 2 – Meeting Attendees

Name	Organization
Andy Abramson	Land Trust
Becky Andrews	Concerned Property Owners High Rock Lake
Bill Medlin	Yadkin Pee Dee Lakes Project
Brad Knisley	Long View Associates
Chip Conner	Uwharrie Point Community Association
Chris Goudreau	NC Wildlife Resources Commission
Dave Wright	US Forest Service
Dean Barbee	NC Wildlife Resources Commission
Donley Hill	US Forest Service
Donna Davis	Stanly County
Gene Ellis	APGI, Yadkin Division
Greg Scarborough	Rowan/Salisbury Association of Realtors
Jane Peeples	Meeting Director
Jody Cason	Long View Associates
John Ellis	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Judy Holcomb	City of Albemarle
Larry Jones	High Rock Lake Association
Lee Hinson	Concerned Property Owners High Rock Lake
Libby Saunders	Badin Lake Association
Roy Rowe	Piedmont Boat Club
Sarah Allen	Normandeau Associates
Steve Reed	NC Division of Water Resources
Stuart Andrews	Concerned Property Owners High Rock Lake
Susan Hennessy	Yadkin Pee Dee Lakes Project
Todd Ewing	NC Wildlife Resources Commission
Wendy Bley	Long View Associates

Attachment 3 – ERM Meeting Presentation

**Yadkin Recreation and Aesthetic Studies
Status Report
February 4, 2004**



February 4, 2004, 1

Delivering sustainable solutions in a more competitive world



Recreation Use Study

- **Spot Counts**
- **Visitor Use Survey**
- **Canoe Registry**
- **Resident Use Survey**
- **Private Community Use Survey**
- **Tailwater Survey**
- **Private organization/clubs/campgrounds phone Survey**

February 4, 2004, 2

Delivering sustainable solutions in a more competitive world



Spot Counts

- **Completed about 5200 spot counts (>70%)**
- **About 2200 more to do**

February 4, 2004, 3

Delivering sustainable solutions in a more competitive world



Visitor Use Surveys

- **Obtained 856 surveys as of 12/1**
 - High Rock - 324
 - Tuckertown - 201
 - Narrows - 314
 - Falls - 17
- **Obtained 104 surveys within UNF**
- **Several of the public access recreation areas receive little use**

February 4, 2004, 4

Delivering sustainable solutions in a more competitive world



Aerial Photographs

- **Aerial photographs taken to document instantaneous peak use at all 4 reservoirs**
- **Completed all 6 aerial overflights**
 - 6/21 (Saturday - weekend)
 - 7/4 (Friday – holiday)
 - 7/18 (Friday – weekday)
 - 8/9 (Saturday – weekend)
 - 8/18 (Monday - weekday)
 - 8/31 (Sunday – holiday)

February 4, 2004, 5

Delivering sustainable solutions in a more competitive world



Canoe Registry

- **Registry boxes at all 4 canoe take-outs**
- **Obtained 3 responses so far**

February 4, 2004, 6

Delivering sustainable solutions in a more competitive world



Resident Use Survey

- **Goes to all waterfront permit holders**
- **9 mailings proposed – 6 completed**
- **Overall 1,182 responses – 49% response rate**
 - High Rock – 46 percent
 - Tuckertown/Narrows – 57 percent

February 4, 2004, 7

Delivering sustainable solutions in a more competitive world



Private Community Survey

- **4 quarterly mailings – 2 sent**
- **Total of about 1,680 surveys to be sent**
- **Results from first mailing**
32% response rate – 134/420

February 4, 2004, 8

Delivering sustainable solutions in a more competitive world



Tailwater Survey

- **Distributed on shore and by boat**
- **About 160 responses**
 - 42 from boats
 - 118 from shore

February 4, 2004, 9

Delivering sustainable solutions in a more competitive world



Private Organizations/Clubs/ Campgrounds Phone Survey

- **Identified 30 entities**
- **Conducted phone surveys with 23 (77%)**
- **Remaining 7 entities either did not respond or appear to be out of business**

February 4, 2004, 10

Delivering sustainable solutions in a more competitive world



Aesthetic Studies

- **Identified key observation points (KOPs)**
- **Photographed KOPs under summer and winter conditions, including Narrows drawdown**
- **Collected aesthetic opinions form**
 - Visitor Use Surveys – 856 responses so far
 - Resident Use Surveys – 1,182 responses so far
 - Private Community Surveys – 134 responses so far
- **UNF Aesthetic Surveys – 23 responses so far**

February 4, 2004, 11

Delivering sustainable solutions in a more competitive world



Recreation Economics Study

- **Collected recreational spending information from**
 - Visitor Use Surveys – 856 responses so far
 - Resident Use Surveys – 1,182 responses so far
 - Private Community Surveys – 134 responses so far
- **Coordinated with RTI regarding IMPLAN model**

February 4, 2004, 12

Delivering sustainable solutions in a more competitive world



Summary

- **Overall project on schedule and obtaining statistically adequate survey responses**
- **Schedule**
 - **complete surveys by early May**
 - **complete analysis by late June**
 - **draft report available late summer**

February 4, 2004, 13

Delivering sustainable solutions in a more competitive world



Attachment 4 – Long View Meeting Presentation

Shoreline Management Plan Comparison Study

Introduction

- **APGI's Yadkin Project (FERC No. 2197)**
- **FERC relicensing initiated in September 2002, with distribution of Initial Consultation Document (ICD).**
- **IAGs were formed to advise APGI on resource issues and studies examined throughout the relicensing process.**
- **This study has been developed in response to comments on the ICD and through discussions with the Recreation, Aesthetics, and Shoreline Management IAG.**

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

Methods

Study examined 12 southeastern U.S. reservoir SMPS:

- APGI – Yadkin Project
- American Electric Power (AEP) Smith Mountain Pumped Storage Project
- Duke Power Nantahala Area
- Duke Power Catawba-Wateree Hydroelectric Project
- Dominion Lake Gaston and Roanoke Rapids Hydroelectric Project
- Georgia Power North Georgia Project
- Progress Energy Lake Tillery Project
- Santee Cooper Lakes Project
- South Carolina Electric and Gas Lake Murray Project
- Tennessee Valley Authority
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Lake Sidney Lanier
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Hartwell Lake

Methods

- **10 SMPs were obtained or are available online**
- **Santee Cooper guidelines were obtained at 2003 NHA conference**
- **Georgia Power guidelines were obtained directly from GP Land Management Office**
- **Follow-up phone calls for clarification and additional information were made, as needed**
- **Some additional geographic data on the reservoirs obtained from the National Inventory of Dams and the National Atlas of the United States**

Projects and Shoreline Management Plans Compared in the Report

APGI -Yadkin Project

Physical Characteristics

- Four reservoirs/dams
- Yadkin River, south-central North Carolina
- Total drainage area of 4,200 mi²
- 556 total shoreline miles
- 23,297 acres of surface area

Shoreline Management Plan

- Dated July 1, 1999 (revised July 1, 2002)
- Appendix E: "Specifications for Private Recreation Facilities at High Rock and Narrows Reservoirs"
- Appendix G: "Shoreline Stewardship Policy"

American Electric Power (AEP) Smith Mountain Pumped Storage Project (FERC No. 2210)

Physical Characteristics

- 2 reservoirs/dams
- Roanoke River, south-central Virginia and NC border
- Total drainage of 1,505 mi²
- Approximately 600 miles of shoreline
- 29,040 acres of surface area

Shoreline Management Plan

- August 29, 2003
- Filed with FERC and effective September 2, 2003

Duke Power Nantahala Area (DPNA) (FERC Nos. 2686, 2692, 2698)

Physical Characteristics

- 10 hydroelectric stations
- 12 reservoirs
- 5 reservoirs governed by guidelines
- Western North Carolina
- Total drainage of 227 mi²
- 2,704 acres of surface area

Shoreline Management Guidelines

- Effective July 1, 2003

Duke Power's Catawba-Wateree Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 2232)

Physical Characteristics

- 13 hydropower plants and 11 developments
- Catawba and Wateree Rivers
- Western North Carolina/ South Carolina
- Total drainage of 4,750 mi²
- Approximately 1,700 miles of shoreline
- 78,896 acres of reservoir surface area

Shoreline Management Plan

- Filed with FERC on July 31, 2001
- Approved on October 15, 2003
- Appendix F: "Shoreline Management Guidelines" (effective June 1996)

Dominion Lake Gaston and Roanoke Rapids Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 2009)

Physical Characteristics

- 2 reservoirs/dams
- Roanoke River, central Virginia-North Carolina border
- Total drainage of 8,400 mi²
- 369 combined shoreline miles
- 24,900 total acres of surface area

Shoreline Management Plan

- Filed with FERC on April 11, 2001
- Appendix C: “Lake Gaston and Roanoke Rapids Lake Construction and Use Procedures” (last updated July 1, 2002)

Georgia Power North Georgia Project (FERC No. 2354)

Physical Characteristics

- 6 reservoirs/dams
- Tallulah and Tugaloo Rivers, northeastern Georgia
- Total drainage of 470 mi²
- 130.6 total shoreline miles
- 4,834 acres of surface area

Shoreline Management Guidelines

- Undated
- Pamphlet format
- No larger SMP

Progress Energy Lake Tillery Project (FERC No. 2206)

Physical Characteristics

- 1 reservoir/dam under Plan
- Pee Dee River, central North Carolina
- Drains 4,600 mi²
- 118 miles of shoreline
- Surface area of 5,260 acres

Shoreline Management Plan

- Filed with FERC on December 31, 2001 (not yet approved)
- Appendix B: "Guidelines for the Use of Leased Properties at Lake Tillery" (last updated on October 1, 2001)

Santee Cooper Lakes Project (FERC No. 199)

Physical Characteristics

- 2 reservoirs/dams
- Santee and Cooper Rivers, southeast South Carolina
- Total drainage of 15,000 mi²
- 450 total shoreline miles
- 160,400 acres of combined surface area

Permitting Policies and

Procedures for Lots Within Santee Cooper Subdivisions

- Last revised June 2000
- Pamphlet format
- No larger SMP

South Carolina Electric and Gas Lake Murray Project (FERC No. 516)

Physical Characteristics

- 1 reservoir/dam
- Saluda River, central South Carolina
- 2,420 mi² drainage area
- 650 shoreline miles
- 48,000 acre reservoir

Shoreline Management Program

- Last revised August 1995
- Also, “Shoreline Management and Vegetation Protection Agreement” (dated March 18, 1998)
- On February 1, 2000, SCE&G submitted a filing to FERC recommending significant amendments to its Shoreline Management Plan
- In October 2003 FERC recommended that SCE&G continue to implement these changes

Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA)

Physical Characteristics

- 34 dams, 29 hydroelectric plants, 1 pumped storage hydropower plant
- Tennessee River system, including tributaries
- 480,000 acres of reservoir surface area
- 11,000 miles of shoreline
- 293,000 acres of public land in 7 states

TVA Act of 1933

- Guidelines under Section 26a
- Also, “Shoreline Management Policy”
- Effective November 1, 1999
- Not regulated by FERC

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Lake Sidney Lanier

Physical Characteristics

- 1 reservoir/dam
- Chattahoochee and Chestatee Rivers, north-central Georgia
- Drainage area of 1,040 mi²
- 38,000 acre lake
- 540 shoreline miles

Shoreline Management Plan

- Adopted in 1979 as “Lakeshore Management Plan”
- Major revision in October 1987
- Last revised in September 2003
- Not regulated by FERC

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Hartwell Lake

Physical Characteristics

- 1 reservoir/dam
- Savannah River, northern Georgia-South Carolina border
- Drainage area of 2,088 mi²
- 592 shoreline miles
- 55,900 acre reservoir

Lakeshore Management Plan

- Adopted in 1979
- Revised in 1989 and 1998
- Not regulated by FERC

Issues

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

Special Environmental Shoreline Classifications

- Does each SMP give certain portions of shoreline a special environmental classification?
- What percentage?
- What special restrictions apply?
- Addressed in 9 out of 12 SMPs

Private Pier Minimum Requirements

- Minimum required lot width
- Required minimum water depth
- Side setback requirements
- Addressed by 11 of 12 SMPs

Private Pier Dimensions

- Total square footage maximums
- Maximum lengths
- Maximum widths
- Addressed in all 12 SMPs

Private Pier Configuration

- Must piers end in a floating section?
- Does each SMP allow certain types of on-pier structures (i.e. boathouses, shelters, or gazebos)?
- Configuration specifications
- Addressed in all 12 SMPs

Pier Materials

- Does each SMP have specifications for flotation?
- Does each SMP have specifications for wood?
- What are the specifications provided?
- Addressed in all 12 SMPs

Private Boathouses

- Does the SMP allow new boathouses?
- Boathouse specifications (where allowed)
- Addressed by all 12 SMPs

Private Boat Ramps

- Does each SMP allow new private boat ramps?
- Boat ramp specifications (where allowed)
- Addressed in 9 out of 12 SMPs

Multi-Use Facilities Specifications

- Facilities minimum requirements
- Size maximums (length, square footage, etc.)
- Configuration specifications
- Setback requirements
- Addressed in all 12 SMPs

Excavation and Dredging

- Does each SMP differentiate between excavation and dredging?
- Are either allowed?
- Specifications for excavation and/or dredging
 - Are activities expressly prohibited during certain times of year?
 - Is removal of original lake bottom prohibited?
 - Is alteration of existing shoreline prohibited?
 - Disposal of dredged/excavated material
 - Is it allowed in vegetated wetlands?
 - Must excavation/dredging allow water to drain freely?
- Addressed in all 12 SMPs

Shoreline Stabilization/Erosion Control

- Allowable methods for shoreline stabilization
- Is there a preferred method?
- Specifications for riprapping
- Specifications for bulkheading
- Addressed in all 12 SMPs

Shoreline Cleanup

- Guidelines governing the removal of lap trees/woody debris
- Guidelines for removal of floating debris, litter or other garbage
- Addressed in 7 of 12 SMPs

Riparian Buffers and Shoreline Vegetation Management

- Discusses each SMP's definition of "buffers" or " riparian buffers"
- Guidelines for vegetation management in the buffer (specifically vegetation removal)
- In what areas do the guidelines refer to? (i.e. defined buffer only, FERC project boundary, other company property, etc)
- Addressed in all 12 SMPs

Other Vegetation Guidelines

- Planting and replanting
 - **Does each SMP require permission before planting?**
 - **Does the SMP require replanting under certain circumstances?**
 - **Are native plants required?**
- Chemical spraying
- Addressed in all 12 SMPs

Permitting Procedures and Requirements

- Permitting process
 - **Application procedures**
 - **Required consultation with other agencies**
- Process for new public access areas (if addressed in the SMP)
- Addressed in all 12 SMPs

Fees

- Each SMP's fees for specified permits/activities
- How each project determines the amount of fees (where discussed)
- Information for 8 of 12 projects

Environmental Considerations

- Special environmental considerations not discussed elsewhere in the report (i.e. fish habitat, educational campaigns, etc.)
- Addressed in 9 of 12 SMPs

Aesthetic Considerations

- Special aesthetic and scenic considerations not discussed elsewhere in the report (i.e. signs, advertisements, view sheds, etc.)
- Addressed in 3 of 12 SMPs

Cultural Resource Issues

- Does each SMP discuss cultural resource issues?
- If so, are any special restrictions in place for cultural resource protection?
 - **Special restrictions**
- Addressed in 10 of 12 SMPs

Shoreline Facilities Classifications (added issue)

- Discusses the differences between each SMP's categorizations of shoreline facilities
- Addressed in 10 of 12 SMPs

Miscellaneous Issues (added)

- Access Pathways
- Electricity receptacles
- Sea planes
- Houseboats
- Permit transfers
- Ski Courses
- Addressed (in part) by 10 of 12 SMPs

Draft Study Report

- Introduction/Background/Purpose
- Description of other projects and SMPs
- Description of issues
- Detailed comparison of SMPs policies on each issue
 - **Summary tables**
 - **Detailed information in Appendices**
- Summary and conclusion