

**Yadkin Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 2197)  
Recreation, Aesthetics, and SMP IAG Meeting  
March 13, 2003**

**Alcoa Conference Center  
Badin, North Carolina**

**Final Meeting Summary**

**Agenda**

See Attachment 1.

**Meeting Attendees**

See Attachment 2.

**Welcome and Introductions**

Gene Ellis, Yadkin, opened the meeting with introductions and a review of the agenda. Jane Peeples, Meeting Director, said that she had distributed copies of “Issue Advisory Groups Outline of Purpose and Suggested Process”, a document distributed originally at the February 28, 2003 Issue Advisory Group (IAG) Organizational Meeting to those who did not have a copy (see Attachment 3). Jane reviewed the three-stage relicensing process schedule. She noted that at the February 28 meeting the following IAG meeting dates were set: April 8-10, 2003; May 20-22, 2003; June 3-5, 2003; July 8-10; August 5-7, 2003; September 2-4, 2003; October 7-9, 2003; November 4-6, 2003; and December 2-4, 2003.

**IAG Dispute Resolution Process**

Jane mentioned that the issue of resolving study disputes was discussed briefly at the February 28 meeting, but was not resolved. Based on the discussions at the February 28 meeting, Jane said that she had prepared a single “IAG Dispute Resolution Process” document that could be used by all of the IAGs (for consistency of process). Jane distributed copies of this document before the meeting began (see Attachment 4) to those who did not have a copy. There were no new suggested revisions to the IAG Dispute Resolution Process, as proposed. Jane agreed to revise the document based on earlier comments by Larry Jones, High Rock Lake Association, and Steve Reed, North Carolina Division of Water Resources (see Attachment 5).

**Introduction of Technical Consultants**

Wendy Bley, Long View Associates, stated that the purpose of the meeting was to scope recreation and aesthetic technical studies based on comments/issues/and study requests submitted to Yadkin in January 2003. She noted that Yadkin has retained Environmental Resources Management (ERM) to plan and conduct the recreation and aesthetic studies at the Yadkin Project. Wendy introduced David Blaha, who said that ERM is an international environmental planning firm that has done FERC (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission) recreation work at

20 projects across the United States. David noted that ERM also has experience working with the U.S. Forest Service. He said that he is also very familiar with North Carolina as he attended school in the state. David explained that ERM had initiated a Recreation Use Assessment at the Yadkin Project in 2002, which was scaled-back because of the extreme drought. He said that ERM collected use data for an entire year (March 2002 through February 2003) to complete the FERC Form 80 and that use in 2002 was lower than in 1996.

### **Discussion of Study Requests and Study Scopes**

Wendy Bley said that field studies would be conducted over the next two years (2003 and 2004). She noted that to be able to take advantage of the upcoming 2003 field season, it would be imperative to use the March and April IAG meetings to quickly develop study plans. She asked the participants to consider which, if any, studies could be conducted in year two rather than year one. She said that the goal for the meeting was “to leave with enough understanding of the study requested to develop draft study plans”.

Wendy listed several study scoping objectives that should be considered by all when scoping technical studies:<sup>1</sup>

1. What is the issue?
2. What is the relationship to the resource and the Project or its operation?
3. What are the study objectives or what questions does the study need to answer?
4. What is the appropriate geographic scope?
5. Are there any timing/scheduling issues?
6. Are there any methodological issues?
7. Are there opportunities to coordinate studies?

After reviewing the issues/comments/study requests received by Yadkin during Stage 1 regarding recreation and aesthetics (see Attachment 6), Wendy distributed outlines for five recreation and aesthetics studies (see Attachment 7).

### **Recreation Use Assessment**

Working from the outline for the proposed Recreation Use Assessment (Attachment 7), Wendy explained that the study was divided into four study areas: 1) an estimate of recreation use at the Project recreational access areas and total use of the Project reservoirs; 2) an evaluation of reservoir carrying capacity (physical and social and to some extent, environmental); 3) an assessment of use of the Project tailwater areas; and 4) an assessment of historic and future use. Wendy solicited comments on the proposed study. David Wright, U.S. Forest Service (USFS), offered to share recreational use data collected at USFS facilities at the Yadkin Project. Wendy asked any other local, state, or federal agencies to share any recreational use data that they may have collected at the recreational areas/facilities.

---

<sup>1</sup> The original list of study scoping objectives (presented at the March 12, 2003 Fish and Aquatics (RTE aquatic) IAG meeting was revised, as presented here.

Chris Goudreau, North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission (NCWRC), asked how the study could distinguish between seasonal recreational use (winter v. summer) and the seasonal fluctuation/drawdown of the reservoir (High Rock). Wendy suggested that the study would have to include a look at other regional reservoirs that do not fluctuate to see what use is truly seasonal as opposed to related to changes in water elevations. She suggested looking for observable differences in the shoulder seasons.

Lawrence Dorsey, NCWRC, suggested that a recent recreational study completed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on the Falls of the Neuse might provide comparable regional data. For comparison purposes with High Rock Reservoir, David Blaha said that it would be necessary to find a “surrogate reservoir” with a substantial resident population. Larry Jones said that several of Duke Power’s reservoirs on the Catawba River might be better surrogates – for example, Lake Norman and Lake Wylie. Gerrit Jobsis, South Carolina Coastal Conservation League (SCCCL) and American Rivers offered Lake Wateree and Ben West, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) offered Lake Lanier as a potential surrogates respectively.

Larry Jones stated that there had been some misunderstandings about the recreation use data presented during the shoreline management planning meetings and suggested that it would be important to distinguish between transient (visitor) and resident use of the reservoirs. David Blaha said that he proposed to collect both visitor and resident use data at the Project. The two figures (visitor and resident use) could then be summed to estimate total recreation use at the Yadkin Project. Larry suggested that ERM/Yadkin take aerial photographs of the reservoir to get snapshots of reservoir use. Wendy Bley explained that using aerial photographs to estimate use could be problematic because the boats move around the reservoir pretty quickly making it almost impossible not to count them twice and overestimate use. David Blaha added that aerial photographs could not distinguish between visitor and resident use.

Chris Goudreau warned against loading the contact surveys/questionnaires with too many questions/issues because they tend to be less useful. Chris asked what kind of information would be collected with the surveys/questionnaires. David Blaha said that he preferred to use spot counts (i.e. people counts) to estimate recreation use, but thought that it would be difficult to capture residential use of the reservoirs through spot counts. He suggested that ERM use a survey, administered through three mailings, asking residents to estimate their use of the reservoirs over the past three months. Chris agreed with this approach. He thought that if residents were asked to estimate their recreational use of the reservoirs for an entire year, the estimate would be ridiculously high. Larry Jones added that recreation on the reservoirs takes many forms – for example, a family picnic on the side of the reservoir (i.e. recreation is not only launching boats). Chris asked how ERM addressed avoidance (those users avoiding taking the survey). David said that the survey instrument would be limited to a front and back of a single page. He said the survey is intended to be self-administered, but the surveyors will ask the questions verbally and record responses, if necessary. Chris suggested that different parts of the survey (addressing individual and independent issues) could be given separately. David said that ERM also plans to track refusals or claims that the user has already completed the survey.

Ray Johns, USFS, said that it is typically a struggle to decide how to treat the second level of development living behind the pier owners. David said he recognized that there are several

“water-privileged” communities that might access and use the Project reservoirs via a community pier, which might constitute a significant portion of total recreational use at the Project. He said that he would specifically address recreational use by water-privileged communities in the draft study plan.

David Wright questioned the intent of the bullets listed on the issues/comments/study requests table for recreation (see Attachment 6) under the study request to “inventory public recreation facilities and opportunities; and evaluate ADA accessibility” (the bullets read non-motorized camping, portage trails, and primitive camping). Wendy Bley said that non-motorized camping, portage trails, and primitive camping were of particular interest to the commenters, but that all recreation facilities would be inventoried. David said that he was curious about how use of the dispersed camping areas along the shoreline adjacent to the Uwharrie National Forest would be estimated. Wendy said that she was not aware of any authorized dispersed primitive campsites on Yadkin property. David suggested a walk along the shoreline to identify dispersed campsites. Ray Jones noted that all USFS lands are open to camping. He agreed with David that the dispersed campsites at the Uwharrie National Forest and elsewhere on the reservoirs needed to be identified.

Scott Jackson, North Carolina Watershed Coalition, asked if there was a way to estimate potential use (e.g. if there were additional opportunities for non-motorized boating). David Blaha said that portage trails exist around all four Yadkin Project dams. He noted that to estimate use of the portage trails, ERM proposed to provide a registry at the trails to capture use (because spot counts of portage trail use are difficult). David also said that ERM could evaluate regional recreation demand to see if there is a need to provide additional non-motorized boating recreational opportunities.

Lawrence Dorsey commented that the NCWRC is concerned about displaced users (specifically anglers). He asked if there is anyway to address users who do not visit (for crowding or other reasons) recreational access areas anymore. David Blaha said that it would be possible to ask questions such as “how severe is the crowding at the access areas” or “is crowding affecting your use” of those who still use the access areas. He said that it would be hard to capture the opinions of those who do not use the access areas anymore. Lawrence suggested that ERM look at the NCWRC license database to determine if there was a decline in angling use. David suggested that ERM administer the use surveys first to determine how significant an issue crowding is and then potentially follow-up with a look at the NCWRC license database. Larry Jones said that the NCWRC and others should avoid biases towards one type of recreationist over the other (i.e. anglers v. boaters). Chris Goudreau clarified that the NCWRC had no bias towards anglers or boaters and stated that the NCWRC is only interested in trying to understand recreational use at the Project. Mark Bowers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) agreed that it would be important to understand the displacement of recreational users. He suggested an evaluation of historical data and noted that in 1960, the majority of users at the Project reservoirs were likely anglers (less so today). Wendy Bley said that it would be possible to compare current data to data available from 1996. David said that ERM intends to include several identical questions included on the 1996 use survey conducted by Louis Berger in the 2002/3 surveys for comparison and trend analysis purposes.

Larry Jones said that the 1996 recreational use data included in the Yadkin Project Initial Consultation Document (September 2002) showed that recreational use at High Rock Reservoir was only 20 percent greater than recreational use at Lake Tillery, noting that High Rock Reservoir is much larger than Lake Tillery. Larry questioned the validity of 1996 survey and data. David said that he was uncomfortable with how residential use was calculated in 1996 and proposed that the current study be more intensive. Ray Johns asked that when the draft survey instruments were circulated for review that ERM highlight those questions that are identical to the 1996 survey questions.

Gerrit Jobsis questioned why the recreation use assessment being conducting in 2002 was scaled-back and/or curtailed. He thought the drought would be an ideal time to capture recreation use at varying water elevations. David Blaha said that the intent of the 2003 survey was to conduct spot counts, and administer a visitor and resident survey. He explained that ERM collected spot count data for an entire year at 40+ recreation access areas (March 2002 through February 2003), but stopped administering the visitor survey in July 2002 and did not administer the resident survey. Gerrit asked that the effects of reservoir operations on opportunities for waterfowl hunting be evaluated.

David Wright said that the social experience on the reservoir as it relates to reservoir carrying capacity is very important to the USFS. He said that the USFS would like to be able to determine if reservoir uses are consistent with USFS ROS standards. Mark Bowers said that use of the national forest is affected by noise generated on the reservoirs (e.g. during turkey hunting season it is not possible to here the turkey's gobbles because of the noise of boat traffic).

Chris Goudreau asked if there was a proposed methodology for estimating the environmental carrying capacity of the Project reservoirs. Wendy Bley replied no and solicited input on how to best determine the environmental carrying capacity of the reservoirs. David Blaha said that typically, as a part of the Recreation Facility Inventory, he would note any significant signs of erosion etc. He said that based on his experience the reservoirs will reach their physical and social carrying capacities before their environmental capacity. He said that it would be difficult to come up with a defined number of boats that cause environmental problems. Wendy asked the resource agencies if there were particular resources that they are concerned about (e.g. boating use and nesting). If so, ERM could focus on these resource areas. Gerrit said that he was concerned about boat wake and bank erosion and shallow water spawning species nest disturbance. Mark Bowers said that there is a new marina located in a sensitive area on Narrows Reservoir at Uwharrie Point. Ann Bass, Yadkin Pee-Dee Lakes Project, said that much of the vegetation along the Uwharrie National Forest starts to disappear in the summer from continued recreational use. She said that she was also concerned about invasive aquatic plants.

Larry Jones asked that the value of the recreation at the Project reservoirs be quantified (e.g. a comparison of recreation use in summer 2002 to summer 2003 (assuming no drought) to see what the loss of recreation days in the summer 2002 cost the region). Wendy said that Yadkin had proposed a Recreation Economic Impact Study, which would be largely based on the recreational use data collected in the Recreation Use Assessment.

Robert Petree, SaveHighRockLake.org, asked that the study address recreational safety during reservoir drawdowns. He noted that at High Rock Reservoir boating hazards exist at less than six feet below full pond. He said that unmarked hazards cause physical damage to boats during low water conditions. Terry Bary, Concerned Property Owners High Rock Lake, asked that navigational aids be addressed as part of the Recreation Facilities Inventory. Dean Barbee, NCWRC, said that it is difficult to mark every hazard with buoys, but he encouraged reservoir users to contact the NCWRC about any known hazards. Terry asked if the NCWRC was responsible for the buoys. Dean replied yes and noted that the NCWRC checks all buoys twice a year.

Chris Goudreau asked Yadkin/ERM to define “tailwater” for the purposes of the Tailwater Use Assessment (specifically, is there a finite tailwater boundary). For the purposes of the Tailwater Use Assessment, Gerrit Jobsis asked that a random stratified sampling technique be used when the generating units are on and off. He also asked that water quality be considered when assessing recreational use of the tailwaters. David Blaha said that it would be difficult to schedule the use assessment when the generating units are on and off. He proposed sampling every tailwater and every access area in the summer on three weekdays and three weekend days (with three visits to each access area per day). He said that he could request generation data from Yadkin after the fact to determine if there were any observable differences in recreation use while the generating units were on and off.

Gerrit asked if a creel survey was proposed as part of the Recreation Use Assessment. He thought such a survey would help determine if angling is being supported or not supported by Project operations. Wendy Bley answered that there are no plans for a creel survey. She suggested that if the anglers were in the tailwater, they were likely catching fish. She said that ERM was not planning to look at success rates, but only use (i.e. how many people and what are they doing). Mark Bowers recommended that a quality of experience question be included in the contact survey. Wendy asked the NCWRC if there was any creel survey data available. Lawrence Dorsey said that the NCWRC had creel survey data, but it was probably ten years old. Wendy said that the intensive fish surveys planned in the tailwaters would provide information about the availability of fish species under varying conditions. Mark said that the USFWS goal was not to just characterize the fish species in the tailwater for the sake of knowing, but to also understand opportunities to restore not only the fish, but the fishing.

Greg Scarborough, Rowan Association of Realtors, asked how private use of the reservoir (i.e. the Elk Clubs, boy scouts etc.) would be accounted for. David said that it was likely that private groups would be addressed similar to the “water-privileged” communities discussed earlier. He said that ERM would attempt to estimate recreational use at any facility providing access to the Project reservoirs. Mark Bowers noted that many bass fishing tournaments take place at the reservoirs and asked that this use be accounted for. David asked Mark or the NCWRC to notify him of any scheduled tournaments.

### **Recreation Facility Inventory and Accessibility Assessment**

Working from the outline for the proposed Recreation Facility Inventory and Accessibility Assessment (Attachment 7), Wendy explained that ERM planned to inventory all existing

recreation facilities to determine their condition and any necessary improvements. She said ERM would also determine any limitations on accessibility and any facility upgrades needed to provide barrier-free recreation opportunities at the Project. Wendy solicited any comments on the proposed study. Scott Jackson asked whom Yadkin would rely on regarding recommended improvements to the recreation facilities. Wendy responded that ERM would complete the facility inventory and would provide recommendations about needed facility improvements.

Ray Johns said that based on his experience during the Tapoco Project relicensing, the USFS and the licensee have struggled with the discrepancy between the licensee's standards and the USFS standards for recreational facilities. He said that the USFS standards tend to be more stringent. Wendy Bley agreed that the USFS standards are very high and suggested that ERM review the USFS standards to see which, if any, should be applied to recreation areas and facilities outside of the national forest. She said that the criteria for the facility inventory and accessibility assessment would be described in the draft study plan.

Gerrit said that the SCCCL and American Rivers had commented that the existing Project boundary is inadequate to meet recreational needs at the Project (i.e. the full pool elevation as the Project boundary provides less than optimal opportunities for land-based recreation). He asked if the Project boundary limits recreational access at the Project (i.e. is the Project and its existing boundary "assuring the optimum development of the recreational resources afforded by the Project" 18 CFR 2.7(a)). Wendy Bley suggested that the Regional Recreation Evaluation, as proposed, would identify any recreational opportunities not currently available at the Project and/or the surrounding region.

Dean Barbee suggested that spot counts be conducted at the public boat ramps on weekend days when use is at its highest. Tim Langford, NCWRC, agreed and said he was not interested in average use, but rather highest use. David said that ERM would be able to report the peak use for each recreation area. Gerrit Jobsis suggested more spot counts during the week to get statistically valid data.

Chris Goudreau asked ERM to define "off-season". David Blaha replied that the prime recreation season is from May 15 through September 15; shoulder seasons are from about the middle of September through November and March through May; and the off-season is typically December through February. Wendy added that details such as these would be included in the study plan.

Ann Bass noted the bilingual challenge to conducting contact surveys. David said that ERM had quickly realized that there is a significant Hispanic population recreating at the access areas and had therefore also made the contact available in Spanish (one of the survey administrators is also fluent in Spanish).

### **Recreation Economic Impact Study**

Working from the outline for the proposed Recreation Economic Impact Study (Attachment 7), Wendy explained that ERM planned to estimate the economic impact of current and future recreational use of the Yadkin Project on the local region. Wendy solicited comments on the proposed study.

Ann Bass noted that the Yadkin Pee Dee Lakes Project supports the creation of a “Central Park Economy” in central North Carolina and asked that the study evaluate recreation opportunities holistically to evaluate the potential to support longer, more varied recreation visits. Wendy acknowledged Ann’s issue and suggested simpler study objectives at the outset (because even the most simple of this type of evaluation can get very complicated). Wendy explained that the Recreation Economic Impact Study would use the recreation use and expenditure data (collected by the Recreation Use Assessment) to model (using IMPLAN) how recreation use and expenditures impact the regional economy. She said that the IMPLAN model could also be used to evaluate how changes in recreational use (based on changes in Project operations) impact the regional economy.

Ann noted that the management of the recreation areas and facilities needed to be improved and suggested that the effective management of these areas and facilities could open up other economic avenues. Wendy explained that the management of the recreation areas and facilities would be addressed by the Recreation Facility Inventory.

Harry Saunders, Badin Lake Association, asked that the tax base created by the residents living around Narrows Reservoir be considered in the Recreation Economic Impact Study. He said that without Badin, Montgomery County would be broke. Wendy responded that the question of tax base would be more appropriately addressed in the County Economic Impact IAG meeting.

### **Regional Recreation Evaluation**

Working from the outline for the proposed Regional Recreation Evaluation (Attachment 7), Wendy explained that ERM planned to identify any recreational opportunities either unique to the Yadkin Project or missing from the Yadkin Project that should be protected and/or enhanced. Wendy solicited comments on the proposed study.

David Wright asked that the study evaluate recreational experiences on a regional basis. For example, the recreational experience on Narrows Reservoir is considerably different from the recreational experience on Falls Reservoir. He asked that the recreational experiences on regional reservoirs be characterized to determine how unique/rare an experience is on one reservoir when compared to other reservoirs in the region (he clarified that the characterization should not only include a discussion of the recreational opportunities available, but also the recreation experience).

Chris Goudreau asked how ERM planned to project future recreational use at the Yadkin Project. He noted that FERC requires a 50-year projection. He suggested that there might be other data sources, not specific to Yadkin, such as recreation trend data that could be used to project future use. Wendy Bley said that the USFS had provided useful recreational trend data during the Tapoco Project relicensing that she thought could be applied to the Yadkin Project. Ray Johns agreed. He said that the 1999 Cordell report, as well as a Recreation Realignment Report specific to the Uwharrie National Forest would be good data sources. He agreed to provide both to Yadkin.



Robert Petree questioned why there were no shoreline management related studies outlined. When Larry Jones asked why SMP issues were not listed on the presentation, Wendy Bley said that Alcoa did not consider the High Rock Lake Association's comments to ask for any study or issue review related to the SMP. Wendy said that Yadkin had received a request to update the inventory of pier permits. Larry Jones asked if there would be a Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) associated with Yadkin's new license. Wendy explained that when Yadkin filed the original SMP with FERC, Yadkin had acknowledged the need to re-examine the SMP as a part of the Project relicensing. She said that it is not Yadkin's intent to open up all SMP related issues during relicensing, but if, for example, there was an issue raised during relicensing (e.g. the Bald Eagle Management Plan), Yadkin would consider addressing it. Larry said that he had interpreted the Yadkin Project ICD to read that there would be a new SMP under the new license. He wanted the SMP re-examined to determine why the Yadkin Project SMP is much more restrictive than the Progress Energy and Duke SMPs. Larry asked if the existing SMP would expire in 2008. Wendy said the existing SMP would be implemented as long as Yadkin was operating under the current license. Wendy asked if there were any specific studies or issues related to shoreline management that needed to be studied.

### **Aesthetic Assessment**

Working from the outline for the proposed Visual Assessment (Attachment 7), Wendy explained that ERM planned to evaluate visual quality under existing and altered Project operations, visual compatibility of Project features with the surrounding landscape, and the consistency of the Narrows and Falls developments with the USFS' Visual Quality Objectives (VQOs).

David Wright asked that the assessment be named "Aesthetic Assessment", implying that it would include not only an assessment of the visual qualities of the Project, but also sights, sounds, and smells associated with the Project. He also asked that the assessment include a vegetative risk assessment (i.e. an examination of shoreline vegetation that may be susceptible to a catastrophic event such as pine beetle infestation). Wendy reminded the USFS that, for the most part, the normal full pool of the reservoirs is the Project boundary. Wendy asked if the vegetative risk assessment had a nexus to the Project and its operation. David noted that the presence of the Project causes induced effects and asked that the assessment be conducted on lands within the Project boundary. Gene Ellis noted that that the four vertical feet along the national forest between the reservoir and forest is not within the Project boundary.

Wendy Bley asked if the USFS has standards to evaluate noise. David Wright replied no. He suggested that recreational users in the Uwharrie National Forest be questioned about any noise problems (i.e. what are the noises and where are they coming from). David Blaha suggested an evaluation to determine if the noises are compatible with the USFS ROS standards.

Ray Johns asked that Yadkin also assess the amount of trash along the national forest related to dispersed recreational use. He said the trash is created by induced recreational use. Wendy said that maintenance of the recreation areas and facilities would be addressed by the Recreation Facility Inventory. Larry Jones noted that much of the trash flows down the river from upstream and is not associated with recreational uses of the reservoirs. Larry noted that there are provisions in the Yadkin Project SMP, which do not allow shoreline residents to clear

accumulating trash. Robert Petree recommended that trash receptacles be added to areas frequented by bank anglers. David agreed that litter and sanitation problems could be addressed in the Recreation Facility Inventory, or possibly a preference survey.

The meeting adjourned at around 4:30 p.m.

**Attachment 1 – Agenda**

**Alcoa Power Generating Inc. Yadkin Division (FERC No. 2197)  
Communications Enhanced Three-Stage Relicensing Process**

**Issue Advisory Group Meetings**

**March 12-14, 2003  
Alcoa Conference Center  
Badin, North Carolina**

**IAG Meeting Schedule**

Wednesday, March 12 1:00 to 4:00 p.m.	Fish and Aquatics (RTE aquatic)
Thursday, March 13 8:00 to 10:00 a.m.	Water Quality
Thursday, March 13 10:00 to 12:00 noon	Wetlands, Wildlife, Botanical (RTE terrestrial)
Thursday, March 13 1:00 to 4:00 p.m.	Recreation, Aesthetics, Shoreline Management
Friday, March 14 8:00 to 10:00 a.m.	Operations Model
Friday, March 14 10:00 to 12:00 noon	County Economic Impacts

**Agenda**

(The following agenda applies to all individual IAG meetings)

1. Review of Meeting Schedule for 2003 and Procedures
2. Discussion of IAG Dispute Resolution Process
3. Introduction of Technical Consultants
4. Review and Discuss Study Requests and Study Scopes
5. Agenda for Next Meeting

## Attachment 2 – Meeting Attendees

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>E-mail</b>
Alan Bledsoe	High Rock Business Owners Association	<a href="mailto:abledsoe@triad.rr.com">abledsoe@triad.rr.com</a>
Andy Abramson	The Land Trust for Central NC	<a href="mailto:andy@landtrustnc.org">andy@landtrustnc.org</a>
Ann Bass	Yadkin Pee Dee Lakes Project	<a href="mailto:aliebenstein@vnet.net">aliebenstein@vnet.net</a>
Ben West	US Environmental Protection Agency	<a href="mailto:west.ben@epa.gov">west.ben@epa.gov</a>
Bill Medlin	Yadkin Pee Dee Lakes Project	<a href="mailto:bmedlin@ctc.net">bmedlin@ctc.net</a>
Bob Smet	APGI, Yadkin Division	<a href="mailto:robert.smet@alcoa.com">robert.smet@alcoa.com</a>
Brian Strong	NC Division of Parks and Recreation	<a href="mailto:brian.strong@ncmail.net">brian.strong@ncmail.net</a>
Carl Davidson	Davie County	<a href="mailto:carl.Davidson@co.davie.nc.us">carl.Davidson@co.davie.nc.us</a>
Chris Goudreau	NC Wildlife Resources Commission	<a href="mailto:goudrecj@wnclink.com">goudrecj@wnclink.com</a>
Clegg Mabry		
Coralyn Benhart	Alcoa	<a href="mailto:coralyn.benhardt@alcoa.com">coralyn.benhardt@alcoa.com</a>
Dave Wright	US Forest Service	<a href="mailto:dwright@fs.fed.us">dwright@fs.fed.us</a>
David Blaha	ERM	<a href="mailto:david.blaha@erm.com">david.blaha@erm.com</a>
Dean Barbee	NC Wildlife Resources Commission	<a href="mailto:fishhead@dialpoint.net">fishhead@dialpoint.net</a>
Donley Hill	US Forest Service	<a href="mailto:donleyhill@fs.fed.us">donleyhill@fs.fed.us</a>
Donna Davis	Stanly County Utilities	<a href="mailto:ddavis@co.stanly.nc.us">ddavis@co.stanly.nc.us</a>
Gene Ellis	APGI, Yadkin Division	<a href="mailto:gene.ellis@alcoa.com">gene.ellis@alcoa.com</a>
Gerrit Jobsis	SC Coastal Conservation League	<a href="mailto:scribers@bellsouth.net">scribers@bellsouth.net</a>
Greg Scarborough	Rowan Association of Realtors	<a href="mailto:gscarborough@cbiinternet.com">gscarborough@cbiinternet.com</a>
Harry Saunders	Badin Lake Association	<a href="mailto:badinlake@rtmc.net">badinlake@rtmc.net</a>
Jane Peeples	Meeting Director	<a href="mailto:jpeeples@carolinapr.com">jpeeples@carolinapr.com</a>
Jody Cason	Long View Associates	<a href="mailto:jjcason@worldnet.att.net">jjcason@worldnet.att.net</a>
Judy Holcomb	City of Albemarle	<a href="mailto:jdyholcomb@aol.com">jdyholcomb@aol.com</a>
Julian Polk	APGI, Yadkin Division	<a href="mailto:julian.polk@alcoa.com">julian.polk@alcoa.com</a>
Larry Jones	High Rock Lake Association	<a href="mailto:larry@foxhollowfarm.org">larry@foxhollowfarm.org</a>
Lawrence Dorsey	NC Wildlife Resources Commission	<a href="mailto:dorseylg@vnet.net">dorseylg@vnet.net</a>
Mark Bowers	US Fish and Wildlife Service	<a href="mailto:mark_bowers@fws.gov">mark_bowers@fws.gov</a>
Mike Norton	Uwharrie Point Community Association	<a href="mailto:mikenorton@uwharriepoint.com">mikenorton@uwharriepoint.com</a>
Paul Shiers	PB Power	<a href="mailto:shiers@pbworld.com">shiers@pbworld.com</a>
Randy Benn	LLGM, Yadkin counsel	<a href="mailto:rbenn@llgm.com">rbenn@llgm.com</a>
Ray Johns	US Forest Service	<a href="mailto:rayjohns@fs.fed.us">rayjohns@fs.fed.us</a>
Robert Petree	SaveHighRockLake.org	<a href="mailto:pete@savehighrocklake.org">pete@savehighrocklake.org</a>
Roy Rowe	Piedmont Boat Club	<a href="mailto:rowe@triad.rr.com">rowe@triad.rr.com</a>
Scott Fletcher	Framatome-ANP	<a href="mailto:scott.fletcher@framatome-anp.com">scott.fletcher@framatome-anp.com</a>
Scott Jackson	NC Watershed Coalition	<a href="mailto:scott@ncwatershedcoalition.org">scott@ncwatershedcoalition.org</a>
Scott Slatton	Town of Badin	<a href="mailto:sslatton@badin.org">sslatton@badin.org</a>
Terry Bargy	Concerned Property Owners High Rock Lake	<a href="mailto:tbargy@lexcominc.net">tbargy@lexcominc.net</a>

Tim Langford	NC Wildlife Resources Commission	<a href="mailto:timlangford@nc.rr.com">timlangford@nc.rr.com</a>
Wendy Bley	Long View Associates	<a href="mailto:bleylva@aol.com">bleylva@aol.com</a>

**Attachment 3 – “Issue Advisory Groups Outline of Purpose and Suggested Process”  
Document**



Alcoa Power Generating Inc. – Yadkin Division  
Communications Enhanced Three-Stage Relicensing Process

# Issue Advisory Groups

## Outline of Purpose and Suggested Process

### Purpose

Issue Advisory Groups (IAGs) are being formed to advise Yadkin on the important resource issues requiring study during the relicensing process. As a member of an IAG, your primary role will be to help identify issues that should be considered in the relicensing process, help determine information and study needs in support of those issues and to review study results.

### Membership

IAGs are composed of representatives from state and federal agencies, legislatures, tribes, affected municipalities and recognized non-government organizations (NGOs). Recognized NGOs are those who meet the following criteria:

- represent interests not represented in already existing NGOs
- represent an interest that is directly affected by Yadkin's relicensing
- represent the interests of a group of stakeholders rather than an individual
- demonstrate a defined organizational structure
- have a designated representative who can speak for the organization

### Time Line

The first objectives of the IAG process are to help Yadkin develop a scope of technical resource studies to be conducted and to review study plans. It is anticipated that IAGs will then meet as needed throughout 2003, 2004 and the first quarter of 2005 to review study results, as available, and refine/adjust studies, as needed.

### Meeting Procedures

The following are suggested procedures for managing the work of the IAGs. These suggestions are open for discussion and revision within the IAG.

#### *Meeting Schedule*

- Yadkin will schedule the initial meetings. Subsequent meetings will be held on an as needed basis as determined by the IAG or Yadkin. Yadkin will try to provide notice to IAG members of all IAG meetings about 30 days prior to the meeting, if possible. Meetings may be scheduled with less than 30 days notice, if necessary. IAG members who are unable to attend the meeting in person will be given the opportunity to participate by conference call.
- It may be helpful to select a particular week of the month to convene IAGs in order to avoid conflict with other regional licensing processes.

#### *Agenda and Information*

- IAG meeting agendas will be prepared by Yadkin with input from IAG members and distributed to members at least 14 days prior to the meeting. IAG members may submit comments about the agenda in writing, by phone, e-mail or fax up to one week prior to the meeting. In addition, the agenda may be modified at the beginning of the meeting with agreement from those attending.
- Yadkin and IAG members should endeavor to make available all documents and other information necessary to prepare for the meeting at least one week prior to the meeting. As an alternative, materials may be provided at the meeting.

#### *Meeting Summary Preparation and Distribution*

- Yadkin will provide a draft meeting summary to all meeting attendees within about 15 days of the meeting. Meeting attendees should provide their comments on the meeting summary to Yadkin in writing or by phone, fax, or e-mail within about 15 days following the meeting. Yadkin will then finalize the meeting summary within about 30 days after receiving comments and will distribute a final meeting summary to all IAG members, regardless of their

*(continued)*

## Issue Advisory Groups (continued)

participation in the meeting. If no corrections are submitted, the meeting summary will become final 30 days after the date of the meeting.

### Meeting Norms

- Meetings begin and end on time
- Agenda is followed during the meeting
- Needed information resources are available during the meeting
- Tangible progress is made toward accomplishment of the tasks
- All decisions are brought to closure in a way that is clearly understood
- Agenda for next meeting discussed at close of each meeting
- Group members demonstrate effective meeting behaviors

- One speaker at a time, one subject at a time, limit war stories
- Respect for opinions of others, look for merit in ideas
- Active participation of all
- All members present at start of meeting
- All members arrive informed about previous meeting and agenda for present meeting

### Resolving Study Disputes

- As the process unfolds, disagreements may surface regarding the type and scope of studies to be conducted. It is anticipated that IAGs will consider developing an appropriate dispute resolution process with the goal of

resolving any study disputes within the IAG. Under FERC's regulations, a licensee is expected to conduct all "reasonable and necessary" studies requested by resource agencies and tribes. If through its dispute resolution process an IAG is not able to resolve a dispute regarding whether or how a particular study should be conducted, then Yadkin may opt to send the dispute to FERC for formal dispute resolution.

## Yadkin's Communications Enhanced Three-Stage Relicensing Process

Stage One 2002-2003	Stage Two 2003-2006	Stage Three 2006-2008
1) Inform stakeholders and public (publish ICD) 2) Receive input from stakeholders and public 3) Form Issue Advisory Groups	4) Conduct studies 5) Review studies w/ IAGs and public 6) Draft Application 7) Receive comments on draft Application 8) File Application	9) FERC Reviews Application and Comments 10) Conducts Environmental Assessment 11) Issues License



**Attachment 4 – IAG Dispute Resolution Process Document**

**Alcoa Power Generating Inc.—Yadkin Division (FERC No. 2197)  
Communications Enhanced Three-Stage Relicensing Process**

**IAG Dispute Resolution Process**

As the Issue Advisory Group process unfolds, there will be situations in which the issue being discussed cannot easily be resolved within the normal IAG setting. When such disputes first present themselves, Yadkin and the IAG members will discuss the issue and attempt to resolve the dispute through discussion commensurate with the nature and importance of the dispute. Should initial discussions over the dispute cause an inordinate delay of the work of the IAG or become an obstacle to the progress of the IAG, Yadkin will implement the following process:

- (1) The issue will be delegated by Yadkin or the meeting manager to a smaller dispute resolution work group made up of Yadkin representative(s) and IAG members who have a vested interest in the issue.
- (2) The dispute resolution work group will convene outside of the regular IAG meeting to discuss the issue. Interested parties who are part of the dispute resolution work group will have responsibility for development of their position statements.<sup>1</sup>
- (3) Yadkin will take into consideration the position statements prepared by the interested parties while making a decision on the disputed issue. Yadkin's decision on the disputed issue and the position statements of the interested parties will be reported back to the full IAG.
- (4) Both the position statements prepared by the dispute resolution work group 's interested parties and Yadkin's report to the full IAG will become part of the IAG meeting summary and the final consultation record, which will be reviewed by FERC.

---

<sup>1</sup> For instance, in cases where the dispute is over a request to conduct a study or gather information, the position statements prepared by the dispute resolution work group should at a minimum include 1) a description of the study or information being requested, 2) the purpose of the study or need for the information being requested, and 3) the relationship between Project operations and effects on the resource to be studied.

**Attachment 5 – IAG Dispute Resolution Process Document as Revised**

**Alcoa Power Generating Inc.—Yadkin Division (FERC No. 2197)  
Communications Enhanced Three-Stage Relicensing Process**

**IAG Dispute Resolution Process**

As the Issue Advisory Group process unfolds, there will be situations in which the issue being discussed cannot easily be resolved within the normal IAG setting. When such disputes first present themselves, Yadkin and the IAG members will discuss the issue and attempt to resolve the dispute through discussion commensurate with the nature and importance of the issue. Should initial discussions over the dispute threaten an inordinate delay of the work of the IAG or become an obstacle to the progress of the IAG, Yadkin will implement the following process:

- (1) The issue will be delegated by Yadkin or the meeting manager to a smaller dispute resolution work group made up of a Yadkin representative(s) and IAG members who have an expressed interest in the issue.
- (2) The dispute resolution work group will convene outside of the regular IAG meeting to discuss the issue and attempt to resolve it. As part of this effort, IAG members who are part of the dispute resolution work group will develop a written statement of their positions.<sup>1</sup> It is expected that these efforts will take place before the commencement of the next meeting of the IAG.
- (3) If the dispute resolution work group is unable to reach a timely resolution of the issue, Yadkin will take into consideration the position statements prepared by the interested parties when making a decision on the disputed issue. Yadkin's decision on the disputed issue and the position statements of the interested parties will be reported back to the full IAG.
- (4) Both the position statements prepared by the dispute resolution work group's interested parties and Yadkin's report to the full IAG will become part of the IAG meeting summary and the final consultation record, which will be reviewed by FERC.
- (5) If through this dispute resolution process an IAG is not able to resolve a dispute regarding whether or how a particular study should be conducted, then Yadkin or the resource agencies may opt to send the dispute to FERC for formal dispute resolution.

---

<sup>1</sup> For instance, in cases where the dispute is over a request to conduct a study or gather information, the position statements prepared by the dispute resolution work group should at a minimum include 1) a description of the study or information being requested, 2) the purpose of the study or need for the information being requested, and 3) the relationship between Project operations and effects on the resource to be studied.

**Attachment 6 – Issues/Comments/Study Requests Tables**



## RECREATION

ISSUE/COMMENT	STUDY REQUEST
Recreation use levels at Yadkin Project and at public recreation facilities	Assess recreation use at Yadkin Project.
Public recreation opportunities and facilities at Project	Inventory public recreation facilities and opportunities; and evaluate ADA accessibility. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Non-motorized boating</li> <li>•Portage trails</li> <li>•Primitive camping</li> </ul>
Recreational carrying capacity of the Yadkin Project reservoirs	Evaluate the recreational carrying capacity of the Project reservoirs; including safety, experience and environmental aspects.
Effects of reservoir operations/fluctuations on recreation facilities and use	Evaluate effects of reservoir fluctuations on recreation facilities and facility use.
Effects of generation and releases on recreational use of tailwaters	Evaluate effects of powerhouse releases on recreational use of tailwaters.
Effects of recreational use of reservoirs on regional economy	Evaluate economic impacts associated with recreational use of the Project reservoirs. Evaluate effects of water level fluctuations on regional economy.



## RECREATION (REGIONAL)

ISSUE/COMMENT	STUDY REQUEST
Effects of Yadkin Project operations and resulting river flows on recreational opportunities and use downstream of Blewett Falls	In cooperation with Progress Energy, conduct instream flow study for fishing and boating in lower river, below Blewett Falls.
Yadkin Project recreation facilities/opportunities may not be adequate from a regional perspective	Evaluate regional recreational opportunities.



## AESTHETICS AND VISUAL QUALITY

ISSUE/COMMENT	STUDY REQUEST
Scenic quality is one of the most important aspects of the Yadkin Project	Inventory visual conditions of Project reservoirs and facilities from public access points.
Project facilities and operations may effect USFS visual quality standards and have an impact on aesthetics	Evaluate whether Project features meet visual quality objectives for UNF.





## SHORELINE MANAGEMENT ISSUES

ISSUE/COMMENT	STUDY REQUEST
PIERS	
Update information on pier permits and other shoreline activities since inception of SMP	Create an updated pier permit and multi-use permit inventory for the Project.
Potential impact of piers on aquatic vegetation (water willow)	Evaluate the impact of pier development and use on water willow.
EROSION	
Reservoir shoreline erosion is adversely impacting terrestrial habitats at UNF	Inventory reservoir shorelines adjacent to UNF for areas of erosion that may be impacting terrestrial habitats.

## **Attachment 7 – Recreation and Aesthetics Study Outlines**

# STUDY: Recreation Use Assessment

1. Reservoir Use Assessment
  1. Evaluate use levels at all public access facilities
    1. How many people use facilities
      1. Monthly
      2. Seasonally
      3. Day vs Night
      4. With varying water levels
    2. Facility needs with respect to use levels
      1. Adequacy of parking
      2. Adequacy of other facilities
  2. Evaluate total recreational use of Project reservoirs
    1. Resident use
    2. Visitor use
    3. Use by recreation type
    4. With varying water levels

# STUDY: Recreation Use Assessment (continued)

## 2. Reservoir Carrying Capacity

1. Safety (boats/acre)
  1. Typical use days
  2. Peak weekend use days
2. Experience (do users feel reservoirs are too crowded)
3. Environmental

## 3. Tailwater Use Assessment

1. How many people use tailwater facilities
2. Use by recreation type
  1. Bank fishing
  2. Boat fishing
3. With varying tailwater discharges
4. Safety assessment

## 4. Historic and Future Use Assessment

1. Historic and traditional uses
2. Evaluation of recreation use trends for central NC region
3. Application of use trends to Yadkin Project and estimates of future use
  1. Future use levels (numbers of users)
  2. Future demand for recreation opportunities (types of recreation)
4. Identification of future recreation facility needs at Yadkin based on use trends

# STUDY: Recreation Facility Inventory and Accessibility Assessment

## 1. Recreation facility inventory

1. Existing facilities

2. Condition

3. Facility improvements needed

## 2. Accessibility Assessment

1. ADA accessible facilities

2. Facility upgrades needed for accessibility

3. Limitations on accessibility

# STUDY: Regional Recreation Evaluation

1. Regional recreation sites/facilities
2. Regional recreation opportunities
3. Comparison of Yadkin Project opportunities/facilities to region

# STUDY: Recreation Economic Impact Study

1. Evaluate economic impact to local region from current use of Yadkin Project
  1. Resident component
  2. Visitor component
2. Evaluate economic impact to local region from future recreation use of the Project
  1. Continued existing operations
  2. Altered Project operations/reservoir fluctuations

# STUDY: Visual Assessment

1. Visual Assessment
  1. Identification of viewer locations
  2. Evaluation of existing visual quality under current Project operations
  3. Evaluate visual quality under altered Project operations
  4. Visual compatibility of Project features (t-lines, powerhouses, etc) with surrounding landscape
2. USFS Visual Quality Objectives
  1. Determine applicable USFS VQOs for UNF
  2. Evaluate applicable portions of Narrows and Falls (viewed from UNF) for consistency with VQOs