

**APPALACHIAN POWER COMPANY
CLAYTOR PROJECT NO. 739
SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN
WORK GROUP MEETING
JANUARY 7, 2009
NOTES**

I. INTRODUCTION:

On January 7, 2009 the work group involved in the development of the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) related to the relicensing of the Claytor Project met at American Electric Power's Pulaski County Service Center. The purpose of the meeting was to present an update on the progress of the Plan, to review the SMP outline and process and to discuss future related activities. The meeting began at 9:30 AM and adjourned at Noon.

Meeting participants included the following:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Bill Kittrell	Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries (VDGIF)
John Copeland	VDGIF
Mike McLeod	Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VDEQ)
Ron Powers	Friends of Claytor Lake (FOCL)
Bob Munson	Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (VDCR)
Chuck Dietz	VDCR
Paul Caruso	VDCR
Mary Rhodes	Resident
Melody Taylor	Pulaski County
Ron Coake	Pulaski County
Dave Rundgren	New River Valley Planning District Commission (NRVPDC)
Jack Whitmore	NRVPDC
Stephen Scheckler	New River Land Trust (NRLT)
Debbie Lineweaver	NRLT
Elizabeth Obenshain	NRLT
Laura Bullard	FOCL and Resident
Laura Walters	ROCL
Steve Shekler	Resident
Teresa Rogers	Appalachian Power Company (Appalachian)
Mark McGlothlin	Appalachian
Wayne Alexander	Appalachian

Liz Parcell welcomed the group and participants introduced themselves.

II. SUMMARY:

Ms. Parcell noted that the purpose of the meeting is to review the parameters that have been developed, how they were applied and the resulting shoreline classifications. She noted that a draft SMP will be submitted with the PLP at the end of January. There will be a public comment period. However, meetings will be held prior to the final public comment date and Appalachian recommends that comments be shared as quickly as possible as opposed to waiting to the file comments at the end of the public comment period. A final plan will be provided with the application in June 2009.

Ms. Parcell emphasized that the plan is very draft plan and input is welcome.

Shoreline classifications were reviewed and it was explained that they are based on a hierarchy. All uses can be done under High Density Commercial Use. Low Density is flexible – single family, commercial, multi-family, public use – the density is the same but the setbacks are different. Impact Minimization is designated as such in order to protect certain attributes. Conservation / Environmental would require a variance from the FERC.

The parameters for each classification were reviewed. High Density Commercial includes all existing marinas. High Density Multi-Use includes all existing multi-use type facilities (community lots, ramps, town houses); a potential parameter of being undeveloped with more than 500' across the cove has not yet been applied. Public Use includes all existing public uses and future public uses. To date, Low Density Use includes all existing single family docks and piers.

Impact Minimization Zone includes 9 parameters and development would be prohibited unless you can mitigate for these attributes. The example of significant woody debris which is valuable fish habitat and shouldn't be cleared away was given; it needs to be retained or relocated or addressed in another way. The following parameters were reviewed.

- 1) Areas defined as significant littoral habitat including trees and large woody debris
- 2) Areas defined as potential habitat for Fringed Mountain Snail [There will be a separate management plan that will detail what requirements will be in place for these sites.]
- 3) Areas defined as good foraging and good nesting habitat for the Bald Eagle and 14 sites were identified as good nesting and good foresting.
- 4) Areas within 100 feet of a known cultural resource
- 5) Immediately in front and below the dam
- 6) Area across from State Park beach – for scenic
- 7) Unique natural feature of the Project – The Cliffs

The work group expressed disappointment in the findings of the Recreation Plan relating to the scenic inventory. Bob Munson suggested that VDCR and Virginia Tech's landscape architects conduct a scenic analysis of the lake and put together an inventory utilizing US Fish and Wildlife Service's unbiased objective criteria. It was suggested that the scenic parameter to "viewshed or proximity to the State Park or those identified in the scenic resources inventory." Include a preface statement that the scenic inventory will be done and that new areas may be identified.

- 8) Areas in coves less than 100 feet. (maps do not reflect this at this time.)
- 9) Undeveloped islands

With regards to reviewing proposals adjacent to shoreline designated Impact Minimization Zone, VDGIF indicated that they expected that there would be standard protocol over time and that they coordinate with AEP enough that guidelines would start becoming standardized.

Conservation/Environmental parameters include all wetlands, Virginia Natural Heritage Communities, areas within boat barrier areas, and areas adjacent without an upland use other than a right-of-way. Discussion ensued regarding the latter parameter and it was suggested that perhaps VDOT couldn't do work on the roadway under this restriction and that perhaps it might be a better parameter for IMZ.

With regards to the scenic parameter, Bob Munson indicated that an inventory would identify significant scenic attributes that makes Claytor Lake special. There needs to be priorities to protect and IMZ is a good description of what we are wanting to do. Want to work together with the landowner to minimize impacts to scenic areas. It was noted that this inventory can be a tool for Pulaski County.

Laura Bullard indicated that soil is a natural resource that needs to be protected and suggested that areas that are subject to high erosion be protected.

Dave Rungren provided an update on the county's comprehensive plan. He indicated that everything discussed so far is very site specific. The Comprehensive plan looks to the future, looks at the transition from where we are today to where we are going. The County has been divided into 5 areas that will be addressed with 5 different plans. With regards to the south side of lake, the plan has been public noticed. The undeveloped areas along the lake are recommended to be put into planned unit development which will require rezoning. Erosion, scenic values, lack of access, may have one dock that serves community. A buffer of 50' is proposed; but the buffer refers to density not vegetation. It is a goal at this point but it hasn't been implemented as an ordinance. Needs to identify that you take the measurement from the 1850' contour.

Slope – Currently, a sedimentation / erosion plan is required if more than an acre is to be disturbed or to develop on a slope but there is no slope criteria that has to be met. Need to have ordinances to address this.

Getting over into the legal area. If a slope is stable, then it is not a problem from the state's point of view.

Stormwater management is necessary to keep erosion out after construction. Subdivision – two stages 1) subdivision itself, 2) Erosion and Control. After a lot is sold, individual can do an agreement in lieu of a plan. If someone cuts in a road that slips into the lake, the recourse is court; a civil suit.

The work group expressed an interest in prohibiting heavy development on steep slopes. It was suggested that shoreline with High Erosion Potential be designated as IMZ. Within 1850 boundary, may not be able to have multiple docks within this area.

The idea of protecting slopes was an issue that was brought up by the stakeholder group. Various slopes were discussed. The places to build houses on low slopes are gone. Appalachian will proceed with modifications to the shoreline classification maps to classify steep slopes as IMZ. Steep slope will be considered anything greater than 2:1 or 30 degrees or 50%. It was also suggested that the plan needs to recognize that there are highly erodible soils that need to be protected.

It was requested that there be a composite map for soils and slope for next meeting; an overlay of topography onto soils map. However, soils maps are not available in an electronic format. The erosion maps were requested.

It was requested that additional AEP owned property along shoreline across from state park be designated as scenic.

Appalachian agreed to pursue investigating the scenic group. They will consult in February to set up parameters, criteria and then do field work in March.