

**APPALACHIAN POWER COMPANY
CLAYTOR PROJECT NO. 739
SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN
WORK GROUP MEETING
APRIL 2, 2009
NOTES**

I. INTRODUCTION:

On April 2, 2009 the work group involved in the development of the Shoreline Management Plan (Plan) 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 review the changes made to date, proceed with review of the various sections and to hear a presentation from Dr. Patrick Miller on the Scenic Assessment, being conducted by Virginia Tech. The meeting began at 9 AM and adjourned at 11:30 AM.

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)
Chuck Dietz	Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (VDCR)
Christopher Barbour	Skyline Soil and Water Conservation District
Paul Caruso	Claytor Lake State Park
Mary Rhodes	Resident
Melody Taylor	Pulaski County
Laura Bullard	Friends of Claytor Lake (FOCL) and Resident
Debbie Lineweaver	Resident
Cheri Strenz	FOCL
Robert A. Strenz	Resident
Teresa Rogers	Appalachian Power Company (Appalachian)
Wayne Alexander	Appalachian
Mark McGlothlin	Appalachian
Liz Parcell	Appalachian

Brenda Winn, VDEQ, participated via conference call.

Liz Parcell welcomed the group and participants introduced themselves.

II. SUMMARY:

A revised plan dated March 27, 2009 and mapping were provided to the stakeholders. Ms. Parcell highlighted changes included the revised plan including an emphasis on compliance with all federal, state and local requirements and the addition of a new parameter in IMZ regarding the backs of coves with streams based on VDEQ's comments. If there is more than 1000 feet of shoreline, an additional structure is allowed. The draft language has a 1000' fairway (distance between docks). The group was encouraged to review and offer suggested language. Slope was removed from IMZ and made into an overlay. Some slope areas remain IMZ due to other reasons but others have shifted to High Density Multi-Use. The group needs to be aware and also hear an update from Ron Powers of FOCL regarding their pursuits of slope policies and regulations at the county level. Likewise, discussion on public use will be deferred until Bob Munson is available.

Ms. Parcell also noted that Patrick Miller with Virginia Tech will provide an update on the scenic study that is currently underway. The study results won't be available until end of May due to student's schedules and end of year exams.

Army Corp and Virginia Marine Resource Commission (VMRC) regulations have been identified. VMRC regulations relate to the original streambed that existed prior to the construction of the project. The next step is to identify where this will be to make sure their regulations are included or addressed for these areas.

Patrick Miller provided an outline of the tasks of the Scenery Assessment. They have already been out on the lake two days. They are in the process of classifying shoreline based on visual characteristics. They are identifying unique characteristics along the shoreline. Asked if there is anything that is particularly important to take note. They are adapting methods that have been used by the US Forest Service. Mary Rhodes indicated that the area across from the State Park is important.

Patrick indicated that shoreline is classified based on its characteristics; clearly there are differences in topography. Length of view is considered. The levels of concern (sensitivity) will be identified. Example: If there is forest right to the shoreline, if you remove the vegetation for development, would the development be more visible. The view from recreation settlements is considered.

Bill Kittrell asked if they are looking at developed or undeveloped shoreline? Patrick indicated that they will look at both developed and undeveloped. What is the predominant use of the landscape? The scenic assessment is being done as it is viewed by the water.

Laura asked for a clarification of objective vs. subjective noting that if the forest service objectives are followed, then people would naturally like the natural environment. Dr. Miller responded that in settlement areas, in a developed classification you are looking at the visual characteristics of the shoreline. What are the predominant characteristics – how do you fit it into the environment? Be as clear as possible in how the shoreline is

identified. What would fit in and what would not fit in a particular area. Eroding banks are not attractive.

The assessment will also include suggestions on ways to develop while minimizing impact. This will be a tool. Cliffs (big and little) were noted as visually attractive. If you want to retain the scenic characteristic, this is what could be done. There will be some areas that are more scenic than others. Political processes are considered.

Dr. Miller questioned, how far do you go - foreground, middle ground and background? The assessment will include a five mile boundary in the seen area maps – with and without vegetation. If there are favorite spots, a specific type of development or situation, let Dr. Miller know. His email address is pmiller@vt.edu.

The question was raised, how do you address erosion on steep slopes while keeping it scenic? Vegetation softens the look of riprap.

The changes that have been made with regards to allowing more than one structure on property with more than 1,000 feet of shoreline were discussed.

8. The minimum fairway – 1020 feet? Add “linear”

Discussion ensued regarding clustering – is there advantage with clustering? It was questioned if it could be an either/or situation because you may have limitations on where you can place the structure.

Melody noted that the County currently does the permitting of docks. Once the shoreline management plan is in place, then AEP will issue the permit and the County will issue a building permit.

If natural or scenic areas preclude placing the structures 1020 feet apart, can you cluster them? Have flexibility if some condition exists that doesn't allow them to be 1000 feet such as a variance vs. “Special Exception”. Balance so there is the option so retain character of land.

Increasing the square footage was discussed. Ms. Parcell responded that she didn't feel comfortable with going above 1000 sq. feet. She added that the VMRC – requires all structures on the water to be “Water dependent uses” for example, a floater and lift are water dependent - 288 x 2 for slips, 400 sq. feet for other structures.

Robert Strenz noted that 48 sq. feet is too little – impacts ability to function. Storage is not a water dependent use. Larger storage areas can be located outside of the project boundary. The rafters underneath the roof can also be used for storage. Ms. Taylor suggested that the document be clarified so that it is clear that personal watercraft slips are considered slips.

20 – take out “lease holder”

13. Does there need to be a minimum water depth here? You don't want to issue a permit for a dock where you would have to continually dredge? Some people may want a dock for other purposes other than boat. Keep working on 13.

It was noted that the permit is a personal right. If the property is sold, then the right isn't automatically transferred. The new property owner will need a permit so that they understand that they are responsible for upkeep. Will we require that the property owner lease? Leasing requirements will be left to the land management department to decide.

Low Density Multi-Use would be shoreline designated for more than 2 families to use. The question was raised regarding parking for guests. The square footage is allocated and its use can be determined by the applicant/owner. For example, a floater could be utilized by the guest(s). Ms. Parcell questioned if we care if there is one slip per housing unit – recommend to take it out and leave it up to homeowners association. The Virginia Department of Health may comment.

It was noted that Page 30, 13. Place a period after “16”. With regards to #16., feet. is measured from full pond to top of structure. If this isn't correct, please provide additional information.

Slips shall be constructed perpendicular to the shoreline (not applicable in single family).

Ms. Bullard talked about taking slope out of IMZ and suggested that highly erodable soils also be taken out. It was noted that it was important to protect habitat/downed trees. If erodable soils are in the IMZ – you have to mitigate for loss of habitat. It was noted that siltation smothers habitat. A field visit is scheduled in April to the site in question.

Ms. Bullard described a proposal to stabilize the toe area. She has 3000 feet with erodable shoreline and trees that are hanging over. Don't grade back, but put toe in and have rock sloped at 2:1. The result is that you preserve habitat and stabilize at the same time. With regards to ripraping from land, you will have to take trees out to come from land; the alternative would be to do it from a barge. With drawdown, you can go along shoreline and stabilize from shoreline.

Shoreline has a lot of area where the trees are laying out in the water. How do you protect the shoreline and keep the habitat? Discussion ensued regarding techniques.

There being no further business, the meeting concluded at 11:30. The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, April 22, 2009 at 9 AM.