

**Pacific Power  
Lewis River Projects  
Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) Public Meeting**

August 22, 2007

**Summarized Issues from SMP Public Meeting**

- 1. Erosion/ Sedimentation:** This was one of the most frequently mentioned topics, albeit several times from each source.

**SMP Related**

- Perceived need for PacifiCorp to identify measures to protect shoreline from ongoing erosion;
- Request for identification of permitting and management policies for shoreline protection and debris management as it relates to safety, habitat and recreation

**Non-SMP**

- Erosion due to operations (See operations).
- Erosion due to boat traffic - this is a recreation management issue and is more related to lake uses and state regulations related to type of craft and any restrictions on operations.

**Other Potential Issues**

- Erosion of project lakes beyond FERC Project Boundary or erosion easements

**Recommendation:**

- The SMP should reference and/or identify areas of concern related to erosion (if any).
- If there are significant areas of erosion, the SMP could include them within a shoreline classification that provides the most protection/least allowable development.
- The SMP should include a discussion of permitting policies for shoreline protection systems. PacifiCorp should design permitting standards on an incremental/progressive basis with the most preferred methods (also the easiest to permit) having the least environmental and aesthetic effect (i.e. vegetative plantings, natural rip-rap) with artificial rip-rap, constructed or formed shoreline hardening allowed only where protection of resources, property or safety warrants.
- The SMP should include a section or appendix that provides information on best management practices (BMPs) for shoreline stabilization and erosion control.
- A general statement related to debris and other potential safety issues may be included in the SMP. Such statement should relate to PacifiCorp's responsibility for public safety and also availability and protection of habitat and natural processes.

- 2. Operations:** Questions and comments on operations focused on seasonal drawdowns and potentially related erosion and access issues.

**Recommendation:**

- PacifiCorp should not consider/addressing any operational issues within the SMP.
- PacifiCorp may consider ensuring there is at least one readily available access point (during periods of maximum drawdown) to each lake located and maintained to provide emergency personnel access but that is more applicable to Recreation Planning. Lake access only would affect SMP to the extent access is an allowable use within a classification.

- 3. Vegetation Management:** Depending on how one compiles comments, this was probably the 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> most frequent topic. Most comments related to ‘viewshed’ and aesthetics with an even mix of complaints regarding private owners current practices and others desiring to maintain their view. Management of eroded vegetation/trees also was mentioned – see erosion, above.

**Recommendation:**

- The SMP should include a section detailing PacifiCorp’s policies and management practices for vegetation management along the shoreline. Typically, this includes policies regarding soil disturbance and removal of downed timber as well as removal of floating timber or “drift wood” adjacent to the shoreline. In some instances, downed timber and floating debris provide valuable habitat along the shoreline. Anchored or lodged materials provide shoreline protection as well as habitat. In other instances, floating debris is a hazard.
- The SMP should reinforce current policy and practices for woody debris removal.
- FERC typically prefers a restrictive approach to vegetation management. Allowing limited-width trails to access the shoreline or permitted shoreline facilities, removal/control of noxious weeds, vista trimming, and hazardous trees BY PERMIT, are appropriate inclusions.
- The SMP permitting section should include descriptions of allowed shoreline access/path access widths, construction and control methods, and appropriate uses of the access trails.
- The SMP should include a section or appendix discussing vegetation management BMPs.

- 4. Communications:** Improved communications from and to PacifiCorp was a frequent topic. Some of the comments related to past communications, the relicensing and settlement and other areas of PacifiCorp’s operations.

SMP Related:

- Attendees requested at least one additional SMP meeting. Others asked how they would stay informed during the SMP development process and then later in implementation.
- Commenters requested easy access to PacifiCorp personnel and single sources of information or points of contact for permitting and other shoreline issues.
- Several commenters indicated that at the next meeting, detailed maps showing how the SMP categorized/managed areas would be important.
- Others suggested additional coordination among and between PacifiCorp and the county and state bodies regulating shorelines and zoning.

#### Non-SMP

Several attendees requested a ‘general’ meeting for PacifiCorp to review and explain the relicensing and settlement and how it may affect resources and uses at or near the lakes.

#### **Recommendations:**

- PacifiCorp has already planned one additional public meeting for the SMP process prior to agency/stakeholder comment. It is likely a third meeting will be held to explain the SMP as filed with FERC and or to include some of the proposed permitting guidelines.
- The next meeting should probably have a focus on the application of the classifications and their associated allowable uses and proposed practices/policies such as vegetation management and grandfathering and should occur after the SMP document is fairly well along. We should prepare detailed maps of each lake or lake segments showing the application of the shoreline classifications.
- The SMP should have a section describing PacifiCorp’s means of implementing the SMP including descriptions of who/how/where to contact PacifiCorp regarding SMP (or other) issues.
- The SMP will contain a section describing the relationship of the SMP to County and state regulatory systems and providing information related to how the systems interact.
- PacifiCorp may want to consider putting together a newsletter and distributing it to your stakeholder mailing list periodically.

- 5. Permitting:** Several comments related to the existing permit process and the relationship of PacifiCorp’s process to that of the county and other regulatory agencies. Other comments related to existing uses and grandfathering. Enforcement was also mentioned.

#### **Recommendations:**

As discussed above, the SMP should include a section related to implementing a permitting program and describing the basic policies. The permitting guidelines and recommendations themselves should be prepared in a stand alone document, rather than in the FERC approved SMP. As above, a section will address the relationship of the SMP to the county and state programs. Grandfathering will be carefully defined in the SMP, but the permits for

grandfathered structures will be separate. Permitting documents should include examples of permits, drawings as well as any BMPs or other suggested practices or recommended (or excluded) construction and maintenance techniques.

**6. Access/Recreation Management:** We received a few comments related to access to recreation access at the lakes. While neither is directly related to the SMP these comments should be considered on several levels when developing the plan.

- There are public safety and access concerns for rescue or other emergency personnel due to the limited access at all lakes (also above).
- Other comments went to access through public recreation areas and the times and availability of boat launches and day use docking facilities.

**SMP Recommendation:** The classification and their associated allowable uses will partly dictate access. PacifiCorp currently manages public access through the ‘park’ areas. As part of your recreation management review, if data indicates there may be a greater demand for access in the future then the SMP should make sure that classifications and uses are strategically placed to accommodate future growth/expansion.

**Related Non-SMP Issues:** Lake access is typically a blend of recreation and shoreline management plans. If data show that current management does not provide adequate access either by location or by management of facility availability (time, dates, # available), then both plans may require adjustment to accommodate increased demands. If access is an allowable use, then PacifiCorp may want to determine if additional access points for either public safety or public recreation are warranted and may implement them without modifying the SMP.

## **GENERAL OBSERVATIONS**

There were no direct requests for forming a committee or direct public participation in the SMP development process. There was limited interest in frequent stakeholder meetings, though it was clearly expressed that stakeholders desired another briefing once the SMP was further along and then an explanation of the SMP once the document was ready for review.

Graphics depicting shoreline classifications, boundaries, etc, will be important for stakeholders at the next meeting.

A clear explanation of the interaction among and between PacifiCorp, the counties and the state will be a necessary part of the SMP and the permitting ‘package’.