



**Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs
Reservation of Oregon**

P. O. Box 960 • Warm Springs, OR 97761



Portland General Electric Company

121 S.W. Salmon Street • Portland, OR 97204

ES-027-2015

January 22, 2015

ELECTRONICALLY FILED

Honorable Kimberly D. Bose
Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20426

**Re: Project No. 2030 – Pelton Round Butte Hydroelectric Project
Article 428 – Shoreline Management Plan Six-Year Review**

Dear Secretary Bose:

Portland General Electric Company (PGE) and the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon (CTWSRO) are the Joint Licensees for the Pelton Round Butte Hydroelectric Project (Project No. 2030), *Portland General Electric Company and Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon*, 111 FERC ¶ 61,450 (2005), *order on rehearing*, 117 FERC ¶ 61,112 (2006).

Article 428 of the license requires the Joint Licensees to implement a Shoreline Management Plan (SMP), which the Joint Licensees filed with the Commission on July 11, 2007. The Commission modified and approved the SMP on January 27, 2009, *Portland General Electric Company and Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon*, 126 FERC ¶ 62,058 (2009). The Joint Licensees filed a revised SMP on September 9, 2009 and the Commission approved the revisions on February 15, 2011, *Portland General Electric Company and Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon*, 134 FERC ¶ 62,142 (2011).

Section 7.0 of the SMP and Ordering Paragraph (E) of the Commission's January 27, 2009 order require the Joint Licensees to conduct a formal review of the SMP program every six years, beginning January 2015. Pursuant to Section 7.0, the review is to evaluate "the effectiveness of the SMP in achieving its prescribed goals, particularly with regard to resource protection permitting, monitoring and enforcement, and coordination with other jurisdiction agencies." The report is to be prepared in consultation with the Shoreline Management Working Group (SMWG), which includes the Joint Licensees, representatives of private shoreline property owners, the Cove Palisades State Park, the CTWSRO Bureau of Natural Resources, Oregon State

Honorable Kimberly D. Bose
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Article 428
January 22, 2015
Page 2

Parks, the United States Forest Service, Jefferson County, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. Ordering Paragraph (E) further provides that the report should include “descriptions of (1) the review process; (2) the information and issues considered during the review; (3) the entities who participated in the review; and (4) the results of the process, including any proposed revisions in the SMP.”

Accordingly, attached for filing with the Commission is a copy of the Joint Licensees’ *Shoreline Management Plan: Six-Year Review – 2015*. This report has been prepared in consultation with the SMWG. Consultation is documented in Appendix B to the Report.

The Joint Licensees look forward to working with Commission Staff on further implementation of the SMP for the Project. For questions about this filing please contact Jessica Graeber at (503) 464-8133.

Sincerely,



Ray Hendricks
Manager
Environmental Compliance & Licensing

Pelton Round Butte Hydroelectric Project

FERC Project No. 2030

Madras, Oregon

Shoreline Management Plan

Six-Year Review Report

Portland General Electric Company

Portland, Oregon

The Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon

Warm Springs, Oregon

January 21, 2015

Table of Contents

1.1	Licensee' Responsibilities.....	2
1.2	Process of SMP six year Review	2
2.0	Background	3
2.1	Description of Project	3
2.2	Shoreline Management and Ownership	3
2.3	History of the SMP	4
3.0	Management Goals, Principles, and Standards	6
3.1	Goals	6
3.2	Principles for Protection and Mitigation.....	7
3.3	Standards for Protection and Mitigation	7
4.0	Site-Specific Management and Mitigation Measures.....	7
4.1	Shoreline Uses and Resources	7
4.2	Implementation History.....	10
4.2.1	Enforcement.....	10
5.0	Ongoing Management and Enhancement Programs.....	10
5.1	Ongoing Management Programs.....	10
5.1.1	Mooring Buoy Guidelines (SMP Section 3.5)	10
5.1.2	Implementation (SMP Section 4.0)	11
5.1.3	Permitting Existing Structures (SMP Section 4.1)	11
5.1.4	Shoreline Structure Permitting Process (SMP Section 4.2).....	12
5.1.5	Variances (SMP Section 4.3)	12
5.1.6	Permit Transfers (SMP Section 4.4)	12
5.1.7	Repairs, Maintenance, and Alterations (SMP Section 4.5)	12
5.1.8	Monitoring (SMP Section 4.6)	13
5.1.9	Enforcement (SMP Section 4.7)	13
5.1.10	Appeals (SMP Section 4.8)	14
5.1.11	Annual Meetings (SMP Section 5.0).....	15
5.1.12	Amendments to the Plan (SMP Section 6.0)	15
5.1.13	Reporting (SMP Section 7.0)	15
6.0	Adoption and Review of the SMP	16

6.1 Amendment Procedures 16

6.2 Review of the SMP 16

7.0 References 16

Appendices

Appendix A – Shoreline Management Plan Annual Meeting Notes 2009-2014

Appendix B – Consultation Record

Tables

Table 1: Approximate Percentage of Shoreline Ownership Surrounding Project Reservoirs 4

Table 2: Summary of Shoreline Management prescribed activities..... 5

Table 3: Shoreline Recreation Facilities within the project boundary at Lake Billy Chinook and Lake
Simtustus..... 8

Table 4: Suggested Content Updates to Table 2 within SMP Section 2.2 *Shoreline Uses and Resources* 9

List of Acronyms

BLM	Bureau of Land Management
CRMP	Cultural Resources Management Plan
CRNG	Crooked River National Grassland
CTWS	Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon
DNF	Deschutes National Forest
DSL	Oregon Division of State Lands
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
IIEP	Integrated Interpretation and Education Plan
LWMP	Large Wood Management Plan
OPRD	Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
OSMB	Oregon State Marine Board
PGE	Portland General Electric Company
RRIP	Recreation Resources Implementation Plan
SEP	Shoreline Erosion Plan
SMP	Shoreline Management Plan
SMWG	Shoreline Management Working Group
SSP	Shoreline Structures Permit
TRMP	Terrestrial Resources Management Plan
TRRAW	Three Rivers Recreation Area Waterfront Zone
USFS	United States Forest Service
WECS	Wave Energy Control Structure

Introduction

The Pelton Round Butte Hydroelectric Project (Project), Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Project No. 2030, is owned and operated by Portland General Electric (PGE) and the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon (CTWSRO) (Licensees). The Licensees jointly prepared this Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) six-year review to guide the protection and treatment of shoreline resources associated with the Project and to update and make changes as appropriate. The *Six-Year Review* consists of a report providing the results of a comprehensive review of the first six years of implementation of the SMP. Pursuant to the Order Amending Article 402 and Modifying and Approving the SMP (126 FERC 62,058 January 27, 2009), the report includes descriptions of: (1) the review process; (2) the information and issues considered during the review; (3) the entities who participated in the review; and (4) the results of the process, including any proposed revisions to the SMP. The review focuses on the effectiveness of the SMP in achieving its prescribed goals, particularly with regard to resource protection, permitting, monitoring and enforcement, and coordination with other jurisdictional entities.

The primary objectives of the shoreline management program are:

- (1) Protect public health and safety.
- (2) Manage the lands and waters associated with the Project in a manner that assures safe and reliable Project operations and protects environmental values.
- (3) Provide an accurate inventory of existing uses and development on Project reservoirs.
- (4) Provide consistent and coordinated management of new developments on Project reservoirs.
- (5) Provide consistency with new Project license requirements related to shoreline erosion control, enhancement of shoreline habitat and vegetation, protection of cultural resources, and control of in-water structures.
- (6) Provide a management tool to evaluate proposed shoreline actions in a manner that is consistent across multiple ownership, jurisdictional, and management boundaries and treats all classes of owners in a consistent manner.
- (7) Recognize existing uses of the shoreline and achieve a balance of the interests of the Licensees and private and commercial property owners and recreational users.

The overall purpose of the SMP is: to provide a tool to manage new shoreline developments within the project boundary to protect health and safety, to recognize existing uses of the shoreline, and to achieve a balance of the interests of the Licensees and private and commercial property owners and recreational users, while allowing the Licensees to efficiently manage the Project's power generating facilities and fulfill the Project purposes.

Under the authority granted by the Federal Power Act and the license, the Licensees are responsible for managing Project-related effects on designated shoreline within project boundaries.

1.1 Licensee' Responsibilities

Section 1.7 *Roles and Responsibilities* of the SMP describes the specific roles the plan plays at the Project. In addition, Section 1.7 provides details regarding the responsibilities that each key regulatory authority for shoreline management holds relating to the protection and preservation of shoreline resources. These key regulatory authorities include: the Licensees, the CTWSRO Bureau of Natural Resources, Jefferson County, United States Forest Service (USFS), and the United States Bureau of Land Management (BLM). No changes to the key regulatory authorities are suggested in the review of the Plan. In addition to the licensees and the regulatory agencies involved in the management of shoreline resources, the license and SMP require a Shoreline Management Working Group (SMWG) to be formed to represent the regulatory, private, and commercial stakeholders' interests related to shoreline activities. The licensees and SMWG meet annually to review the past year of activities and/or concerns that have arisen and discuss the progress of the SMP. In addition to the annual meeting, the SMWG assists the licensees with revisions and reviews to the SMP, such as this six-year review.

The SMP specifically details in section 4.0 *Implementation*, the provisions for new structures and docks proposed within the Project boundary. Criteria for construction and use adopted in the SMP are intended to be as consistent as practicable with those established by state and local building codes and the applicable guidelines of the Tribal, federal, and state entities owning and managing lands within the Project boundary.

Section 5.0 *Annual Meeting*, Section 6.0 *Amendments to Plan*, and Section 7.0 *Reporting* lay out the requirements for coordination, incorporating changes, and required Commission filings related to SMP activities.

1.2 Process of SMP Six-Year Review

Review of the SMP was conducted in 2014 by the Licensees and the Shoreline Management Working Group (SMWG). Following the annual meeting held September 3, 2014, the Licensees reviewed the discussion topics, issues, and resolutions documented in the formal annual meeting notes from years 2009 through 2014. The Licensees drafted an outline for the six-year review report and notified the SMWG of the six-year review deadline and proposed a meeting on November 5, 2014 to review and comment on the draft six-year SMP review report. The SMWG received the draft six-year SMP review report one week prior to the meeting in order to prepare comments.

SMWG comments were addressed at the November 5 meeting and relevant changes were incorporated into the report following the meeting. The Licensees distributed the revised report to the SMWG on November 14, 2014. No substantive comments were received during the comment period, and the Licensees are filing the SMP six-year review report with the Commission for its review and approval.

2.0 Background

2.1 Description of Project

The Pelton Round Butte Project consists of the existing Round Butte, Pelton, and Reregulating developments located in Jefferson County, Oregon. The three developments are located in sequence on the Deschutes River, near the confluence of the Deschutes with the Crooked and Metolius Rivers. Water released from the Round Butte Development flows directly into the Pelton Development and then into the reregulating Development. The Project is operated as a modified run-of-river system. The project is licensed by the Commission as Project No. 2030 and the current license will expire on June 21, 2055.

The 250.95-MW Round Butte Development is the largest of the three Project developments, in terms of both generation capacity and reservoir storage capacity. The Round Butte Dam is a rock-filled structure rising 440-feet above the riverbed to create Lake Billy Chinook, a popular and important regional recreational resource. The 100.8-MW Pelton Development is located downstream of the Round Butte Development. The Pelton Dam is a variable-radius concrete arch structure 204 feet high that creates Lake Simtustus. The 18.9-MW Reregulating Development was originally constructed without power generating facilities as part of the Pelton Development. The Reregulating Dam is a combined concrete gravity and rock-filled structure with a maximum height of 88-feet. In 1982, the CTWSRO constructed a powerhouse adjacent to the Reregulating Dam spillway. The power facilities are owned by the CTWSRO and operated by PGE under an agreement with the CTWSRO.

Land abutting the Project includes property owned by PGE, the United States government, the State of Oregon, the CTWSRO, and private citizens. Approximately 18,608 acres of property lie within the Project boundaries or within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of the boundary, with 16.3 percent (3,028 acres) of this managed by the U.S. government, including the Deschutes National Forest, the Crooked River National Grassland, and the BLM Prineville District. The CTWSRO own 2,161 acres (11.6%) of the property with the Reservation located to the north of the Metolius River and west of the Deschutes River. The State of Oregon manages 138 acres (.01%) of the property within a quarter-mile of the Project boundary. Jointly owned lands (lands owned by the Licensees) comprise approximately 62.4 percent (11,618 acres) of the land, with flowage easements on another .09 percent (1,663 acres) that is in private ownership.

2.2 Shoreline Management and Ownership

All Project shore lands are in Jefferson County and are owned or managed by a variety of federal, Tribal, state, and private entities. Major land and resource managers include the BLM, USFS, Oregon Parks Recreation Department (OPRD), and the CTWSRO. In addition to these entities, some reaches of the reservoir shoreline are owned by the Licensees and private parties. Table 1 summarizes the approximate percentage of ownership adjacent to the Project reservoirs. Ownership is depicted on the maps included as Appendix B to the SMP.

Table 1: Approximate Percentage of Shoreline Ownership Surrounding Project Reservoirs

Owner/Manager	Percent of Total ¹
BLM	31
CTWS	30
USFS: Crooked River National Grassland	13
Private	10
State of Oregon	7
Licensees	5
USFS: Deschutes National Forest	4
Total	100
¹ Percentages reflect approximate ownership within 0.25 miles of the Project boundary	

The SMP applies to new development and the alteration of existing development within the Project boundary on Lake Billy Chinook and Lake Simtustus. Land owners seeking approval to develop new structures or to alter existing structures within the Project boundary of either lake Billy Chinook or Lake Simtustus are required to obtain a permit from the Licensees and satisfy all other regulatory requirements, including obtaining any necessary permits required by the entity with underlying jurisdiction as described in Section 1.7 of the SMP. Landowners seeking only to modify or replace structures do not need approval from the Licensees and the County before construction may begin on a proposed alteration.

Each Tribal and federal entity has the authority to administer its lands in accordance with its regulatory and planning policies; however, the license requires the Licensees to regulate land uses within the Project boundary. This overlapping authority balances the needs of the federal, Tribal, state, and local landowners and regulatory authorities with the Licensees' mandate to ensure consistency with the terms of the license. Management guidelines in use by each of the primary landowners at the time of SMP development are listed in Section 2.1 of the Shoreline Management Plan (April 2011).

2.3 History of the SMP

Article 428 of the new license required the Licensees to file an SMP within one year of license issuance. The licensees filed an SMP with the Commission on June 8, 2006, after completing consultation with the SMWG, established pursuant to Article 402(d). The Commission issued public notice of the filing on July 3 and invited public comments until July 31 but subsequently extended the comment period until August 31. During the comment period, the Commission received 55 comments or requests to intervene from landowners owning property along Lake Billy Chinook, in addition to requests to intervene by the Department of the Interior and the USFS.

After extensive public notice, the Licensees then held four public meetings with members of the public to identify issues associated with the SMP and to develop a process by which the SMWG could be expanded to include representatives of the public. As a result, the Licensees agreed to

expand the SMWG to include five representatives for the public and to initiate a facilitated consultation process with the expanded SMWG to draft a revised SMP.

The revised SMP was filed with the Commission on July 11, 2007, and was approved with modifications on January 27, 2009, *Portland General Electric Company and Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon*, 126 FERC ¶ 62,058 (2009) (errata issued February 12, 2009). In that order, the Commission approved the expansion of the SMWG and required the Licensees to make specified revisions to the SMP and refile it within nine months. The revised SMP was filed with the Commission on September 9, 2009 and approved on February 15, 2011, *Portland General Electric Company and Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon*, 134 FERC ¶ 62,142 (2011).

Ordering paragraph (D) of the 2009 Order required the licensees, beginning in January 2010 and by January 31 of each year, to file with the Commission a status report on their efforts to complete the initial implementation phase of the SMP. Ordering paragraph (E) required the licensees to also file a report every five years from the issuance date of the order providing results of a comprehensive review of the Plan. On January 19, 2012, the licensees filed a request that, among other items, sought to eliminate the annual reporting requirement for the approved SMP for the project, because the initial implementation phase of the Plan was complete. On October 23, 2012, the Commission approved the request to eliminate the annual report and instructed licensees to provide information on the continued implementation of the SMP to any party of the Settlement Agreement upon request and to continue to conduct a six-year review with the first report due to the Commission by January 27, 2015, providing the results of a comprehensive review of the SMP, *Portland General Electric Company and Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon*, 141 FERC ¶ 62,068 (2012).

In compliance with the approved SMP, the Licensees have facilitated annual meetings for the purpose of identifying shoreline management related issues and/or changes within the Project area. Additionally, an annual shoreline inventory is conducted each year to identify potential sites of interest, permit compliance, and changes to shoreline resources. A summary of the significant SMP activities/annual meeting and inventory dates is presented in table 2.

Table 2: Summary of Shoreline Management prescribed activities

Date	Activity
January 27, 2009	FERC order modifying and approving SMP.
July 2009	Baseline inventory of existing shoreline structures was developed
August 24, 2009	First Shoreline Inventory
September 9, 2009	Filed revised SMP to address sections identified in Jan. 2009, FERC order
September 2009	Permits issued to property owners
October 21, 2009	Annual SMWG Meeting
September 1, 2010	Shoreline Inventory

November 3, 2010	Annual SMWG Meeting
February 15, 2011	FERC order modifying and approving revisions to September 2009 SMP. FERC requested additional provisions for Section 4.5 of revised SMP. (Note: In reading this order, we need to revise the verbiage in the permit application procedure to include modifications to existing structures – See paragraphs 7&8 of this order)
April 2011	Final SMP, including revisions, identified in February 2011 FERC order distributed to SMWG
August 24, 2011	Shoreline Inventory
October 21, 2011	Annual SMWG Meeting
August 21, 2012	Annual SMWG Meeting
August 22, 2012	Shoreline Inventory
January 19, 2012	Request to eliminate annual report and seek clarification on six-year report
October 23, 2013	FERC order approving request and clarification of six-year report
August 19, 2013	Shoreline Inventory
October 9, 2013	Annual SMWG Meeting
September 3, 2014	Shoreline Inventory
September 3, 2014	Annual SMWG Meeting

3.0 Management Goals, Principles, and Standards

The Licensees are committed to the stewardship of shoreline resources within the Project boundary. The Licensees' responsibility for such management derives from the authority granted by the Federal Power Act and the license. Outside the Project boundary, the responsibility is shared with the appropriate land holders, both federal and private. The Licensees will protect and preserve the integrity of the shoreline resources affected by the Project to the extent possible within the requirements on continuing Project operation and the need to balance stewardship of all sensitive resources in an integrated fashion. Effective management of the shoreline resources will be founded on the goals, management principles, and standards discussed below and conducted through ongoing management programs throughout the term of the operating license.

3.1 Goals

The Licensees' goals for protecting and managing shoreline resources include the following:

- Protect public health and safety.
- Manage the lands and waters associated with the Project in a manner that assures safe and reliable Project operations and protects environmental values.
- Provide an accurate inventory of existing uses and development on Project reservoirs.
- Provide consistent and coordinated management of new development on Project reservoirs.

- Provide consistency with new Project license requirements related to shoreline erosion control, enhancement of shoreline habitat and vegetation, protection of cultural resources, and control of in-water structures.
- Provide a management tool to evaluate proposed shoreline actions in a manner that is consistent across multiple ownership, jurisdictional, and management boundaries and treats all classes of owners in a consistent manner.
- Recognize existing uses of the shoreline and achieve a balance of the interests of the Licensees and private and commercial property owners and recreational users.

3.2 Principles for Protection and Mitigation

As described in Section 4.0 *Implementation of the SMP*, the Licensees will implement and administer SMP provisions for new structures and docks proposed within the Project boundary. Criteria for construction and use adopted in the SMP are intended to be as consistent as practicable with those established by state and local building codes and the applicable guidelines of the Tribal, federal, and state entities owning or managing lands within the Project boundary.

3.3 Standards for Protection and Mitigation

To achieve the goals listed above, the Licensees will follow the procedures detailed in Section 3.0 *Regulations Pertaining to All Shoreline Areas in the SMP*. That section presents the Licensees' standards for new shoreline structures, installation of new docks, and the alteration or modification of existing docks. These guidelines pertain to all shoreline areas – regardless of stewardship – within the Project boundary surrounding Lake Billy Chinook and Lake Simtustus. Specifically, Article 428 requires the Licensees to develop standards and guidelines for “new shoreline development, installation of new docks, and modification of existing docks”. Article 443 authorizes the Licensees to grant permission for certain types of use and occupancy of Project lands and waters, and describes the Licensees' responsibilities to supervise and control uses for which they grant permits, and to ensure that facilities are maintained in good repair and comply with applicable state and local health and safety requirements.

4.0 Site-Specific Management and Mitigation Measures

4.1 Shoreline Uses and Resources

Land use around Lake Billy Chinook is strongly influenced by ownership and the dramatic geology of the shoreline. Development has occurred in only five areas around the reservoir where topography is suitable. In addition to the hydroelectric development, other developed land uses on the reservoirs are primarily recreation-oriented, with three parks providing reservoir access to the public. The main uses and resources for the lands surrounding Lake Billy Chinook and Lake Simtustus are:

- Natural resources

- Recreation and public access
- Private development
- Private commercial development
- Private recreational development
- Hydroelectric development

Table 3 lists the Shoreline recreation facilities within the project boundary at Lake Billy Chinook and Lake Simtustus.

Approximately one third of the shoreline area along both reservoirs is within the Warm Springs Reservation, with access restricted to tribal members in all but two recreation sites designated for public use.

Table 3: Shoreline Recreation Facilities within the project boundary at Lake Billy Chinook and Lake Simtustus

Site Manager/Owner	Facility	Amenities
Lake Billy Chinook		
OPRD: To Cove Palisades State Park	Cove Palisades Marina	One boat launch, fuel dock, 127-slip marina
	Crooked River Day Use Area	One three-lane concrete boat launch, two boarding floats, three courtesy docks
	Lower Deschutes Day Use Area	One 2-lane concrete boat launch, two boarding floats, two courtesy docks, 20 moorage slips
	Upper Deschutes Day Use Area	One 3-lane concrete boat launch and one boarding float
USFS	Perry South Campground	One concrete boat launch and one boat tie-up dock
	Street Creek Boat Launch	One unimproved boat launch open conditionally
CTWS	Chinook Island Day Use Area	One boat tie-up dock that accommodates up to 8 boats
Private	Three Rivers Store and Marina	300-slip marina, bulkhead, access walk-ways enclosed by wave erosion control structures, fuel dock, and transient dock
Private	Fly Creek Area	Fly Creek area docks and structures, which include 17 docks with 41 slips and 7 bulkhead pads

Private	Lake Billy Chinook Houseboats	One unimproved boat launch, houseboat mooring docks, a service/fuel dock, pumping station, floating storage buildings, and access walk-ways
Private	Three Rivers Land Owners Assn.	Four concrete boat launches with two docks and one pier, private day use picnic and swim beach, enclosed swim area with swim platform for use by community members, a shoreline stabilization structure, and a gabion wall with access walkway and retaining wall
Lake Simtustus		
Licensees	Pelton Park	Two boat launch lanes with tie-up docks and a 43-slip marina, swim beach with docks
CTWS	Indian Park Campground	One concrete boat launch and one boat tie-up dock (A Tribal permit is required to use this campground)
Private	Lake Simtustus RV park	One boat launch, 30-slip marina

The following clarifications were suggested for Section 2.2 *Shoreline Uses and Resources* under sub-section 2.2.2 *Recreation and Public Access* Table 2. These content updates are noted here for information only and will not be incorporated as a change to the SMP.

Table 4: Suggested Content Updates to Table 2 within SMP Section 2.2 *Shoreline Uses and Resources*

Facility	Original Text	Suggested Text
Street Creek Boat Launch	One unimproved boat launch open seasonally	One unimproved boat launch open conditionally
Chinook Island Day Use Area	One boat tie-up dock that accommodates up to 14 boats	One boat tie-up dock that accommodates up to 8 boats

4.2 Implementation History

4.2.1 Enforcement

Two violations of the terms laid out in the SMP have been managed to date. The first occurrence was an unpermitted dock observed in 2011 at a private property near Perry South Campground. The dock was subsequently removed by the owner. The second occurrence was also an unpermitted dock extension observed in 2013 near the Fly Creek development. After discussions, the owner disconnected the dock and attached it to his house boat.

5.0 Ongoing Management and Enhancement Programs

5.1 Ongoing Management Programs

Long-term management of shoreline resources in the Project is the responsibility of the Licensees as described in Section 4.0 and will be achieved through the operation of ongoing programs discussed below. Updates to the approved SMP agreed upon in consultation with the SMWG on November 5, 2014, at the SMP Five year Review Meeting are discussed within each section below.

5.1.1 Mooring Buoy Guidelines (SMP Section 3.5)

As required by the Commission's December 7, 2006, order approving the Recreation Resources Implementation Plan, the Licensees undertook a study (the Mooring Buoy Study) of the feasibility of implementing an off shore moorage buoy program in Lake Billy Chinook. The Licensees filed this study with the Commission on August 18, 2008, after consultation with the SMWG. The Mooring Buoy Study concluded that a program of mooring buoys installed and maintained by the Licensees would be neither feasible nor desirable. The study also determined that the Licensees should adopt a program, to be administered in parallel with the permit program established by this SMP, to provide for the issuance of permits to OPRD or to private individuals seeking to install mooring buoys for houseboats. The Commission approved the Mooring Buoy Study by letter dated January 27, 2009.

Permission to install mooring buoys, or any other type of buoy other than navigational buoys, must be obtained from the Licensees. Proposed installations must demonstrate an appropriate anchoring system, adequate distance from the shore, and sufficient water depth. The proposed buoy must not jeopardize ingress or other rights of property owners or the public. Anyone proposing to install a buoy must demonstrate that it has obtained any other permits required for such installation. The criteria for issuing mooring buoy permits are attached as Appendix G-1 to the 2011 approved SMP. The process for obtaining a mooring buoy permit is detailed in Appendix G-2 to the 2011 approved SMP.

State mooring buoy standards are established by the Oregon State Marine Board (OSMB) in OAR 250-010-0205 and pertain to all Project waters. Pursuant to the criteria established by the OSMB, mooring buoys shall not be mistaken for navigational aids. Mooring buoys shall be white with a blue band clearly visible above the water line, except those in officially designated mooring areas.

No changes were suggested for Section 3.5 *Mooring Buoy Guidelines*.

5.1.2 Implementation (SMP Section 4.0)

The Licensee will implement and administer SMP provisions for new structures and docks proposed within the Project boundary. Criteria for construction and use adopted in the SMP are intended to be as consistent as practicable with those established by state building codes and the applicable guidelines of the Tribal, federal, and state entities owning or managing lands within the Project boundary.

No changes were suggested for Section 4.0 *Implementation*.

5.1.3 Permitting Existing Structures (SMP Section 4.1)

During the inventory phase of SMP implementation, the Licensees inventoried and issued a permit for each existing shoreline structure. All existing structures were grandfathered. The Licensees completed the inventory of structures within the Project boundary to establish a management baseline as of the date of Commission approval of the SMP. After written notification to the landowner, agents of the Licensees were granted access to shoreline structures from the reservoir but were required to obtain permission before entering onto private property outside the Project boundary. The Licensees administered SMP provisions and applied the provisions to new structures as well as alterations to existing structures within the Project boundary. The Licensees contacted each landowner with a shoreline structure attached to property within the Project boundary within one year of the Commission-approved SMP to confirm and document the type and condition of the existing structure(s). At this time a Shoreline Structures Permit (SSP) was issued for all structures within the Project boundary regardless of existing condition.

As discussed in the SMP Section 3.1, properties with permitted existing structures and their attendant SSPs may be sold or otherwise transferred, modified, repaired, maintained, and replaced. If an existing structure with an SSP is not used for a period in excess of three years (36 consecutive months), the SSP expires; the right to continue using the structure terminates and the structure and further use of it must comply with the requirements of this SMP applicable to new structures.

No changes were suggested for Section 4.1 *Permitting Existing Structures*.

5.1.4 Shoreline Structure Permitting Process (SMP Section 4.2)

This section (4.2) of the SMP describes how to apply for a SSP, the permit review process, and the general information that must be included in an application. The steps identified in Section 4.2.1 through 4.2.6 pertain to all non-Project related proposals to construct new structures or to alter existing structures within the Project boundary.

No changes were suggested for Section 4.2 *Shoreline Structure Permitting Process*.

5.1.5 Variances (SMP Section 4.3)

Variances may be granted from the specific provisions of Section 3.2 when it can be shown that due to special physical circumstances related to a specific shoreline, or lakebed or stream bed profile, strict application of the provisions of Section 3.2 would cause an undue or unnecessary hardship because the proposed structure would be unable to function properly for its intended use. An application for a variance will be reviewed by the Licensees under the procedures described in this section of the SMP. In granting a variance, the Licensees may attach conditions deemed necessary to protect the resources of the Project and surrounding properties or which may otherwise be required by the terms of the license.

No changes were suggested for Section 4.3 *Variances*.

5.1.6 Permit Transfers (SMP Section 4.4)

As noted, SSPs are transferable with title to the property. It is the property owner's obligation to notify the Licensees of any change in the identity or address of the owners. Transfer notifications shall be provided to the Licensees at the locations described in Section 4.2.3.

No changes were suggested for Section 4.4 *Permit Transfers*.

5.1.7 Repairs, Maintenance, and Alterations (SMP Section 4.5)

Existing structures may be repaired, maintained, or replaced for any reason without a permit from the Licensees. If an existing structure is damaged by fire, other casualty, or natural disaster, it may be repaired, restored, or replaced without a permit from the Licensees, when either (i) such work commences within one year of the damage or (ii) application for a building permit to undertake such repair, restoration, or replacement has been made within one year of the damage.

However, alteration of an existing structure will require a permit pursuant to this SMP. If an existing structure is not used for a continuous period of more than three consecutive years, the structure will be considered to be abandoned and must be

permitted as provided in Section 3.2 before any use of the structure resumes. Alterations may not be undertaken without prior authorization by the Licensees.

In order to avoid a possible enforcement action, if a Landowner is uncertain whether its proposed repair, maintenance, or replacement restoration of an existing structure will require a permit, it should notify the Licensees at least 60 days before starting such work in order to provide the Licensees an opportunity to inspect the property and determine whether a permit is required. If the Licensees determine that a permit is required, the landowner must comply with the procedures described in Section 4.2 of the SMP. If the Licensees determine that no permit is required, the landowner may proceed with the repair, maintenance, or restoration work, but must notify the Licensees when that work is completed. The Licensees will then inspect the work to ensure compliance with this section.

No changes were suggested for Section 4.5 *Repairs, Maintenance, and Alterations*.

5.1.8 Monitoring (SMP Section 4.6)

The Licensees will monitor all shoreline structures within the Project boundary annually to assure SMP compliance. After written notification to the landowner, agents of the Licensees will have access to shoreline structures from the reservoir, but will need to obtain permission before entering onto private property outside of the Project boundary. The Licensees will visually monitor shoreline structures, observe and document structural conditions, structural uses, and surrounding resource conditions. Monitoring and inspection of existing structures will be limited to that necessary to verify that the structure has not been altered and does not present a hazard to public health and safety of Project operations. The Licensees will contact, by certified mail, any landowner whose structure is not consistent with the SSP terms and conditions or which poses a threat to public health and safety or to the safe operation of the Project. In the case of private property uses inconsistent with the SSP, contact will also be made with Jefferson County to verify permit conditions. The Licensees do not have the authority and will not seek to enforce Jefferson County or other applicable regulations themselves. Regardless of whether Jefferson County seeks to enforce County ordinances, the Licensees may, if warranted, take action as appropriate pursuant to the terms of the license to initiate enforcement action pursuant to the SMP Section 4.7 *Enforcement*.

5.1.9 Enforcement (SMP Section 4.7)

The Licensees are solely responsible for enforcing the terms of this SMP. If the Licensees determine that a permittee is in violation of the terms of its SSP, they will issue a notice of violation to the permittee by certified mail. The notice of violation will specify the nature of the violation and a deadline of not less than 60 days in which to

take corrective action, provided that a shorter deadline may be specified if the violation presents a hazard to health or safety. The Licensees will notify Jefferson County of all SMP violations being processed by the Licensees; however, Jefferson County is not responsible for enforcing the SMP. The owner may, within 30 days of receipt of the notice of violation, request a meeting with the Licensees to review the violation and to discuss ways to remedy it. If the violation is not addressed within the time period specified in the notice (as such deadline may be extended at the written request of the owner) and has not been appealed as provided in Section 4.8, the Licensees may require removal of non-complying structures and pursue any other available remedies.

Any violations of Jefferson County ordinances will be handled by the County under its own processes. However, the County may notify, and as necessary, coordinate with the Licensees on such violations. Noncompliance or environmental degradation documented on federal, state or Tribal land will be directed to the appropriate management agency.

No changes were suggested for Section 4.7 *Enforcement*.

5.1.10 Appeals (SMP Section 4.8)

Any person whose application for an SSP or a mooring buoy permit is denied or conditioned in a way that is not acceptable to such person and any person who receives a notice of a violation of an SSP or a mooring buoy permit may, but is not required to, request that the Licensees reconsider such decision. A person seeking reconsideration may submit additional information in support of its request. The Licensees shall act upon request for reconsideration and respond by certified mail within 30 days. If the request seeks reconsideration of an enforcement notice, the Licensees will take no action pursuant to the notice until a decision is reached. Any person aggrieved by the Licensees' decision on a request for reconsideration or by a permit denial or enforcement notice if no reconsideration is requested, may file an appeal of the Licensees' action with the SMWG within 30 days of receipt of the decision being challenged. The Licensees shall convene a meeting of the SMWG, which shall act upon the appeal and respond by certified mail within 60 days. If the appeal challenges an enforcement notice, the Licensees will take no action pursuant to the notice until a decision on the appeal is reached. If the matter in dispute cannot be satisfactorily resolved by the decision of SMWG, the aggrieved party may bring the issue to the attention of the Commission, which could consider the matter. Further challenges to the Commission's action on an appeal are governed by Section 313 of the Federal Power Act, 16 U.S.C. § 825l.

No changes were suggested for Section 4.8 *Appeals*.

5.1.11 Annual Meetings (SMP Section 5.0)

As stated in Section 5.0 *Annual Meeting*, of the SMP (2011) the SMWG will meet annually, no later than October 31 or as requested by the Licensees or as agreed to by the SMWG, to review the previous year's actions under the SMP, discuss the following year's anticipated activities, and identify representatives of the public who will serve as members of the SMWG for the following year. In addition to this annual meeting, the SMWG may choose to meet at other times of the year, as needed, to address specific SMP activities or unanticipated matters or circumstances.

No changes were suggested for Section 5.0 *Annual Meeting*.

5.1.12 Amendments to the Plan (SMP Section 6.0)

Amendments to this plan may be submitted to the Commission after consultation with the SMWG. The Licensees shall include with any proposed amendment filed with the Commission documentation of consultation, copies of comments and recommendations on the proposed amendment after it has been provided to the SMWG, and specific descriptions of how the SMWG's comments are accommodated by the proposed amendment. The Licensees will allow a minimum of 30 days for the SWMG to comment before filing the proposed amendment with the Commission.

No changes were suggested for Section 6.0 *Amendments to the Plan*.

5.1.13 Reporting (SMP Section 7.0)

In Section 7.0 *Reporting*, the SMP states that by January 31 of each year, beginning January 2010, the Licensees will file with the Commission a status report on their efforts to complete the initial implementation phase of the SMP. Each report, at a minimum, will include detailed descriptions of the Licensees' progress in inventorying and permitting all existing structures within the project boundary and correcting any unsafe conditions related to these structures. As noted on October 23, 2012, the Commission approved the request to eliminate the annual report and instructed licensees to provide information on the continued implementation of the SMP to any party of the Settlement Agreement upon request.

Every six years, starting January 2015, the Licensees will file a report with the Commission providing the results of a comprehensive review of the effectiveness of the SMP in achieving its prescribed goals, particularly with regard to resource protection, permitting, monitoring and enforcement, and coordination with other jurisdictional entities. The report will be prepared in consultation with the SMWG.

No changes were suggested for Section 7.0 *Reporting*.

6.0 Adoption and Review of the SMP

Shoreline resource management is an ongoing process that may change as new issues arise. This section describes adoption and amendment procedures that may be necessary to maintain and administer appropriate and effective shoreline management strategies over the term of the license.

6.1 Amendment Procedures

Amendments to this plan may be submitted to the Commission after consultation with the SMWG. The Licensees shall include with any proposed amendment filed with the Commission documentation of consultation, copies of comments and recommendations to the proposed amendment after it has been provided to the SMWG, and specific descriptions of how the SMWG's comments are accommodated by the proposed amendment. The Licensees will allow a minimum of 30-days for the SMWG to comment before filing the proposed amendment with the Commission.

6.2 Review of the SMP

Every six years starting January 2015, the Licensees will file a report with the Commission providing the results of a comprehensive review of the effectiveness of the SMP in achieving its prescribed goals, particularly with regard to resource protection, permitting, monitoring and enforcement, and coordination with other jurisdictional entities. The report will be prepared in consultation with the SMWG.

7.0 References

FERC (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission). 1990. *Hydroelectric Project Relicensing Handbook*. Office of Hydropower Licensing, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C.

Bureau of Land Management. 1986. Two Rivers Resource Management Plan, Record of Decision, Rangeland Program Summary. USDI Bureau of Land Management, Prineville District Office, Prineville, OR. June 1986.

Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. 1999. Integrated Resources Management Plan and Project Assessment for the Non-Forested and Rural Areas. Warm Springs, OR.

Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon. 1998. Water Quality Standards, Beneficial Uses and Treatment Criteria (Ordinance 80) and Implementation Plan (Ordinance 81). Warm Springs, OR.

Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon. 1968. Water Quality Management Plan (Ordinance 45 / Tribal Code 430). Warm Springs, OR.

Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs, Bureau of Indian Affairs, US Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, State of Oregon, et al. 1999. Pelton Round Butte

Comprehensive Management Plan (Recreation / Land Use / Aesthetic Component).
March 1999.

EDAW and Portland General Electric. 1999. Private Shoreline Development and
Condition Inventory, Pelton Round Butte Hydroelectric Project, FERC No. 2030.
Portland, Oregon. May 1999.

Everett, Charles and Charles Frayer. 1999. Developed Recreation Facilities Inventory
and Evaluation for the Pelton Round Butte Hydroelectric Project. Prepared for
Portland General Electric. Portland, Oregon. September 1999.

Hall, Troy and Bo Shelby. 1998. Location and Condition of Shoreline and Upland
Dispersed Recreation Sites within the Pelton Round Butte Project Area, FERC No.
2030. Prepared for Portland General Electric. April 1998.

Jefferson County. 1981, as amended. Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, as
amended through October 9, 2002.

Jefferson County. 2003. Jefferson County Zoning Ordinances. Madras, Oregon. April
2003.

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department. 2002. The Cove Palisades State Park Master
Plan.

Oregon State Marine Board. 2001a. Best Management Practices for Environmental and
Habitat Protection in Design and Construction of Recreational Boating Facilities.
2001, as revised in September 2002.

Oregon State Marine Board. 2001b. Best Management Practices for Environmental and
Habitat Protection during Operation and Maintenance of Recreational Boating
Facilities. 2001, as revised in September 2002.

PGE. 1998. Pelton Round Butte Hydroelectric Project, Land and Resource Management
Plan, Initial Consistency Review Analysis. Portland General Electric Company.
Portland Oregon. April 1998.

Tressler, Ron et al. 1996. Vegetation Cover Type Mapping Final Report. Prepared by
EDAW for Portland General Electric.

USDA- Forest Service. Northwest Region Invasive Plant Final Environmental Impact
Statement, Appendix F. April 2005.

USDA- Forest Service. 1990. Deschutes National Forest Land and Resource
Management Plan.

Appendix A

SMWG Meeting Notes

Shoreline Management Working Group
Meeting Summary
2009 Annual Meeting

MEETING SUMMARY
Pelton Round Butte
Shoreline Management Working Group
Annual Meeting
October 21, 2009

In attendance:

Terry Luther (CTWS-BNR)	Scot Lawrence (PGE)
Brian Cunninghame (CTWS-BNR)	Tony Dentel (PGE)
Mike Gauvin (ODFW)	Dave Buckley (Property Owner Representative)
Laurel Skelton (USFS/BLM)	Mike Olin (Property Owner Representative)
Bill Crawford (OPRD)	Virginia Pugh (Property Owner Representative)
Ross Kihs (OPRD)	Richard Olson (Landowner)
Deb Schallert(PGE)	Kylie Olson (Landowner)
Debi Curl (Property Owner Representative)	Jerry Curl (Landowner)
Gary Popp (Property Owner Representative)	

Deb Schallert (PGE) opened the 2009 Annual Meeting of the Shoreline Management Working Group (SMWG). She reviewed the agenda and goals of the meeting.

UPDATE OF PUBLIC REPRESENTATIVES TO SMWG FOR 2010

Public representatives to the SMWG for 2010 were selected. The members from 2009 (Debi Curl, Ty Peters, Wayne Purcell, Gary Popp, and Don Colfels) were chosen as primary representatives for 2010. 2009 alternates Dave Buckley, Virginia Pugh and Mike Olin will continue in 2010.

REVIEW OF SMP IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES

SMP Status

Deb Schallert and Scot Lawrence (PGE) provided an update to the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) activities implemented in 2009. FERC approved and modified the SMP in January 2009 and that the Licensees subsequently requested an extension of time to address the modifications to the SMP ordered by FERC. After review by the SMWG, the revised SMP was filed at FERC September 9, 2009. Approval is pending.

Inventory of Shoreline Structures

Scot Lawrence reported that a physical inventory of the shoreline structures was conducted by PGE Property Services on August 25, 2009. The inventory was compared to aerial

photographs taken summer of 2008. Tony Dentel (PGE) noted that one structure in the 2008 photos was missing during the inventory, and that there was one new structure not visible in the 2008 photos. This inventory will provide the baseline inventory going into the future.

Debi Curl (Property Owner Representative) received a question from another property owner regarding the desire to construct a cabin, and whether that person needs to file a building permit in what order – Jefferson County, or the Licensees. Deb Schallert replied that a permit from the Licensees is only required if the structure will fall within the project boundary. In that case, the applicant should apply at Jefferson County first, and then to the Licensees.

Mike Olin (Property Owner Representative) asked if the recent ruling to designate the Metolius Basin an area of critical concern would impact the property owners on the Metolius arm of Lake Billy Chinook (LBC). Deb Schallert replied that she would investigate. Note: Investigation determined that SMP protocols would not be impacted by this designation.

Richard Olson (Property Owner) wants to obtain a permit to construct a cantilevered dock structure. He wants to know where the high water mark is. He will contact us for a permit application, and Deb Schallert will contact Jefferson County Community Development to coordinate SMP information for the public.

Tony Dentel commented that PGE's Property Department is preparing information to verify with the property owners the dimensions of each inventoried structure. Scot Lawrence proposed that packages be delivered to each property owner that will contain the structure dimensions/descriptions; the permit; and the permit tag, made of metal with a design similar to those found on power poles. A suggestion was made to include a copy of the SMP, so this will be included in the package.

Permit Applications

Deb Schallert asked if there were questions about the permitting process. Debi Curl asked how the SMP would encumber property; specifically how a prospective buyer would be aware of the SMP. In discussing the question, it was agreed that disclosing the SMP is the personal obligation of the seller. Gary Popp (Property Owner Representative) suggested that the permit be recorded with the property.

ACTIVITIES FOR 2010

Scot Lawrence indicated that the goal of the Licensees is to distribute the package containing the structure information, the permit and the permit tag early in 2010. Scot Lawrence also noted that the structure inventory is an annual requirement of the SMP. He proposed that the package include a notice that the annual inventory will be conducted in the month of August. Mike Olin asked if people will be walking the owner's property. Scot replied that if access is

needed, the individual property owners will be contacted in advance, as required under the SMP

There was some discussion regarding the Shoreline Erosion Plan (SEP). Mike Olin commented that some property owners have been towing logs and trees to the CTWS side of the Metolius arm in order to reduce erosion. In response to a question, Tony Dentel provided an update to activities at BLM Beach, and that erosion mitigation efforts at the location known as the Rope Swing will be conducted in coordination with the work at BLM beach. Work at both sites will be done following the fall 2010 drawdown of the reservoir.

In response to the fall 2010 drawdown, Mike Olin asked if there are any plans to address the milfoil growing in the Metolius arm. Terry Luther (CTWS) replied that milfoil control has been discussed at other resource working group meetings, but no specific plans to manage milfoil had been formalized.

Richard Olson commented that wake boats are an erosion concern and asked if there are any restrictions on LBC. Tony Dentel replied that this is an enforcement issue that concerned individuals should contact the Oregon State Marine Board or Jefferson County Marine Deputies. Debi Curl asked if wake boats are addressed in the SEP. Deb Schallert replied that erosion sites included in the SEP are evaluated and monitored based on resource impacts, rather than included due to wakes or other causes.

FALL SHORELINE TOUR

Deb Schallert briefly explained to the group how the SEP works and how annual monitoring & inspection of erosion sites is conducted in the winter, during the drawdown period. She asked if anyone in attendance would be interested in participating in the inspections, tentatively scheduled in January, 2010. No one expressed interest at this time. Deb will follow up individually with those individuals who expressed interest.

The meeting adjourned at noon.

Shoreline Management Working Group
Meeting Summary
2010 Annual Meeting

MEETING SUMMARY
Pelton Round Butte
Shoreline Management Working Group
Annual Meeting
November 3, 2010

In attendance:

Terry Luther (CTWS-RO)	Scot Lawrence (PGE)
Mike Gauvin (ODFW)	Mike Livingston (PGE)
Laurel Skelton (USFS/BLM)	Tony Dentel (PGE)
Dave Bulkley (Montgomery Shores)	Eileen McLanahan (PGE/Meridian)
Ginny Pugh (Montgomery Shores)	Don Colfels (Three Rivers HOA)
Mike Olin (private property owner)	Gary Trent (A&P Shores property owner)
Debi Curl (Shoreline Property Owners)	Jerry Curl (Shoreline Property Owners)

Scot Lawrence (PGE) opened the 2010 Annual Meeting of the Shoreline Management Working Group (SMWG). He handed out the Shoreline Permit dated October 18, 2010 and reviewed the agenda and goals of the meeting.

UPDATE OF PUBLIC REPRESENTATIVES TO SMWG FOR 2011

Scot Lawrence asked the group if there would be any changes to the list of public representatives to the SMWG for 2011. Debi Curl (Shoreline Property Owners) indicated that no final decisions had been made, but those present at the meeting (Debi Curl and Don Colfels, both primary representatives, and Dave Bulkley, Ginny Pugh, and Mike Olin, alternates) indicated their willingness to continue to serve. Debi Curl reported that Wayne Purcell is also willing to continue, and thinks Ty Peters would probably also serve. Scot indicated that he did not need to have a final list immediately, but asked that Debi Curl e-mail him with any changes after she had talked to all the representatives and alternates.

REVIEW OF SMP IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES

SMP Status

Scot Lawrence reported that PGE filed the revised SMP with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) on September 9, 2009, but had not yet received word from FERC regarding approval. Based on a conversation with FERC staff earlier this year, Debi Curl understands that FERC has assigned Brian Romanek as the primary contact for the SMP. Scot will follow up with Mr. Romanek for information about the anticipated timeline for approval.

Large Wood Management

Mike Olin (private property owner) asked about PGE's plans for moving and anchoring large woody debris, as he had not noticed that any of the logs he's seen in the reservoir this year have been labeled. Scot Lawrence responded that large wood management is addressed in the Large Wood Management Plan, rather than the SMP. Logs will be moved and anchored, as described in the plan, but Scot noted that crews may be waiting to tag the logs until they're ready to move them.

Inventory of Shoreline Structures

Scot Lawrence reported that PGE conducted a fly-over of the reservoir in July, 2010 with a GIS specialist aboard to photograph all the structures and compare them with those photographed during the 2008 surveys. Mike Livingston (PGE) conducted a physical inventory in August, 2010. The new information will be compared and reconciled with 2008 maps and photos. In cases where changes are documented, PGE will send the photos to the property owners.

Permit Status

Scot Lawrence and Mike Livingston provided information about shoreline structure permits under the revised SMP. Although property owners can inform Mike immediately via e-mail if they want more than one permit for their structures, Mike indicated that it would be more efficient for PGE to send out permit packets by the end of November that would include 1) a cover letter asking property owners if they would like more than one permit; 2) new permits and signature pages (old permits and permit numbers to be considered void); and 3) updated maps.

Terry Luther (CTWS-BNR) asked the SMWG members if they are comfortable with the new permit system. Several people indicated that they are not happy with it, but have agreed to it because it seemed the most reasonable approach that would be acceptable to FERC. Debi Curl indicated that the amount of liability insurance that will be required for new shoreline structures is a concern. The public representatives had understood that the amount would remain the same under the new SMP, but they have heard it has been increased to \$1 million for new structures. Debi pointed out that the SMP currently before FERC doesn't specify the amount. Scot Lawrence will verify that the amount has not changed; if it has increased, the group may need to meet again to discuss this issue.

Note: As a follow up, Scot investigated the permit for new structures and there is not a \$1 million insurance requirement.

ACTIVITIES FOR 2011

Mike Olin brought up a concern about the explosion of aquatic vegetation he has noticed in the past five to ten years, and asked if PGE is considering development of a weed abatement plan. Scot Lawrence thinks the milfoil is a natural occurrence, rather than a project effect,

and for that reason, PGE is not proposing to develop a plan for managing it. Terry Luther suggested that operation of the new fish facility and selective water withdrawal could reduce water temperatures, which could make conditions less suitable for aquatic weed growth. In answering a question about how much colder the water would be, Mike Gauvin (ODFW) indicated that there would be less warm-water influence from the Crooked River, and more cold-water influence from the Metolius River, but the temperature change would only be noticeable in that deeper water would be cooler. Dave Bulkley (Three Rivers HOA) noted that the last drawdown reduced weed abundance for about a year following the drawdown, but weeds quickly re-established; the lagoon at The Island is no longer accessible by boat as a result of the weed infestation. Terry Luther observed that weeds can be pulled, but quickly grow back, and broken pieces of plants can take root elsewhere.

FALL SHORELINE TOUR

Scot Lawrence asked if anyone would be interested in a boat tour of the shoreline during the drawdown period. The main focus of the tour would be on the erosion control measures that have been implemented along the shoreline at Perry South and those that will be implemented at BLM Beach, as well as the two invertebrate structures that are being installed. Several members of the group indicated they would like to participate; Tony Dentel (PGE) requested that they e-mail him in advance so that everyone can be accommodated. Scot set a tentative date as December 1st, with a back-up date of December 2nd. Those interested in participating should plan to meet at PGE's offices at 10:00 a.m.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 1:50 p.m.

Shoreline Management Working Group
Meeting Summary
2011 Annual Meeting

MEETING SUMMARY
Pelton Round Butte
Shoreline Management Working Group
Annual Meeting
October 21, 2011

In attendance:

Terry Luther (CTWS-RO)	Scot Lawrence (PGE)
Mike Gauvin (ODFW)	Mike Livingston (PGE)
Clay Penhollow (CTWS-BNR)	Tony Dentel (PGE)
Dave Bulkley (Shoreline Property Owner)	Wayne Purcell (Shoreline Property Owner)
Ginny Pugh (Shoreline Property Owner)	Matthew Bottiglieri (PGE)
Chris Parkins (Oregon State Parks)	

Following introductions, Scot Lawrence (PGE) opened the 2011 Annual Meeting of the Shoreline Management Working Group (SMWG). He reviewed the agenda and goals of the meeting.

UPDATE OF PUBLIC REPRESENTATIVES TO SMWG FOR 2012
--

Scot Lawrence asked the group if there would be any changes to the list of public representatives to the SMWG for 2011. The Shoreline Property Owners in attendance, Dave Bulkley, Ginny Pugh and Wayne Purcell, were not aware of any changes. The group decided to maintain the current list of public representatives. Scot then introduced Matthew Bottiglieri (PGE), explaining that Matt would be assuming most of the administrative activities related to the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP).

ROLE OF SMWG

Scot Lawrence explained that one of the roles of the SMWG members is to ensure that implementation of the SMP is communicated to those who are represented by the SMWG. Dave Bulkley (shoreline owner) remarked that some property owners, such as Simtustus RV Park may not be receiving updates on the more recent implementation activities. Ginny Pugh (shoreline owner) added that there may be some other property owners that are not readily known by the public representatives. Wayne Purcell (shoreline owner) added that there has been some change in ownership and the new owners may not be aware that there are representatives. The Licensees will send a notice out to the owners of record providing the contact information of the public representatives.

REVIEW OF SMP IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES

SMP Status

Mike Livingston (PGE) reported that signed permits have been received from all but three property owners, and those three were in various stages of completion.

Inventory of Shoreline Structures

Matt explained that the annual inventory was successful and that approximately 85% of the structures had the permit labels attached in a visible location. Wayne Purcell commented that not all property owners regularly visit their properties and some owners may have not been to their properties since the permit tags were issued. To that, Mike Livingston commented that as long as a permit has been issued, the posting of the permit tag is not a significant concern. Ginny Pugh expressed concern that the tags will not last long. Tony Dentel (PGE) remarked that new tags can be provided, should the tags deteriorate. Ginny also asked if the labels needed to be attached to the docks, or if the tags could be affixed to another location, visible from the water, such as the side of a building. Those in attendance thought this was a good idea and agreed that tags could be attached to a structure, such as a shed, house, or garage. To that end, the notice to be sent out to the property owners indicating the contact information of the representatives will include information about locating the tags, the availability of metal plates to attach the tags to, and an offer to provide assistance in attaching the tags. Matt emphasized that it is important that the permits are in a location visible from the water.

New Unpermitted Structure

Mike Livingston explained to the group that there was a new unpermitted structure on the Metolius arm. The owners (joint ownership) have been contacted via phone call and email, and appear to be agreeable to following the permitting process. Wayne Purcell remarked that the owners should follow the guidelines spelled out in the SMP. Scot Lawrence replied that the guidelines are in fact being followed. Dave Bulkley recalled that there could have been a dock at that location prior to the Eyerly fire of 2002, and that the owner might consider the new dock as a replacement. Scot Lawrence recalled that the SMP provides for replacement of existing structures that have been damaged by fire, etc, but that a structure needs to be replaced within one year. As the fire was nearly 10 years ago, the owner would need to follow the guidelines in the SMP for a new structure.

Matt also indicated that the SMP clearly outlines a procedure for addressing unpermitted structures, and suggested that the next step should be to send out a letter via certified mail that requests that the owners comply within 60 days, per the language in the SMP.

Q&A

Wayne Purcell proposed that the annual meeting be moved up to mid-summer, following the annual inventory. By moving the meeting up, the representatives could offer an opportunity to meet with the property owners and solicit feedback prior to the annual meeting. The Licensees will schedule the annual meeting for mid-summer.

Tony Dentel solicited comments regarding the placement of a floating restroom, farther up the Metolius arm. The group agreed that the best location would be near the cove where Perry South Campground is located.

Wayne Purcell also expressed concerns about floating logs that are discharged from the Metolius River, citing safety concerns. Scot Lawrence replied that although the Licensees collect logs, primarily in early spring or following high water events, as part of the Large Wood Management Plan, not all logs meet the minimum length/diameter criteria, and the Licensees do not patrol regularly for logs or other debris. He did go on to encourage any property owners to contact the Licensees if they do observe logs in the reservoir.

Prior to the meeting, Ginny Pugh asked Scot Lawrence what the extent of the annual drawdown would be. Scot checked with the Don Kraus, the PRB operations manager who indicated that the drawdown would not exceed five feet, unless weather conditions mandated a more extensive drawdown. During the meeting, Scot announced the planned drawdown level and proposed adding this topic to the annual meeting. All in attendance agreed that this would be helpful.

The meeting adjourned approximately 11:45

Shoreline Management Working Group
Meeting Summary
2012 Annual Meeting

**Pelton Round Butte
Shoreline Management Working Group
2012 Annual Meeting Summary Draft
August 21, 2012**

In attendance:

Jerry Curl (Shoreline Property Owner)	Scot Lawrence (PGE)
Kathy Dube (Watershed GeoDynamics)	Mike Livingston (PGE)
Clay Penhollow (CTWS-BNR)	Tony Dentel (PGE)
Dave Bulkley (Shoreline Property Owner)	Mike Olin (Shoreline Property Owner)
Ginny Pugh (Shoreline Property Owner)	Matthew Bottiglieri (PGE)
Dave Slaght (Oregon State Parks)	Robert Marheine (PGE)

Following introductions, Matthew Bottiglieri (PGE) opened the 2012 Annual Meeting of the Shoreline Management Working Group (SMWG). He reviewed the agenda and goals of the meeting.

**UPDATE OF PRIVATE PROPERTY REPRESENTATIVES TO SMWG FOR 2012/FALL 2011
LETTER TO PROPERTY OWNERS**

Matthew provided a brief overview of the letter that was sent out to the private property owners in fall 2011 which provided contact information of the private property representatives who are members of the SMWG. Matt inquired if there was any feedback in response to the letters. Dave Bulkley replied that his contact information was incorrect. Matt asked the group if the letter should be sent out annually, to which the group agreed. The discussion then moved to the update of the private property representatives to the SMWG for the upcoming year. Jerry Curl commented that he thought that he was an alternative to his wife, Debby Curl. The group agreed to add Jerry to the list of alternatives (Action Item). Dave Bulkley, who has attended each annual meeting as an alternate, proposed that he be made a primary representative replacing Ty Peters, who has not attended in a number of years. The property owners in attendance agreed to this change. (See Action Item list.)

2012 RESERVOIR DRAWDOWN

Matt updated the group on the schedule and amount of the fall reservoir drawdown. The drawdown is scheduled to begin in mid to late October, but may occur earlier if there is significant rainfall in September. The drawdown will likely not exceed four feet. Dave Slaght (State Parks) replied that if the drawdown does exceed four feet that he needs to know in advance in order to remove some structures. Matt replied that he would follow up with a more definitive drawdown level. (See Action Item list.)

UPDATE ON PERMIT STATUS

Mike Livingston (PGE) reported that there are still four permits that were not completed, but emphasized that it was not an issue of refusal to sign, but more of a matter of completing the paperwork. When Jerry Curl asked if the names of the unsigned permits could be provided, Dave Bulkley replied that he had signed one permit at the 2011 meeting. Note: Mike Livingston followed up and confirmed that Dave did in fact sign the permit, making three permits to be completed. Mike Olin queried about the status of the one unpermitted structure that was identified in the 2011 inventory. Tony Dentel (PGE) replied that at the request of the property owners, PGE crews removed the dock.

5-YEAR REVIEW OF SHORELINE EROSION PLAN

Scot Lawrence (PGE) provided an overview of the Shoreline Erosion Plan (SEP) 5-year review, explaining that the review is a “look back” at the SEP and determining if the objectives described in the SEP are being implemented and if any modifications to the plan were needed. The draft report was distributed to the members of the SMWG for review on July 24, 2012, for discussion and review at this meeting. Comments are as follows: Scot brought attention to Section 4.1, where the Licensees have proposed to submit an amendment to the SEP to change the annual shoreline monitoring to a biennial schedule, due to the stability of the shoreline. Clay Penhollow (CTWS-BNR) asked that this section be modified to also include years when there is a significant drawdown. (See Action Item list.) Clay further inquired about the sentence in Section 4.1 regarding the slow erosion rates of existing sites and that few new erosion sites have developed. Kathy Dube (Watershed GeoDynamics) explained that she does in fact monitor for new erosion sites and records them in her annual survey, if new sites are observed. Tony Dentel asked Kathy if sites that previously had erosion control measures implemented continued to be monitored, to which Kathy replied that they are: She conducts visual assessments and takes photo points, but does not measure transects. Dave Slaght noted that LBC 15 has had erosion control measures, but had been omitted from Section 3 and Table 2. Scot replied that that oversight will be corrected in the formal draft (See Action Item list). Jerry Curl inquired about the schedule for finalizing the 5-year review. Scot replied that the comments received at the meeting would be incorporated into this draft that had been circulated for review (See Action Item list). Subsequently, the draft and the amendment would be circulated for formal review, likely by mid-September. Any additional comments would be incorporated into the both documents, with filing at FERC filing by the end of October.

INVENTORY OF NAVIGATIONAL HAZARDS

Tony Dentel said that all known navigational hazards have had markers placed. A rock shoal near the Crooked River day use area was marked with a beacon in winter of 2010 and a rock outcropping near Chinook Island was marked with a buoy in spring 2011. Tony asked the group if they knew of any additional hazards. Robert Marheine (PGE) remarked that there is a delta forming near the confluence of Lake Billy Chinook and the Crooked River, above the bridge on Jordan Road. As this is outside the project boundary, Tony said that he would

contact Jefferson County. (See Action Item list.) Dave Slaght commented that the beacon that Tony and Scot placed in 2010 is working very well.

Mike Olin (Shoreline Property Owner) asked about aquatic weeds in the Metolius arm, and if these weeds could potentially become a navigational hazard. Robert Marheine replied that this is native vegetation. As Asian milfoil was recently discovered in the Metolius River, removal of native vegetation by physical removal would likely disturb the lake bed and would allow establishment of a highly invasive non-native aquatic plant. Robert added that a group from Portland State University is coming out to conduct field work and he would inquire if they know of any low-impact treatments (See Action Item list). Mike commented that the vegetation dies back in the winter when the reservoir is drawn down and asked Scot to inquire with FERC if a more significant winter drawdown would be allowed in an attempt to further reduce it. Scot replied that he would inquire and get back to him.

PARTICIPATION IN 2012 SHORELINE INVENTORY

Due to past requests to participate in the shoreline inventory and inspections, Matt extended the offer to the SMWG to participate in the 2012 shoreline inventory, scheduled for Wednesday, August 22, 2011. Dave Bulkley planned on participating.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

Jerry Curl commented that his permit stickers were disintegrating, and requested new stickers. He suggested that a more durable material be considered. Dave Slaght noted that the permit stickers that had been attached to the State Park mooring buoys had been stolen and replacements were needed. (See Action Item list.) The meeting adjourned approximately 11:45.

Action Item	Responsible
Update SMWG member list	Matthew Bottiglieri
Replace State Parks mooring buoy permit stickers	Matthew Bottiglieri
Verify level and date of drawdown	Matthew Bottiglieri
Notify Jefferson County about the hazard at Lake Billy Chinook and Crooked River	Tony Dentel
Inquire about low-impact treatment for native vegetation	Robert Marheine
Update SEP 5-year review regarding monitoring during a significant drawdown	Matthew Bottiglieri
Update Table 3.2 of SEP 5-year review regarding LBC 15	Matthew Bottiglieri

Shoreline Management Working Group
Meeting Summary
2013 Annual Meeting

**Pelton Round Butte
Shoreline Management Working Group
2013 Annual Meeting Notes
October 9, 2013**

In attendance:

Wayne Purcell (Shoreline Property Owner)	Scot Lawrence (PGE)
Mike Olin (Shoreline Property Owner)	Dave Slaght (Oregon State Parks)
Clay Penhollow (CTWS-BNR)	Tony Dentel (PGE)
Dave Bulkley (Shoreline Property Owner)	Matthew Bottiglieri (PGE)
Ginny Pugh (Shoreline Property Owner)	

Following introductions, Matthew Bottiglieri (PGE) opened the 2013 Annual Meeting of the Shoreline Management Working Group (SMWG). Ginny Pugh introduced her husband and son as meeting guests. Matthew reviewed the agenda and goals of the meeting.

UPDATE OF PRIVATE PROPERTY REPRESENTATIVES TO SMWG

After a brief discussion the group determined that there are no changes to the current working group.

UPDATE OF 2013 ACTIVITIES

Matt provided a brief update of 2013 activities, which included the annual aerial survey. Matt explained the purpose of the aerial survey, which allows the Licensees to maintain an accurate inventory of the structures currently on LBC to compare to the 2008 baseline and the 2012 inventory. He added that the survey was conducted in August. Matt also provided an update to the one unpermitted structure that was discovered in 2011. The structure has since been removed and the owner is working with the Licensees to attain a permit. Matt added that the Licensees recently received an application to place a mooring buoy in LBC. Mike Olin (Property Owner) asked if it is a private party or a property owner, to which Matt responded that he is investigating. Dave Bulkley (Property Owner) inquired about the location of the buoy. In response, Tony Dentel (PGE) remarked that there are few locations on the Metolius Arm due to locations of raptors. Matt added that he will follow up.

2013 RESERVOIR DRAWDOWN

Scot Lawrence (PGE) commented that the annual winter drawdown of Lake Billy Chinook (LBC) was under way. Typically the reservoir is drawn down 3-5 feet under normal conditions, but could be drawn down seven feet this, depending upon the need to conduct some shoreline erosion maintenance at Chinook Island. Dave Slaght (OSP) replied that if

LBC is drawn down any more than normal that he needed four weeks' notice in order to remove some docks. Wayne Purcell (Property Owner) added that it would be a good idea to notify the entire working group of a larger drawdown.

Note: As a follow-up, the winter drawdown will be the normal 3-5 foot drawdown.

UPDATE ON PERMIT STATUS

Scot Lawrence reported that there are still three permits that were not completed and one revised permit outstanding. All four are neighboring properties: Olson Family; Streetcreek Properties; FTI, LLC; and McVeigh. The Licensees will close the loop on these permits.

2013 SHORELINE INVENTORY

Matt provided a brief overview of the 2013 boat-based inventory. He noted that there are some misplaced or missing tags. Matt added that one new, unpermitted structure was observed and that he is following up with the owner. Tony Dentel added that the Licensees are printing new replacement tags and will distribute them to the owners.

Dave Bulkley inquired about the large boat that has been moved around LBC and is currently moored in a cove near BLM property. The Licensees will follow up with BLM and Jefferson County.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

The Licensees are considering a web site to post information and developments. The Licensees will keep the SMWG informed. Ed Pugh added that lake level information would be a valuable item to post to the web site.

Dave Bulkley commented that some log booms have been abandoned by the owners, while others would like to remove old booms but do not have the resources to remove them. Tony Dentel responded that if the owners contact the Licensees, they would work with the owners to remove them.

Wayne Purcell (Property Owner) asked about logs that are found floating in LBC. Scot Lawrence replied that if logs are encountered to call him and he will arrange to have the logs collected.

Wayne Purcell remarked that some boats are creating excessive wakes and asked if the current marker could be changed from "10mph" to "No Wake Zone". Dave Bulkley cautioned about creating additional regulations. Any changes to the existing regulations would need to be made the Oregon State Marine Board. The Licensees will initiate a conversation with the Marine Board.

Mike Olin expressed a concern that livestock on the Reservation side of LBC is contributing to shoreline erosion. Clay Penhollow (CTWS-BNR) will contact the Tribal livestock management group.

Dave Bulkley inquired if there was a phone number that a person could call to get lake level elevations, such as at Lake Shasta. Scot Lawrence replied that he would investigate.

The meeting concluded at 11:15.

Notes respectfully submitted by Scot Lawrence.

Shoreline Management Working Group
Meeting Summary
2014 Annual Meeting

**Pelton Round Butte
Shoreline Management Working Group
2014 Annual Meeting Notes
September 3, 2014**

Attendees:

Wayne Purcell	Shoreline Property Owner
Michael Olin	Shoreline Property Owner
Dave Bulkley	Shoreline Property Owner
Brett Davies	Cove Palisades State Park
Gary Popp	Cove Palisades State Park
Clay Penhollow	Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs – Bureau of Natural Resources
Dave Slaght	Oregon State Parks
Rod Bonacker	U.S. Forest Service
Scot Lawrence	Portland General Electric
Tony Dentel	Portland General Electric
Jessica Graeber	Portland General Electric
Nuria Claudio-M.	Portland General Electric

Following introductions, Scot Lawrence (PGE) opened the 2014 Annual Meeting of the Shoreline Management Working Group (SMWG). Scot reviewed the agenda and goals of the meeting.

UPDATE OF PRIVATE PROPERTY REPRESENTATIVES TO SMWG

After a brief discussion the group determined that there may be changes to the list of primary and alternate property owners. An action item was created for Scot to send out the current list and ask property owners for revisions. Note: In an email dated September 4, 2014, Scot Lawrence provided the list of primary and alternate representatives. On September 4, alternate Jenny Pugh proposed to be made the alternate to Dave Bulkley, representing Montgomery Shores. No other proposed revisions have been received.

UPDATE OF 2014 ACTIVITIES

Scot provided a brief update on the shoreline activities. A boat-based inventory will be conducted September 3, 2014. An aerial inventory will not be conducted in 2014.

2013 RESERVOIR DRAWDOWN

Scot commented that the annual winter drawdown of Lake Billy Chinook (LBC) is tentatively scheduled to begin October 1, 2014. Attendees were informed that the reservoir is estimated to be drawn down three to five feet (under normal conditions), but could be drawn down further. The 2013 drawdown was supposed to be larger in order for PGE to conduct shoreline erosion maintenance at Chinook Island, but island construction was able to be

completed without further drawdown. Dave Slaght (OSP) replied that if LBC is drawn down any more than normal that he needed 30-40 days' notice in order to remove some docks. A property owner added that it would be a good idea to notify the entire working group of a larger drawdown so they could conduct maintenance on their docks as well. Cove Palisades also mentioned their docks are not designed to be dropped to 20 feet, should the drawdown be more significant.

The property owners mentioned their interest in using the drawdown as an effective means of eliminating the Elodea in the lake (perhaps through freezing in the winter). Scot explained that PGE's terrestrial resources biologists claim that Elodea is native to the area. As a follow up Scot will investigate whether a 10-foot drawdown for a very short time period in the winter of 2015-16 would be sufficient enough to kill back the elodea.

UPDATE ON PERMIT STATUS

Scot mentioned that the permits were mailed out to the property owners prior the SMWG meeting. Michael Olin mentioned his permit number had advanced by 1 digit, even though permit numbers should not change. Wayne mentioned that his mother's permit arrived at the wrong address. Dave mentioned he did not receive his permit at all. Oregon State Parks also mentioned they did not receive permits for their buoys. PGE will investigate the discrepancy and likely re-issue new permit tags.

2014 SHORELINE INVENTORY

Scot provided a brief overview of the 2014 boat-based inventory, which would be conducted after the SMWG meeting. Property owners discussed the "phantom boat" floating on LBC and asked how it could be removed. It was concluded that the "phantom boat" owner is likely not breaking any laws, and it is unclear within whose jurisdiction it is to have the boat removed from the lake. Also, there is a funding issue with respect to who would bear the cost of removing the boat. Property owners are concerned about trespassing and safety issues. Scot mentioned that the review period for the SMP will begin in 2015-2016 (five year review period) and there may be some verbiage available in other plans as to a "stay limit" on boats in the lake. Property owners mentioned it is currently anchored in the North Cove area.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

PGE continues to work on the development of the Shoreline Management online services website. It was suggested that the website include information such as: (1) information on the drawdown dates and levels, (2) a pdf of the Shoreline Management Plan document, (3) permit information for property owners, (4) permitting process flow charts, (5) aerial view of the Project, (6) lake levels linking to the USGS page, (7) fuel options and hours on the lake, (8) weather information, (9) history of the Project/Dam history, and (10) date of shoreline inventory.

Wayne Purcell remarked that some boats are creating excessive wakes and asked if the current marker could be changed from “10mph” to “No Wake Zone”. Any changes to the existing regulations would need to be made the Oregon State Marine Board. Scot distributed a petition form. Dave (OSP) opposed speed limits in general and mentioned he would take a stand against any speed limits on lakes.

The attendees discussed that PGE may be hosting the 2015 FERC Shoreline meeting, which would be held at Pelton/Round Butte. Property owners express interest in presenting “from a property owners perspective” at the conference.

Wayne Purcell suggested that the property owners were concerned about institutional knowledge that Scot possesses should he retire soon. They asked who would take over Scot’s position. The property owners would like to meet more often with PGE as the retirement date comes closer. Scot said he has not announced a retirement date.

OSP also mentioned they have submitted an application for five additional buoys. Three would be for public use and two would be for Cove Palisades. Property owners expressed concern about too many buoys and too many boats on LBC and the overall lake capacity.

The meeting concluded at 11:25am.

Notes respectfully submitted by Nuria Claudio-Mariages.

Appendix B

Consultation Record

The Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) implemented pursuant Article 428 requires the Licensees to file with the Commission a review every six years, starting in January 2015, a periodic review of the SMP program to determine whether it is meeting its goals. The review is to be prepared in consultation with the Shoreline Management Working Group (SMWG). The licensees shall make the draft SMP review available to the SMWG for review and comment. The licensees shall provide notice of the Five-Year review meeting to the SMWG. The licensees shall allow a minimum of 30 days for the consulted parties to comment prior to finalizing the SMP review and filing it with the Commission. The licensees shall specify in the final review how any comments and recommendations were addressed.

The Licensees initiated consultation with the SMWG on October 30, 2014 with the following message:

From: Scot Lawrence
Sent: Friday October 30, 2014 2:12PM
To: terry.m.shrader@state.or.us; chris.parkins@state.or.us; don@nwnetmedia.com; temporarycurl@hotmail.com; billychinook@hughes.net; wpurcell@bendcable.com; wayne@riverhouse.com; terryluther@crestviewcable.com; kkeown@fs.fed.us; Chet.Singleton@co.jefferson.or.us; dave@tomcoelectric.com; mmbrown@blm.gov
Cc: Robert.Dach@BIA.gov; clay.penhollow@wstribes.org; rbonacker@fs.fed.us; David.slaght@state.or.us; mikeolin@bendcable.com; stills_ville@yahoo.com; vrosebudp@yahoo.com; Nancy.E.Doran@state.or.us; Jessica Graeber <Jessica.Graeber@pgn.com>; Scot Lawrence <Scot.Lawrence@pgn.com>; typeters@comcast.net
Subject: Pelton Round Butte Project – Shoreline Management Plan 5-Year Review
Attachments: SMP Five-Year Review 1st Draft to SMWG.docx (56 KB)
 2015 SMWG 5-Year Review Meeting Agenda.docx (28 KB)

Dear SMWG,

Attached is a 1st draft of the 5-year review of the Shoreline Management Plan and an agenda for our meeting, scheduled for 9:00 –Noon, Wednesday, November 5 at the PRB Office. Don't hesitate to contact Jessy (Jessica) Graeber at 503.464.8133 or myself if you have any immediate questions or concerns.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

Scot

SCOT LAWRENCE
PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE & LICENSING – DESCHUTES PROJECTS
121 SW SALMON ST – 3WTBR05
PORTLAND, OR 97204
W – 503.464.7361 C – 503.705.5191
SCOT.LAWRENCE@PGN.COM

The preliminary draft was reviewed at the November 5, 2014 Shoreline Management Plan 5-year Review meeting.

The 30-day draft of the Five-year SMP Review was presented to the SMWG on November 14, 2014, via email:

From: Jessica Graeber
Sent: Friday November 14, 2014 3:30PM
To: Scot Lawrence <Scot.Lawrence@pgn.com>; terry.m.shrader@state.or.us; chris.parkins@state.or.us; don@nwnetmedia.com; temporarycurl@hotmail.com; billychinook@hughes.net; wpurcell@bendcable.com; wayne@riverhouse.com; terryluther@crestviewcable.com; kkeown@fs.fed.us; Chet.Singleton@co.jefferson.or.us; dave@tomcoelectric.com; mmbrown@blm.gov
Cc: Robert.Dach@BIA.gov; clay.penhollow@wstribes.org; rbonacker@fs.fed.us; David.slaght@state.or.us; mikeolin@bendcable.com; stills_ville@yahoo.com; vrosebudp@yahoo.com; Nancy.E.Doran@state.or.us; typeters@comcast.net
Subject: Pelton Round Butte Project – Shoreline Management Plan 5-year Review Report 30-Day Draft
Attachments: 30Day DRAFT_SMP Five-Year Review 111414.docx (64 KB)

Dear SMWG,

Attached for review is the 30-day review draft of the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) 5-year Review Report. Comments received at the November 5, 2014 SMWG meeting were incorporated into this document. Please provide your approval of the report and feel free to contact Scot or myself with any comments or questions that may have come up after our meeting November 5, 2014. **As was discussed in the review meeting, no changes are proposed to the SMP.**

This distribution will start the 30-day review period which will conclude December 30 (accounting for holidays) and will allow us to file the report with FERC before the mandatory filing date of January 27, 2015.

Thank you for your participation in the review of the SMP, we are pleased that so far the process has been successful.

Jessica Graeber (503.464.8133) and Scot Lawrence (503.464.7361)

Jessica Graeber

Environmental Specialist

Portland General Electric Co., Environmental Compliance & Licensing Services

121 SW Salmon St, 3WTCBR05 | Portland, Oregon 97204

The following email was received from CTWS-BNR on November 18, 2014:

From: Clay Penhollow <clay.penhollow@wstribes.org>
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2014 5:08 PM
To: Scot Lawrence
Subject: Re: Pelton Round Butte Project - Shoreline Management Plan 5-year Review Report 30-Day Draft

Hey there!

I looked this over while I was in Boise and while the group was meeting on it, and I'm seeing some things that I'm not sure make sense to me. And then there are a few inconsistencies (I think?), and other things that maybe I'm trying to be too picky about.

Anyway, before I go too far with it and before I send anything to Jessica as suggested changes, I wanted to talk to you about it and see if it makes sense or if I'm over thinking some of it.

When you have a chance, give me a call. I should be here tomorrow (Wednesday).

Clay D. Penhollow
Natural Resources Planner
Branch of Natural Resources
Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs
PO Box C
Warm Springs, OR 97761-3001
office 541-553-2014
cell 541-980-4784
fax 541-553-1994
clay.penhollow@wstribes.org

In response to the above email, a phone discussion between Scot Lawrence (PGE) and Clay Penhollow concluded that no changes were required.

No other comments were received.

Document Content(s)

20150122 SMP 6Y Review.PDF.....1-54