

## MEETING SUMMARY

**Project:** Coosa –Warrior Relicensing Team Meetings  
**Group Name:** CCRT, Coosa RATs  
**Site:** Coosa River Projects  
**Location:** APC Corporate Headquarters, Birmingham  
**Date:** 4/03/01 **Time:** 8:30 AM to 4:00PM

### Attendees

**Name:** **Organization:**

Akridge, Mike	Alabama Power Company
Allinder, Pres	Alabama Department of Public Health
Austin, James D.	Lake Mitchell Home Owners and Boat Owners Association
Beumer, Johan	Trail of Legends Association Inc.
Campbell, Bill	EPRO Consulting
Carden, Lonnie	Coosa River Paddling Club
Catchings, Dan	Alabama Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries
Claybrook, Rick	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Coggins, Bill	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Cook, Stan	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Couret, Carl	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
Crew, Jim	Alabama Power Company
Dentici, Joe	Neely Henry Lake Association
Dewberry, Shannon R.	Alabama Power Company
DiGennaro, Bruce	Kleinschmidt Associates
Duncan, Jeff	National Park Service
Eubanks, Mike	United States Army Corp of Engineers
Evans, Margaret	Neely Henry Lake Association
Fargo, Kelly	Kleinschmidt Associates
Free, John D.	Alabama Public Service Commission
Garnett, Bill	Coosa River Paddling Club
Guyse, Keith	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Hamilton, Janice	Alabama Public Service Commission
Haney, Don	Lay Lake Home Owners and Boat Owners Association
Hathorn, Stacye	Alabama Historical Commission
Haynes, David	Wetumpka City Council
Hipp, Jim	Logan Martin Lake Association
Hooker, John	Lawrence Community Neighborhood Watch
Hornsby, Jon	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Jackins, George	Lake Mitchell Home Owners and Boat Owners Association
Johnston, Dow	Alabama Office of Water Resources
Jones, Frank	Lay Lake Home Owners and Boat Owners Association
Littlepage, Tom	Alabama Office of Water Resources
Lochamy, Jim	Alabama Power Company
Lovett, Barry	Alabama Power Company

McClellan, Diane	East Alabama Regional Planning and Development Commission
McHugh, Jim	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
McKittrick, Ron	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Mealing, Henry	Kleinschmidt Associates
Murchison, Dan	Lake Mitchell Home Owners and Boat Owners Association
Pender, Joe	Logan Martin Lake Association
Piccolo, Sam	Lake Mitchell Home Owners and Boat Owners Association
Pierson, Malcolm	Alabama Power Company
Ramey, Walter R.	Alabama Power Company
Redmond, Jason	Alabama Power Company
Sailors, Jerry	Coosa-Alabama River Improvement Association
Sheppard, Andrew R.	Alabama Power Company
Sherburn, Tom	Southern Outdoor Center
Sim, Bill	Alabama Power Company
Sligh, Dave	American Rivers
Smith, Sheila C.	Alabama Power Company
Strickland, Jon	Alabama Department of Economic and Community Affairs
Taylor, Robert	Alabama Public Service Commission
Thaxton, Bert	Lay Lake Home Owners and Boat Owners Association
Thompson, Dan	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Wentzel, Beth	Alabama Rivers Alliance
Whatley, Dick	Logan Martin Lake Association
Young, Joe	Lake Jordan Home Owners and Boat Owners Association

**Meeting Summary**

**Draft for Review \_\_\_\_\_ Final for Record  X**

# Meeting Summary

## General Structure of the Meeting Summary

This is the first meeting summary of the Coosa Relicensing Team meetings, held April 3, 2001, to be distributed for Team members' review and comment. It is important therefore, to become familiar with the general layout and content. The first page of each meeting summary will provide information on the meeting location, time and meeting attendees. The following pages summarize the activities, discussions, and action items covered during the meeting. As explained on April 3<sup>rd</sup>, this summary is not structured to be a transcript, but is prepared as an overall summary of ideas, comments, questions, actions, and statements. This summary is meant to reflect the general consensus of the group regarding issues discussed and issues raised as well as any other positions raised. The amount of detail included in the summary will vary, depending on the issue or topic. For example, the April 3<sup>rd</sup> summary is not lengthy since the majority of revisions of the issues statements, issue sheets and operating procedures are captured in a MS Word track change version attached in Attachments C, D and F.

All meeting summaries are in draft form for 14 days, during which time stakeholders are encouraged to provide comments. Meeting summaries will be finalized at the subsequent meeting. Comments on the format and content of the meeting summaries may also be provided to APC.

## Introduction, Proposed Team Structure and Responsibilities, and Issue Development Process

During the first session of the April 3<sup>rd</sup> Coosa Relicensing Team Meeting the following items were discussed:

- Meeting Purpose and Agenda,
- Proposed Team Structure and Responsibilities; and
- Issue Development Process.

This portion of the meeting was primarily an information session that provided stakeholders with background of the structure, role, function, and composition of the Teams, a hierarchy of stakeholder participation, the issues identification process, and how issue statements and sheets are formed. Notes on these items were contained in the participant notebooks, which were distributed prior to the April 3, 2001 meeting.

## Breakout Sessions to Review Issue Statements

The meeting participants were then divided into four breakout sessions in which issue statements were reviewed. There were two breakout sessions each for ecological and recreation issues. Facilitators led each of the four groups through the review of the issue statements for the Coosa River. In general, the majority of comments on the issue statements focused on defining the study area (*i.e.*, identifying the geographic scope) and deciding how to address economic issues. There were also minor editorial changes recommended to the issue statements to improve the clarity of the issue. For some of the issues, the recommended revisions occurred on the Issue

Sheets (although issue sheets were not discussed in detail at this meeting). The revised issues statements and sheets are attached as Attachments C-D. All revisions to the issue statements are done in MS Word track changes for ease of review. The following summarizes specific discussions during the breakout sessions.

## Coosa RecRAT Breakout

There were six issue statements discussed in the two recreation breakout sessions. Questions were answered regarding the issue statements and general recreation issues/resources. The general discussion in the two breakout sessions is provided below. As noted, actual changes to the statements are reflected in the track change versions in Attachment C.

The following items were addressed before the specific issue statements were reviewed and discussed.

- Several questions were asked regarding the appropriate time for discussing specific lake related recreational issues. It was determined that these issues will be discussed later in the process and were generally captured on the issues sheets (under description or specific issues or requests).
- Representatives from several agencies discussed their respective role in the relicensing process and specific information about their agencies.
- A long-term land management, development and recreation plan—with comprehensive mapping was recommended — for each lake. These plans would allow APC to preserve land.
- The Recreation RATs ability to operate outside of APC and bring in other large property owners on a specific lake. Will participants have the right to bring these large landowners into the RATs and try to get them to agree on a land management program? It was explained that there are no mandates for property owners outside of the project boundary.
- The groups discussed how future recreation demand was to be anticipated. Several items were explained and further investigation of this issue will occur at later meetings. Some stakeholders expressed concern about a 50-year license term, given that future demands are unknown and current planning only extends ten years into the future. The process of the FERC “form-80” was explained including the re-evaluation of recreation resources every 6 years.
  
- **Other issues discussed to be added as new issue statements or incorporated into existing statement include:**
  - Coosa River Public Education
  - Cultural resources

## Coosa EcoRAT Breakout

Each breakout group (2) discussed 14 issue statements. Questions were answered regarding the issue statements and general ecological issues/resources. The general discussion associated with each is provided below. As noted above, actual changes to the statements are reflected in the track change versions in Attachment C-D of this document.

In general the following were addressed before the specific issue statements were reviewed.

- The group agreed that the list of issues appeared comprehensive.
- The facilitator noted that written comments on the issue sheets were welcome, and should be sent to Nancy Braswell at APC. Jim Crew (APC) asked that written comments refer to issue sheets.
- The group discussed the geographic scope of the issues, and the differences between the project boundary and the area of project impact. The facilitator noted that the definition of geographic scope for each issue was a decision to be determined by the team, and could vary from issue to issue.
- The group discussed the inclusion of “economical” in the issue descriptions. Several participants felt that at the outset all options should be considered and that economic considerations should come into play as a later filter when evaluating different alternatives. The group suggested a global change: deleting “economic” and “economical” from all issue statements and should instead go into the issue sheets.
- The group discussed water withdrawal permitting process. Currently, APC reviews—and can deny—permits for withdrawals from APC reservoirs, but does not review permits for upstream withdrawals.
- The group suggested including “sensitive species” along with threatened and endangered species.
- The group suggested striking references to “anadromous, catadromous, and diadromous species,” and instead referring to this group collectively as “migratory species.” Migratory will have to be defined later.
- The group discussed existing agency management goals. Carl Couret (United States Fish and Wildlife Service) and Jim McHugh (Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources) were to provide more information.
- Another issue suggested: Siltation in the tributary creeks may inhibit fish passage.
- One stakeholder suggested that there be an energy conservation issue statement. This concept is captured in the Issue Statement entitled “Project Releases”.

## **Coosa Operating Procedures**

Operating procedures for the Teams were discussed in two breakout sessions (Coosa EcoRAT and RecRAT). The summary from these sessions is included below.

## **Relicensing Mission Statement**

- First sentence should be the essence of the statement. Some stakeholders discussed the length of the mission statement. Many felt that the statement was too long.
- Look at striking commitment statements
- Stakeholders should include APC
- There were lengthy discussions in both groups regarding the term of the license in the mission statement. Some participants suggested that the 50-year license term mentioned in the statement was too long, given APC’s ability to amend the license. Some participants suggested tying in adaptive management as part of a 50-year license. Ron McKittrick (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission) explained that the length of the license term is based on construction, cost of enhancement measurements, and adaptive

management. While it may be APC's intent to pursue a 50-year license, Team members asked that the time frame be removed.

- Some participants suggested describing non-developmental and developmental resources in the mission statement. The group discussed developmental resources (power generation, system reliability, flood control) and non-developmental resources (ecological, recreation, etc.) and how this is the language used by FERC and contained in the Federal Power Act, as amended by the Electric Consumers Protection Act. Several participants felt that power generation and environmental enhancement should be balanced.
- The group discussed how to incorporate concerns about customer costs, system reliability, and economic feasibility.
- The group suggested adding language that captures the goal of reaching consensus about the licensing process.
- Add language regarding the structure and function of the CCRT and RATs.
- The revised mission statement is located in the revised operating procedures, Attachment F.
- The Ecological group discussed the RAT mission statement. See the revised language in Attachment F.

## Logistics of Meetings

The facilitator discussed with the group various meeting locations, time of meetings, and preferred meeting days. We also discussed preferences for using email and teleconferencing. A consensus was reached that the Ecological and Recreational RAT meetings would not be held concurrently to provide an opportunity for individuals serving on both RATs to participate at both meetings.

### Fall and future meetings

- Location
  - A general consensus was reached that future meetings should be held at a central location, generally in Birmingham but preferably on the outskirts of Birmingham. Specific meetings would occasionally be held on site or in various locations throughout the basin
  - Other suggested locations included the Clanton Water Course and the Shelby County Office
  - Suggested meeting times
    - Meeting time of noon-6
    - 9 AM to 1 PM seasonal.
    - Meeting should be 3 to 4 hours
- Timing of Meetings
  - When (frequency) – It was suggested that quarterly or six meetings a year would likely be the frequency of meetings for the RATs.
  - Other meetings related to participating on the Issue Action Groups may occur independent of the RAT meetings.
  - Timing – longer meetings

## **Ground Rules**

Meeting participants discussed the ground rules and added a ground rule regarding having adequate breaks during the meetings and another regarding the use of cell phones during meetings. It was agreed that everyone would turn off their phones unless they were required by their employer to have the cell phone on.

The meeting concluded at 3:15 p.m. The next meeting will be held on May 2, 2001 at Southern Nuclear Inverness Center, located in Birmingham, AL.

## MEETING SUMMARY

**Project:** Coosa –Warrior Relicensing Team Meetings  
**Group Name:** Coosa EcoRAT and RecRAT  
**Site:** Coosa River Projects  
**Location:** APC Southern Nuclear Inverness Center, Birmingham  
**Date:** 5/02/01 **Time:** 8:30 AM to 4:00PM

### Attendees

**Name:** **Organization:**

Akridge, Mike	Alabama Power Company
Allinder, Pres	Alabama Department of Public Health
Austin, Duncan	Lake Mitchell Home Owners and Boat Owners Association
Bennett, Amy	Kleinschmidt Associates
Braswell, Nancy	Alabama Power Company
Campbell, Bill	EPRO Consulting
Carden, Lonnie	Coosa River Paddling Club
Catchings, Dan	Alabama Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries
Cook, Stan	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Crew, Jim	Alabama Power Company
Dewberry, Shannon	Alabama Power Company
DiGennaro, Bruce	Kleinschmidt Associates
Duncan, Jeff	National Park Service
Dykes, William C.	Alabama Power Company
Eubanks, Mike	United States Army Corp of Engineers
Fargo, Kelly	Kleinschmidt Associates
Gidiere, Stephen	Balch & Bingham LLP
Greer, Don	Logan Martin Lake Association
Haynes, David	Wetumpka City Council
Hornsby, Jon	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Howard, Jim	Alabama B.A.S.S. Federation
Huffaker, Bob	Alabama Marine Police
Jackins, George	Lake Mitchell Home Owners and Boat Owners Association
Jackson, Jim	Lay Lake Home Owners and Boat Owners Association
Leppert, Patti	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Littlepage, Tom	Alabama Office of Water Resources
Lochamy, Jim	Alabama Power Company
Lovett, Barry	Alabama Power Company
Marshall, Preston	Coosa River Paddling Club
McKitrick, Ron	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

McLane, Brad	Alabama Rivers Alliance
Mealing, Henry	Kleinschmidt Associates
Moak, Jason	Kleinschmidt Associates
Murchison, Dan	Lake Mitchell Home Owners and Boat Owners Association
Pender, Joe	Logan Martin Lake Association
Piccolo, Sam	Lake Mitchell Home Owners and Boat Owners Association
Pierson, Malcolm	Alabama Power Company
Sailors, Jerry	Coosa-Alabama River Improvement Association
Sherburn, Tom	Southern Outdoor Center
Sim, Bill	Alabama Power Company
Sligh, Dave	American Rivers
Smith, Sheila	Alabama Power Company
Strickland, Jon	Alabama Department of Economic and Community Affairs
Thaxton, Bert	Lay Lake Home Owners and Boat Owners Association
Thompson, Dan	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Tignor, Danny G.	Alabama Power Company
Wentzel, Beth	Alabama Rivers Alliance
Woods, Diana	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Young, Joe	Lake Jordan Home Owners and Boat Owners Association

**Meeting Summary**

**Draft for Review** \_\_\_\_\_

**Final for Record** **X**

# Meeting Summary

## Introduction

These notes reflect the highlights of the second meeting of the Coosa Ecological and Recreation RATs. Attachments referred to in this summary in parentheses were documents that were distributed in the May mailing. During this meeting, the primary focus was to reach consensus on the issue statements and to discuss the available information for each issue category (*e.g.*, CE12 - Wetlands). Presentations were provided by FERC and APC to educate Team Members on the FERC relicensing process and Coosa River operations.

During this time, some RAT Members expressed dissatisfaction with the amount of time between receiving and reviewing the May meeting packages prior to the actual meeting. Jim Crew of APC noted that the short time frame between the completion of the April meeting and the scheduled May meeting (approximately 3.5 weeks) and the extent of the revisions to multiple documents contributed to the time frame for distributing and reviewing the revised documents. After some discussion, APC stated that they would make every attempt to get the documents to RAT Members at least two weeks prior to the meetings.

The April Meeting Summary was reviewed and finalized during the meeting with no comments on the summary.

## Recreation RAT Meeting

### Review of Issue Statements and Sheets

The recreation issue statements were reviewed during this portion of the meeting. In general, the RAT Members agreed upon the issue statements. Several specific issues and revisions were discussed and will be added to the issue sheets. These revisions will be reflected in the June meeting package and will be reviewed during the June meeting. Also, several specific issues were raised and will be added to the issue sheets.

### Existing Information

This portion of the meeting involved a review of the compiled list of existing information (Attachment E) and a discussion of other available information. Team Members were asked if they were aware of other information that could be used for each of the issue sheets. In some cases, RAT Members volunteered to obtain the literature cites and documents. A literature citation for all additional information sources or documents discussed during this meeting will be added to the existing information list for each issue sheet.

### Presentation on Recreation Inventory

Bill Campbell and Heather Bunce (EPRO) presented the draft GIS recreation inventory database, a brief overview of the contents of the database, the various uses of the database, and the future uses of the database during the relicensing process. A request was made to explain the ultimate purpose of the database, the methods used to gather field data, and the progress made in building the database. EPRO will prepare a document explaining each of these areas. This

document will be provided in the June meeting package. In general, RAT Members agreed that this GIS database would be a useful tool throughout the relicensing process.

## **Joint Recreation/Ecological RAT**

This joint meeting included:

- FERC process and FERC Website presentation by Ron McKittrick of FERC;
- Coosa River Hydro Operations presentation by Andy Sheppard of APC;
- Relicensing web site update by Shannon Dewberry of APC; and
- Review of the mission statement, ground rules and April meeting summary.

Ron's presentations provided background information on the FERC relicensing process and FERC website. Andy's presentation provided background information on the general operations of the Coosa River System. After these presentations, the RAT Members agreed that it would be beneficial to have other agencies and team members present information and mandates to the RATs during the lunch session. Shannon reported that the APC relicensing website would be available in June. It will include many documents, including all of the meeting summaries and RAT information.

There were no comments on the ground rules or the April Meeting Summary. Therefore, the Meeting Summary and ground rules are considered final. The mission statement was changed slightly to include an "e.g." within the parenthesis. This change will be noted in the revisions sent out for the June Meeting.

During this portion of the meeting, Dave Sligh recommended that the operating procedures be further discussed and elaborated on in the document and include a dispute resolution process. David offered to work with Kleinschmidt to put forth some language for the Team's consideration. Note that procedural items, such as the operating procedures are the responsibility of the CCRT and will be discussed and revised during the CCRT Meetings. If members of the RAT Teams would like to provide input to procedural items, they should try to attend the CCRT Meetings or provide written comments to CCRT Member.

## **Ecological RAT Meeting**

### **Review of the Issue Statements and Sheets**

The issue statements were reviewed during this portion of the meeting. In general, the content of the issue statements was agreed upon, but it was agreed that the structure of the statements should be changed from questions to statements. Carl Couret, USFWS, will work with Kleinschmidt and APC to revise the issue statements. Some RAT members recommended that an issue statement be added for "Energy Conservation". David Sligh and Jeff Duncan agreed to prepare an issue sheet for the Energy Conservation issue. These revisions will be reflected in the next meeting package and will be reviewed and discussed during the June meeting.

Also, there was a brief discussion of the scope of the issues. It was noted that although APC is not responsible for all of the issues on the Coosa it would still be beneficial to identify additional information during this relicensing. Local watershed organizations and other groups could use the information obtained from desktop and field studies. During the course of the

RAT Meetings and IAG groups, it will be necessary to identify and clearly delineate what is within APC's scope.

In addition the NEPA Scoping Meeting scheduled by FERC this fall was discussed. The FERC Scoping Meeting was described to the group. It was decided that the RAT Teams will form an IAG to provide input into the Scoping Meeting to make it as productive as possible. Volunteers for this IAG included David Sligh (American Rivers), Ron McKittrick (FERC), Diana Woods (EPA), Tom Littlepage, Mike Eubanks, and Jeff Duncan (USFS).

### **Existing Information**

This portion of the meeting involved a review of the compiled list of existing information (Attachment E) and a discussion of other available information. RAT Members were asked if they were aware of other information that could be used for each of the issue sheets. In some cases, RAT Members volunteered to obtain the literature cites and documents. A literature citation for all documents discussed during this meeting will be added to the existing information list for each issue sheet.

## MEETING SUMMARY

**Project:** Coosa –Warrior Relicensing Team Meetings

**Group Name:** Coosa Cooperative Relicensing Team (CCRT)

**Meeting Location:** APC Headquarters, Birmingham

**Date:** 6/20/01                      **Time:** 8:30 AM to 1:00PM

### Attendees

#### CCRT Members

Allen, Bob	United States Army Corp of Engineers
Carden, Lonnie	Southern Trails, Coosa River Paddling Club, American Whitewater
Guyse, Keith	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Haynes, David	Wetumpka City Council
Howard, Jim	Alabama B.A.S.S. Federation
Martens, Larry	Logan Martin Lake Association
Murchison, Dan	Lake Mitchell Home Owners and Boat Owners Association
Piccolo, Sam	Lake Mitchell Home Owners and Boat Owners Association
Redmond, Jason	Alabama Power Company
Sailors, Jerry	Coosa-Alabama River Improvement Association
Thaxton, Bert	Lay Lake Home Owners and Boat Owners Association
Toth, Helen	Alabama Water Watch
Toth, Michael	Alabama Water Watch, Coosa River Basin Initiative
Whatley, Dick	Logan Martin Lake Association

#### WCRT and CCRT Members (These stakeholders serve on both Teams)

Akridge, Mike	Alabama Power Company
Allums, Rick	Alabama Power Company
Campbell, Bill	EPRO Consulting
Couret, Carl	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
Crew, Jim	Alabama Power Company
Dewberry, Shannon R.	Alabama Power Company
DiGennaro, Bruce	Kleinschmidt Associates
Duncan, Jeff	National Park Service
Huffaker, Bob	Alabama Marine Police
Hutzel, Janet	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Kartalia, Steve	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Littlepage, Tom	Alabama Office of Water Resources
Lochamy, Jim	Alabama Power Company
Lovett, Barry	Alabama Power Company
McKitrick, Ron	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Mealing, Henry	Kleinschmidt Associates
Moore, Jim	Alabama Department of Environmental Management
Pierson, Malcolm	Alabama Power Company
Schaeffer, Kelly	Kleinschmidt Associates
Sheppard, Andrew R.	Alabama Power Company
Sim, Bill	Alabama Power Company
Sligh, Dave	American Rivers
Smith, Sheila	Alabama Power Company
Strickland, Jon	Alabama Department of Economic and Community Affairs
Terhaar, Monte	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Wentzel, Beth	Alabama Rivers Alliance
Woods, Diana	United States Environmental Protection Agency

### **WCRT Members**

Albright, Ray	United States Forest Service
Beason, Jim	Smith Lake Civic Association
Berry, Deb	Smith Lake Environmental Preservation Committee
Cline, Ray	Federation of Fly Fishers
Counts, Tom	United States Forest Service
Denson, Elrand	United States Forest Service
Eisenbarth, John	Trout Unlimited - Riverside Chapter
Eubanks, Mike	United States Army Corp of Engineers
Floyd, Keith	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Harley, Darryl	United States Forest Service
Hillhouse, Jim	Trout Unlimited
Hornsby, Jon	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Moss, Jerry	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Nicholson, Joe	United States Forest Service
Pulliam, Karen	United States Forest Service
White, Stephanie K.	Alabama Power Company

### **Other Attendees**

Bennett, Amy	Kleinschmidt Associates
Bowden, Matt	Balch & Bingham LLP
Bunce, Heather	EPRO Consulting
Garrett, Bill	Alabama Power Company
Glenn, Trey	Alabama Office of Water Resources
Hancock, James	Balch & Bingham LLP
Johnston, Dow	Alabama Office of Water Resources
Langsford, Scott	Alabama Power Company
Moak, Jason	Kleinschmidt Associates
Murphy, Michael	EPRO Consulting

**Meeting Summary**

**Draft for Review** \_\_\_\_\_

**Final for Record**  X

# Meeting Summary

## Introduction

These notes summarize the joint meeting of the Coosa Cooperative Relicensing Team (CCRT) and the Warrior Cooperative Relicensing Team (WCRT) (this was also the first official meeting of the CCRT). This meeting was divided into a morning joint session of the CCRT and the WCRT and an afternoon session for just the WCRT. The primary focus of the morning session was to review and reach consensus on the operating procedures and the communication plan, and to discuss the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. The afternoon session was focused on review of the structure and function of the Issue Action Groups (IAGs) and discussion of the geographic scope for five specific issues (three ecological and two recreation). Alabama Department of Environmental Management (ADEM) and Alabama Power Company (APC) provided lunchtime presentations to educate team members on ADEM's Clean Water Partnership, APC's Relicensing Website, and the status of water quality data and on-going APC field collections for summer 2001.

The June 20, 2001 meeting summary is in draft form for 14 days upon distribution, during which time CCRT and WCRT members are encouraged to provide comments. This meeting summary will be discussed and finalized at the September meeting.

## Joint CCRT/WCRT Meeting

A joint CCRT/WCRT meeting was held during the morning to review the operating procedures and communications plan and to discuss the NEPA scoping process, including the scoping documents and meeting arrangements. The meeting agenda was reviewed and the facilitator acknowledged new participants and asked if any observers were present. No observers were present for this meeting.

The facilitator distributed and discussed the June 11, 2001 letter from David Haynes (City of Wetumpka) to Mr. Mike Akridge (APC). David's concerns centered on receipt of the materials in a timely fashion and getting the materials sent to his correct address. Further, David noted that the mailings to stakeholders were not being distributed according to the Operating Procedures (OPs). The facilitator distributed David's letter to all WCRT and CCRT members at the meeting and then summarized the contents. The facilitator acknowledged that it might be unrealistic for APC to consolidate and prepare meeting summaries and get those distributed within two weeks of the meeting date. WCRT and CCRT members were asked for input on the process and asked to identify if other team members were not receiving their meeting information in a timely manner. No team members responded to the question, therefore it appeared that the difficulty with this mailing was an isolated incident. APC reiterated their intent of to keep the process open to all interested persons and their willingness to share information. APC requested stakeholders to call or email APC staff, specifically Jim Crew or Barry Lovett if any further problems occur. The facilitator stressed the importance of good communication throughout this lengthy process and the need to begin and continue communications at the phone, email, or face to face level.

Deb Berry (Smith Lake Environmental Preservation Committee) also expressed concern regarding the change in meeting dates for the WCRT. Deb commented that attendees at the May meeting who were not on the mailing list might show up on the wrong meeting date. This point was noted, and when possible subsequent meeting dates and locations will be determined at prior meetings – meeting dates will also be posted on the APC web site calendar. Due to input from stakeholders and logistical considerations (such as availability of meeting space), some future meeting dates may change. In cases such as this, all efforts will be made to contact all team members through meeting packages, email, telephone calls, and the website.

### ***Review of the Operating Procedures (OP)***

The next order of business was to discuss the revisions to the OPs and to reach consensus on the final procedures to be filed with FERC. The facilitator explained in detail how the OPs were modified, including general style and wording revisions, additions of the “parking lot” and “new stakeholder participation” text, the communication plan, and further clarification on dispute resolution and decision making processes. The facilitator pointed out that Dave Sligh (American Rivers) had sent recommended language to include in the OPs, most of which was incorporated into the revised OPs. In many cases, the wording of David’s suggestions were incorporated and where necessary the text was altered to fit the OPs. Dave’s remaining suggestions to the OPs that were not incorporated were noted and may be discussed in future meetings. Dave agreed with this approach and felt that the intent of his suggestions was successfully captured in the revised OPs.

General comments included several typos and inconsistencies in the OPs between the CCRT and WCRT mailing packages. These corrections will be made before submittal to FERC. The major changes to the OP were reviewed on an individual basis with the following results:

- ***Items Covered in the Operating Procedures – Page 1:*** Two additional major items were added to the Operating Procedures and were listed under this heading. The Team had no comments to these additions.
- ***Facilitation*** - Section 2.7 in the CCRT Procedures and Section 2.5 in the WCRT--At this time there was a brief discussion on the different numbering format of the WCRT and CCRT OPs. It was explained that the structure and content of the two documents is slightly different because of different team structures for the Coosa and Warrior River relicensing teams. Therefore, the content of the two documents will generally mirror each other, but the numbering will be slightly different.

Dave Sligh commented on the facilitation text and reiterated his reasoning behind the need for neutral facilitators and/or technical facilitators. Dave believes that although the facilitators are currently doing a good job, there may be a need in the future to retain “neutral facilitators” (in the event the Kleinschmidt facilitators take on an advocacy role for particular issues for APC). In order to address team members concerns, text will be added to include that anyone can raise this issue if it is felt that the facilitators are not being neutral or are not accomplishing their responsibilities (as outlined in the OPs). All issues with the facilitators should be discussed with either Jim Crew or Barry Lovett (APC). After the discussion, consensus was reached on this section.

- ***Agency Mandates and Responsibilities*** – Section 3.0 in both the Coosa and Warrior OPs– This section will be revised to exclude the reference to the list of laws and mandates per organization in the OPs. As an alternative, agencies and groups will present this information at designated meetings and a list will be available for distribution as a meeting handout.
- ***Communication*** – Section 2.8 in the CCRT and Section 2.6 in the WCRT OPs: Sam Piccolo suggested that in order to clarify representation, each organization should provide a list of their primary spokesperson and alternate(s). It is important for team members to be aware of each organization’s official spokesperson. In order to accommodate this request, a roster will be redistributed for the September meeting, including the designated alternate, where applicable.
- ***Meeting Locations and Schedule*** - Section 4.1 in both the CCRT and WCRT Ops: At this time, the dates of future meetings and the use of telephone conferencing was discussed. It was suggested and agreed that WCRT, CCRT, and Coosa RAT meetings would be scheduled three months in advance. During the September meetings, team members will work with the 2002 calendar to determine 2002 meeting schedules and locations. Scheduling IAG meetings will be handled differently. Due to the structure and function of the IAGs, meetings can not be scheduled three months in advance. The IAGs are generally comprised of only 5 to 7 members and are task-driven; therefore the logistics of meeting dates will be less difficult to work through. The additional text regarding the use of telephone conferencing was discussed. Consensus was reached on this section with no text changes.
- ***General Administrative Rules*** – Section 4.3 in both the CCRT and WCRT OPs: The “parking lot” and procedures for new team members were discussed at this time. There were no comments to these sections.
- ***Procedures for Making Recommendations*** – Section 6.0 in both the CCRT and WCRT OPs: The facilitator identified a typo in the last sentence of the last paragraph that will be changed to read “will NOT negate”. The facilitator also identified the additional language in this section, including a definition of consensus, which the Team pointed out had been left off the CCRT OPs. The facilitator noted that this was an oversight and that the consensus definition language would be included in the CCRT OPs, as it appears in the WCRT OPs. After some discussion on the definition of consensus, the Team reached consensus on this definition.

Dave Sligh discussed the wording of several bullets and emphasized that silence is not consensus. There was some discussion on this point since the facilitator noted that if the group was silent, it would reflect consensus. However, the facilitator emphasized that his/her role was to remind the group of the decision to be made, ask if there are questions or comments, and then ask if there is consensus. Finally, the facilitator should always clarify the decisions and any decisions should be reflected in the meeting summaries.

Regarding decision making, the facilitator recommended that the Team attempt to reach consensus, as has been defined, rather than “voting” (one vote or say per organization) due to its tendency to polarize individuals or groups and promote

the feeling of “winning or losing”. Jon Strickland (ADECA) stated that caucusing would be an important tool for decision making and reaching consensus. This is noted and is appropriate at anytime during this relicensing process. Also, it was suggested that recommendations be placed in a different section in the meeting summary so all team members can easily review what was decided on at the meeting.

Consensus was reached on the OPs. Once the revisions are complete, APC will file the OPs with FERC. The final OPs will be distributed to the team members with the meeting summary (see Attachment B) and will be posted on the APC relicensing website.

### ***Review Communications Protocol***

The Communications Plan was then summarized. The plan was filed with FERC in September 2000 as part of APC’s request to use alternative procedures for this relicensing. The Communications Plan will be incorporated into the OPs and filed with FERC. Ron McKittrick of FERC discussed the docket and subdocket numbers for APC’s relicensing process in order to simplify information searches using FERC’s Record Information Management System (RIMS) and Commission Issuance Posting System (CIPS). Ron will provide these numbers to the facilitator and they will be distributed (with instructions) to all team members. Ron also stated that he would like to give another presentation on the FERC website during the September meetings to show members how to use RIMS and CIPS.

### ***Discuss NEPA Scoping Documents and Meeting***

The facilitator provided a brief explanation of the NEPA (National Environmental Protection Act) scoping process, including the history, definition of “human environment”, the process of public disclosure, and NEPA and FERC regulations. It was explained that the NEPA process for relicensing is FERC’s responsibility and all scoping documents and meetings will be prepared and conducted by FERC with APC team member input. The facilitator led the group through a discussion and prompted suggestions on how to best assist in the preparation of the NEPA documents and how to most efficiently conduct the Scoping Meeting(s). Considerations included developing a meeting time, location and format that would best serve the purpose of NEPA while remaining cognizant of team members’ time and resources.

Mike Eubanks (ACOE) suggested that a scoping brochure be prepared for a broad mailing and posting on the website. The scoping brochure may include questionnaires and team members should look at ACOE’s scoping brochure for the water allocation process as an example.

Elrand Denson (USFS) suggested that the APC relicensing team could use the Forest Service’s mailing list. He also proposed that the Forest Service and FERC coordinate together to satisfy both agencies’ NEPA requirements.

The facilitator briefly described three considerations for the NEPA scoping meetings: paper scoping, physical meetings, and the timing of site visits/public tours. Discussion followed. Dave Sligh and a few other team members were concerned about just using paper scoping because they felt strongly that the public should have a physical forum to discuss their issues. After additional discussion, team members reached consensus that there should be a NEPA scoping meeting and that APC and FERC should combine the scoping meeting with a team meeting to provide the most value to team members. It was suggested that the Scoping

meetings be held on the evening(s) following the team meetings. Ron McKitrick raised the issue of the logistics of the meetings and the level of effort dedicated to the meetings. The Team reached consensus on having two meetings, one for the Coosa and one for the Warrior. Regarding the scoping documents, Deb Berry suggested that the issue sheets be used for the basis of the documents. Team members noted that they'd already gone through the initial stages of scoping and that much of the work should not be repeated in order to continue making progress. The scoping documents will include a summary of the progress of the teams to date, schedule, issue sheets, and other details.

It was noted that the public process (meeting) would be beneficial to potentially increase representation and education of municipalities. The scoping meeting could be used to educate municipality representatives as well as the general public who've not been participating to date.

Site visits were the next component of the NEPA process to be discussed. The facilitator suggested that the group consider alternatives to the traditional method of visiting each hydro development during the NEPA scoping process, simply due to time and location logistics. Options discussed included meeting at each of the hydro developments over the course of the relicensing process, in conjunction with IAG meetings or other team meetings. Diana Woods (EPA) agreed that site visits should not be held in conjunction with the Scoping meetings. She felt that the site visits should be conducted as the issues are refined. Deb Berry suggested that WCRT meetings be held on site (Smith Lake). Elrand Denson offered to host a WCRT meeting at one of the Forest Service's sites on Smith Lake.

An IAG was formed to assist FERC and APC with the NEPA scoping. Volunteers included: Barry Lovett (APC), Jim Crew (APC), Elrand Denson (USFS), Dave Sligh (American Rivers), Ron McKitrick (FERC), Mike Eubanks (ACOE), Kelly Schaeffer (Kleinschmidt). This group will meet by telephone conference call and email to further discuss NEPA scoping.

#### ***Action Items from the Joint CCRT/WCRT Meeting***

- Revise the OPs and file, along with Communications Plan, to FERC—post on the APC website and distribute these documents in the September mailing package
- Draft the NEPA Scoping Documents for the September Meeting—get team members review and comments at the September meetings
- Identify dates and locations of meetings for the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter of 2002 (minimum), potentially including site visits
- Get a copy of the ACOE water allocation NEPA scoping brochure from ACOE's website or Mike Eubanks (ACOE)
- Schedule and conduct NEPA IAG meeting(s)

#### **Lunchtime presentations**

Jim Moore (ADEM), Shannon Dewberry (APC), Jim Lochamy (APC) and Bill Garrett (APC) presented lunchtime presentations to the WCRT and CCRT. Jim Moore presented information on ADEM's Clean Water Partnership. Shannon reported that the website is now online and provided instructions on how to use the site. Jim Lochamy and Bill Garrett discussed water quality collection efforts and APC's on-going environmental studies. Jon Strickland's presentation on the SCORP was postponed and will be included in a later meeting.

**Handouts distributed during the meeting**

- David Haynes' Letter

Please contact Barry Lovett or Jim Crew (APC) for additional copies of this document.

## MEETING SUMMARY

**Project:** Coosa Resource Advisory Team (RAT) Meetings  
**Group Name:** Coosa Eco RAT and Coosa Rec RAT  
**Location:** APC Headquarters, Birmingham  
**Date:** 6/21/01 **Time:** 8:30 AM to 4:00PM

### Attendees

Akridge, Mike	Alabama Power Company
Allison, Gene.	Alabama Power Company
Austin, James D.	Lake Mitchell Home Owners and Boat Owners Association
Bennett, Amy	Kleinschmidt Associates
Beumer, Johan	Trail of Legends Association Inc.
Blackburn, Jack	Neely Henry Lake Association
Bowden, Matt	Balch & Bingham LLP
Bunce, Heather	EPRO Consulting
Campbell, Bill	EPRO Consulting
Carden, Lonnie	American Whitewater, Coosa River Paddling Club, Southern Trails
Catchings, Dan	Alabama Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries
Claybrook, Rick	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Coggins, Bill	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Cook, Stan	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Couret, Carl	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
Craft, Larry	Alabama Power Company
Crew, Jim	Alabama Power Company
Dentici, Joe	Neely Henry Lake Association
DiGennaro, Bruce	Kleinschmidt Associates
Duncan, Jeff	National Park Service
Eubanks, Mike	United States Army Corp of Engineers
Garrett, Bill	Alabama Power Company
Greer, Don	Logan Martin Lake Association
Hancock, James	Balch & Bingham LLP
Haynes, David	Wetumpka City Council
Hornsby, Jon	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Howard, Jim	Alabama B.A.S.S. Federation
Huffaker, Bob	Alabama Marine Police
Hutzel, Janet	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Jackins, George	Lake Mitchell Home Owners and Boat Owners Association
Johnston, Dow	Alabama Office of Water Resources
Lankford, Scott	Alabama Power Company
Littlepage, Tom	Alabama Office of Water Resources
Lovett, Barry	Alabama Power Company
Kartalia, Steve	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Marshall, Preston	Coosa River Paddling Club

McClanahan, Sue	Neely Henry Lake Association
McClellan, Diane	East Alabama Regional Planning and Development Commission
McHugh, Jim	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
McKittrick, Ron	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Mealing, Henry	Kleinschmidt Associates
Moak, Jason	Kleinschmidt Associates
Moore, David	Weiss Lake Improvement Association
Pender, Joe	Logan Martin Lake Association
Phillips, Mike	Georgia Power Company
Pierson, Malcolm	Alabama Power Company
Redmond, Jason	Alabama Power Company
Sailors, Jerry	Coosa-Alabama River Improvement Association
Schaeffer, Kelly	Kleinschmidt Associates
Sheppard, Andrew R.	Alabama Power Company
Sherburne, Tom	Southern Outdoor Center
Smith, Sheila	Alabama Power Company
Strickland, Jon	Alabama Department of Economic and Community Affairs
TerHaar, Monte	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Thaxton, Bert	Lay Lake Home Owners and Boat Owners Association
Thompson, Dan	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Tignor, Danny G.	Alabama Power Company
Trussell, Isabella	Logan Martin Lake Association
Wentzel, Beth	Alabama Rivers Alliance
Woods, Diana	United States Department of Environmental Protection
Young, Joe	Lake Jordan Home Owners and Boat Owners Association

**Meeting Summary**

**Draft for Review** \_\_\_\_\_

**Final for Record**  X

# Meeting Summary

## Introduction

These notes reflect the highlights of the third meeting of the Coosa Eco and Rec RATs. During this meeting, the primary focus was to review the structure and function of the Issue Action Groups (IAGs), discuss geographic scope and discuss the issue sheets for five specific issues (three ecological and two recreation). Presentations were provided by Alabama Power Company (APC) to educate RAT members on the APC's Relicensing Website and existing water quality monitoring and other on-going environmental studies.

The May Meeting Summary was reviewed and finalized during the meeting with minor revisions to the attendees list.

The summary for the June 21, 2001 meeting is in draft form for 14 days upon distribution, during which time Coosa RAT members are encouraged to provide comments. This meeting summary will be discussed and finalized at the September meeting.

## Ecological RAT meeting

The first portion of the EcoRAT meeting included a review of the structure and function of the IAGs and discussion of the geographic scope. As stated above, the meeting summary was finalized with only minor revisions to the attendee list. The structure and function of the IAGs was discussed with no comments to the text. However, one team member expressed concern about the flow of information from an IAG to the EcoRAT and suggested that each IAG have a lead that would be responsible for updating the EcoRAT. The suggestion will be implemented upon forming the IAGs.

### *Discuss Geographic Scope*

The facilitator distributed a memo on geographic scope, which was developed to educate team members on the typical definition and application of the concept of geographic scope. A discussion of geographic scope ensued. Some team members expressed confusion on this topic and questioned the purpose of the memo. The facilitator explained that the purpose of providing a memo on geographic scope was to educate a variety of stakeholders with little to no experience on NEPA and the relicensing process and to provide those stakeholders with a basic understanding of what geographic scope is, how it's applied, and how we will be discussing it in this relicensing process.

As part of the discussion, team members asked if there would be a process for determining geographic scope as well as other NEPA activities. Jeff Duncan (NPS) provided a schematic illustrating the process that the Team would go through to work on an issue.

### *Discuss Ecological Issues*

Three ecological issues were discussed during the breakout session: E6 threatened and endangered species, E12 wetlands and E7 exotic species control. Henry Mealing (Kleinschmidt) distributed handouts containing threatened and endangered species lists, exotic species laws, and an issue sequencing diagram. These handouts were used throughout this session.

## ***CE6 – Threatened and Endangered Species***

Malcolm Pierson briefly summarized APC's recent and ongoing field studies pertaining to threatened and endangered species. One team member noted that we should use the existing Alabama Coosa Tallapoosa Water Allocation Study (ACT) information for addressing this issue. Another team member proposed a draft approach and list of tasks for the T&E IAG as follows:

1. Form an IAG
2. Review lists and come to agreement on a master species list
3. Review and summarize existing species distribution information
4. Develop a list of species impacted by the project

After discussion on this issue, the Team decided to form an IAG with the following members:

- Jim Crew (APC)
- Carl Couret (USFWS)
- Jon Hornsby (ADCNR)
- Malcolm Pierson (APC)
- Jeff Duncan (NPS)
- Mike Eubanks (ACOE)
- Henry Mealing (Kleinschmidt)
- Kelly Schaeffer (Kleinschmidt - as needed for facilitation)

## ***CE7 – Exotic Species***

Scott Langsford (APC) presented APC's aquatic plant and mosquito management plans and answered several questions regarding the mosquito control programs. He also noted that there is no formal aquatic plant management plan, only a contingency plan.

To address the exotic species issue, one team member suggested that the issue sheet be revised to reflect the following concern: "Should aquaculture of exotic species be allowed in the reservoirs?" Also, sources for additional information on exotic species were identified and will be distributed for review.

### ***Action Items***

- APC will provide a written description of the Aquatic Plant Management and Mosquito Control
- Obtain exotic species/aquatic plant management guidelines from ADCNR
- Develop complete exotic species lists
- Add statement to the issue sheet

## ***CE12 – Wetlands***

Team members discussed the various data available for wetlands and geographic scope. Bill Sim made a brief presentation on the status and availability of currently available wetlands maps. The Team identified additional sources of existing wetlands information. It was noted

that the ACT/ACF study has a lot of information on wetlands in the Coosa Basin. Diana Woods (EPA) will determine the type and amount of “land use” information that EPA has in the Basins program and will make it available for the Team to use.

The Team decided to form an IAG to address wetland issues at the Coosa Project. The following volunteered to serve on this IAG:

- Jon Hornsby (ADCNR)
- Mike Eubanks (ACOE)
- Bill Sim (APC)
- Dan Murchison (Lake Mitchell HOB0)
- Isabella Trussell (Logan Martin Lake Association)

### **Lunchtime Presentations**

During this time, Jason Moak (Kleinschmidt) Jim Lochamy (APC) and Bill Garrett (APC) presented information to the Coosa RATs. Jason reported that the website is now online and provided instructions on how to use the site. Jim and Bill presented information on the water chemistry data that APC is currently collecting and will continue to collect during 2001. Jon Strickland’s presentation on the SCORP was postponed and will be included in a later meeting. Also, during this time the May Meeting Summary was reviewed and a brief summary of the WCRT/CCRT meeting was discussed

### **RecRAT Team Meeting**

The RecRAT meeting was conducted in the afternoon. The first portion of the meeting included a review of the structure and function of the IAGs and discussion of the geographic scope. The structure and function of the IAGs was discussed and reviewed with no comments on the text. After this discussion, several team members noted that they would find it beneficial to have an acronyms and glossary distributed at the next meeting. These documents were originally distributed in the Initial Information Packages (IIPs).

#### ***Discuss Geographic Scope***

The facilitator distributed a memo on geographic scope, which was developed to educate team members on the typical definition and application of the concept of geographic scope. As a result of the EcoRAT meeting earlier, the facilitator distributed and discussed a schematic illustration of the process that the Team may go through in developing a geographic scope for each issue.

#### ***Discuss Recreation Issues***

The Team discussed two recreation issues during this meeting: recreation facilities and public education. Handouts containing a numbered list of all specific recreation issues on the CR1 issue sheet and a table of public education and outreach and general questions were distributed to team members. Several team members questioned why CR1 and CR8 were being discussed first raised issue sequencing. The facilitator explained that issues are selected on several criteria, including, but not limited to, ease of resolution and the amount of time needed to resolve the issue. It was explained that CR8 was a relatively straightforward issue to tackle and

was a good training tool for the IAG groups. The CR1 issue will also provide necessary background information for other recreation issues and may take some time to resolve. Several team members suggested that for the next RecRAT meeting the issues be sequenced with an approximate time frame for addressing each. A draft of the recreation issue sequencing will be provided in materials sent prior to the September meeting. The following were points of discussion during the RecRAT meeting:

- At this time the Lay Lake stump/tree issue was raised. This issue was placed on the parking lot until FERC rules on the Lay Public Safety Plan.
- Land use was raised as an issue. The inventory of undeveloped land and conservation easements was discussed. Jeff Duncan (NPS) suggested that by knowing undeveloped lands outside of the project boundary, the Team can place the project lands in context relative to the watershed. Several team members would like to work the idea of conservation easements onto one of the issue sheets. This issue was placed on the parking lot.
- One team member suggested that an inventory of undeveloped project lands be conducted for identifying potential recreation or conservation areas. Low impact activities, such as hiking, were thought as potential uses for these lands. The ownership of lands was also discussed at this time. This issue was placed on the parking lot.
- The meeting then moved toward discussion of facilities on each of the Coosa reservoirs. Weiss was briefly discussed; however, the Team decided on a different approach for examining each reservoir. Several action items resulted from this discussion.
  - APC will provide a summary of public access areas around the lakes, including shoreline frontage, public vs. private access facilities, project boundary, private and public lands
  - Start developing the recreation plan
- HOB0 input to the recreation management plan was raised and the Team decided to define a procedure for HOB0s to provide interests (future) of the lakes. One team member suggested that this list could be turned into questions for the team members to address.
- APC will provide the Team with examples of recreation management plans that have been filed with FERC for the Team's review. In the plan, APC would identify areas where they have control and/or input.
- The geographic scope for each reservoir was discussed and then expanded to encompass the overall approach to this issue. It was suggested that this approach be outlined before the Team addresses the specifics. Some discussion at this time concerned the determination of the carrying capacity of the lakes (areas of congestion), regulations, identification of public vs. private areas, composition of use activities, and population predictions. To partially address these comments, Ron McKittrick reiterated that the recreation opportunities and use is revisited at intervals for FERC requirements and recreation plan requirements (every six years). One team member suggested that the overall approach could be to do an inventory, identify data gaps and then ask what questions need to be addressed. The approach will be worked through in a pilot project for Mitchell Lake.
- The pilot IAG for Mitchell Lake will be formed over the summer. This group will work together to layout the design/framework for which the Team can use to address other issues at all of the Coosa lakes. Members of this IAG include:

- Barry Lovett or other APC representative
- Jim Howard (Alabama B.A.S.S. Federation)
- Bill Campbell (EPRO)
- George Jackins (Lake Mitchell HOBO)
- Joe Pender (Logan Martin Lake Association)
- Joe Young (Jordan HOBO)
- Marine Police (Joe Young suggested Bill Huffaker; Dan Thompson is the point of contact for the ADCNR)
- Johan Beumer (Trail of Legends, Inc.)
- Bruce DiGennaro (Kleinschmidt – as needed for facilitator)

### ***CR8 – Public Education***

The public education issue sheet was discussed at this time. The facilitator distributed a table of items that were fit into education, public outreach, and question categories.

The facilitator suggested that the questions, if possible, be briefly answered and those answers handed out to the Team at the September meeting. Some of these questions will require input from team members. Shannon Dewberry (APC) was volunteered to organize this effort. Team members agreed with this approach.

It was then suggested that all public education and public outreach programs be identified and inventoried. Shannon will begin by performing an inventory on all APC programs. The RecRAT needs to identify other programs (state, county, private, etc.), to ultimately identify gaps in public education and outreach. Barry Lovett (APC) briefly presented three of APC's programs as examples to the Team ("Renew the Coosa"; Habitat Enhancement – Christmas Tree Program; and Energy Conservation). Barry noted that the success of APC programs is dependent on the participation of other clubs/organizations/volunteers. All team members are to provide contact names and/or program descriptions to Shannon.

#### ***Action Items***

- Prepare answers to questions raised at workshops
- Develop an inventory of existing education and public outreach programs (APC and other entities)
- Shannon will contact Tom Littlepage to obtain Pete Conroy's telephone number in order to get information from the Governor's Commission on Environmental Education.
- Work with the Coosa EcoRAT on this issue

#### **Handouts distributed during the Coosa RAT meetings:**

- Geographic Scope white paper
- APC Aquatic Plant and Mosquito Management Program
- Statewide list of threatened, endangered, and sensitive species
- Alabama's exotic species control laws
- Issue-sequencing diagram for environmental issues

- R1 recreation issue handout
- R8 recreation issue handout

Please contact Barry Lovett or Jim Crew (APC) for additional copies of these documents.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.