

## MEETING SUMMARY

**Project:** Warrior Cooperative Relicensing Team Meeting

**Group Name:** WCRT

**Site:** Warrior River Project

**Location:** APC Corporate Headquarters, Birmingham

**Date:** 4/04/01

**Time:** 8:30 AM to 4:00PM

### Attendees

**Name:**

**Organization:**

Akridge, Mike	Alabama Power Company
Albright, Ray	United States Forest Service
Allinder, Pres	Alabama Department of Public Health
Beason, Jim	Smith Lake Civic Association
Campbell, Bill	EPRO Consulting
Counts, Tom	United States Forest Service
Couret, Carl	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
Crew, Jim	Alabama Power Company
Denson, Elrand	United States Forest Service
Dewberry, Shannon	Alabama Power Company
DiGennaro, Bruce	Kleinschmidt Associates
Duncan, Jeff	National Park Service
Dykes, William	Alabama Power Company
Eisenbarth, John	Trout Unlimited - Riverside Chapter
Eubanks, Mike	United States Army Corp of Engineers
Fargo, Kelly	Kleinschmidt Associates
Gardner, Joel	United States Forest Service
Goddard, Art	United States Forest Service
Hamilton, Janice	Alabama Public Service Commission
Harley, Darryl	United States Forest Service
Lochamy, Jim	Alabama Power Company
Lovett, Barry	Alabama Power Company
McKittrick, Ron	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Mealing, Henry	Kleinschmidt Associates
Moore, Jim	Alabama Department of Environmental Management
Moss, Jerry	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Nicholson, Joe	United States Forest Service
Pasquill, Bob	United States Forest Service
Pierson, Malcolm	Alabama Power Company
Pulliam, Karen	United States Forest Service
Ramey, Walter	Alabama Power Company
Rhinehart, Greg	Alabama Historical Commission
Sheppard, Andy.	Alabama Power Company
Sligh, Dave	American Rivers
Smith, Sheila	Alabama Power Company

Strickland, Jon	Alabama Department of Economic and Community Affairs
Wentzel, Beth	Alabama Rivers Alliance
White, Stephanie	Alabama Power Company

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

# Meeting Summary

## General Layout of Meeting Summary

This is the first meeting summary of the Warrior Cooperative Relicensing Team (WCRT), held April 4, 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 4<sup>th</sup>, this summary is not structured to be a transcript, but is prepared as an overall summary of ideas, comments, questions, actions, and statements. The 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 summary provided for this meeting 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 Appendices C, D and F.

Stakeholders will have 14 days following distribution of the draft meeting summary for review and comment. 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 4<sup>th</sup> WCRT 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 Team, 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 4, 2001 meeting.

## Breakout Sessions to Review Issue Statements

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 issue statements and sheets are included as Attachments C-D. All revisions to the issue statements are

done in MS Word track changes for ease of review. The following summarizes discussions during the breakout sessions.

## **Warrior Recreation Breakout**

There were seven issue statements discussed in the recreation breakout session. Questions were answered regarding the issue statements and general recreation issues/resources. The general discussion associated from the breakout session is reflected in the track change versions in Attachments C and D.

## **Warrior Ecological Breakout**

The participants in this breakout group discussed 13 issue statements. Questions were answered regarding the issue statements and general ecological issues/resources. The general discussion associated with each is reflected in the track change versions in Attachments C and D.

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

- The Team expressed the need for definition of project area, project and project impact area. These terms will be added to a glossary/definition sheet. In general, the geographic scope will be defined in later meetings for each issue, since some issues may have different geographic scopes.
- The Team suggested that economics should not be used to eliminate potential alternatives at the outset of discussions. A clear definition of what economics is relative to the relicensing process and when an “economic” test should be applied should be developed. Economics should be included in the description of the issue, and an evaluation of feasibility of various alternatives and recommendations will actually happen during the analysis of the alternatives. Stakeholders asked “at what point do we make decisions on economics”?
- Add an education issue statement under ecological and recreational issues.
- Make clear who is responsible for what.
- One stakeholder suggested that there be an energy conservation issue statement. This concept is captured in the Issue Statement entitled “Project Releases”.

## **Warrior Operating Procedures**

Operating procedures for the WCRT were discussed in a large group and is described below.

## **Relicensing Mission Statement**

- The revised mission statement from the Coosa relicensing team members was presented to the WCRT. There was some minor editing and the group agreed that it was a good statement. The revised mission statement is located in the revised operating procedures, 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. After some discussion on potential locations, the general consensus was to have the meetings at a central location (*i.e.*, Birmingham) with occasional meetings held at the project.

## **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 3, 2001 at the Southern Nuclear Inverness Center, located in Birmingham, AL.

## MEETING SUMMARY

**Project:** Coosa –Warrior Relicensing Team Meetings  
**Group Name:** WCRT  
**Site:** Warrior River Projects  
**Location:** APC Southern Nuclear Inverness Center, Birmingham  
**Date:** 5/03/01 **Time:** 8:30 AM to 4:00PM

### Attendees

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

Akridge, Mike	Alabama Power Company
Albright, Ray	United States Forest Service
Allinder, Pres	Alabama Department of Public Health
Allums, Rick	Alabama Power Company
Beason, Jim	Smith Lake Civic Association
Bennett, Amy	Kleinschmidt Associates
Berry, Deb	Smith Lake Environmental Preservation Committee
Braswell, Nancy	Alabama Power Company
Campbell, Bill	EPRO Consulting
Cook, Stan	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Counts, Tom	United States Forest Service
Couret, Carl	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
Crew, Jim	Alabama Power Company
Denson, Elrand	United States Forest Service
Dewberry, Shannon	Alabama Power Company
DiGennaro, Bruce	Kleinschmidt Associates
Duncan, Jeff	National Park Service
Eubanks, Mike	United States Army Corps of Engineers
Fargo, Kelly	Kleinschmidt Associates
Floyd, Keith	Alabama Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries
Gidiere, Stephen	Balch and Bingham, LLP
Groce, Tom	United States Army Corps of Engineers
Harley, Darryl	United States Forest Service
Hornsby, Jon	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Huffaker, Bob	Alabama Marine Police
Littlepage, Tom	Alabama Office of Water Resources
Lochamy, Jim	Alabama Power Company
Lovett, Barry	Alabama Power Company
McKittrick, Ron	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Mealing, Henry	Kleinschmidt Associates
Moak, Jason	Kleinschmidt Associates
Moore, Jim	Alabama Department of Environmental Management
Moss, Jerry	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources

Pierson, Malcolm	Alabama Power Company
Pulliam, Karen	United States Forest Service
Sim, Bill	Alabama Power Company
Sligh, Dave	American Rivers
Smith, Sheila	Alabama Power Company
Wentzel, Beth	Alabama Rivers Alliance
Woods, Diana	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

**Meeting Summary**

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

**Final for Record** **X** \_\_\_\_\_

# Meeting Summary

## Introduction

These notes reflect the highlights of the second meeting of the WCRT. 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.*, WE12 - Wetlands). Presentations were provided by FERC and APC to educate WCRT Members on the FERC relicensing process and Warrior River operations.

During this time, some WCRT 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 WCRT 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.

## FERC Presentation and Review of Operating Procedures

Ron McKittrick's presentations provided background information about the FERC relicensing process and FERC website. After these presentations, the WCRT Members agreed that it would be beneficial to have other agencies and team members present information and mandates to the WCRT during the lunch session.

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, including a dispute resolution process. Dave offered to work with Kleinschmidt to develop language for the Team's consideration.

## Lunchtime Presentations

During this time, Andy Sheppard and Shannon Dewberry presented information to the WCRT. Andy's presentation provided background information regarding the general operations of the Warrior River System. Shannon reported that the APC relicensing website would be available in June. It will include many documents, including all meeting summaries and WCRT information.

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

The recreation issue statements were reviewed during this portion of the meeting. In general, the WCRT 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 Recreation 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, WCRT 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, including 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

## **Review of Ecological Issue Statements**

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 WCRT 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 utilize the information obtained from desktop and field studies. During the course of the WCRT Meetings and IAG groups, it will be necessary to identify and clearly delineate what is in APC's scope.

## **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. WCRT Members were asked if they were aware of other information that could be used for each of the issue sheets. In some cases, WCRT Members volunteered to obtain the literature cites and documents. A literature

citation for all information sources or 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:** WCRT Meeting

**Location:** APC Headquarters, Birmingham

**Date:** 6/20/01 **Time:** 8:30 AM to 4:00PM

### Attendees

#### 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

#### 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

### **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

### **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
Lankford, 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 third meeting of the Warrior Cooperative Relicensing Team (WCRT). This meeting was divided into a morning joint session of the WCRT and Coosa Cooperative Relicensing Team (CCRT) 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 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 May Meeting Summary for the WCRT was reviewed and finalized during the meeting with minor changes pertaining to the attendees list. Those changes are reflected in Attachment B.

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 WCRT/CCRT Meeting

A joint WCRT/CCRT 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 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 may likely 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 were 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 C) and will be posted on the APC relicensing website.

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

The Communications Plan was then summarized. The Communications Plan will be incorporated into the OPs and filed with FERC in September 2000. Ron McKitrick 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) of the daytime 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). For recreation issues specific to the USFS, Elrand Denson offered to host a meeting between the USFS, APC and FERC at one of the USFS sites.

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 McKittrick (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.

## **WCRT Meeting**

The WCRT meeting began at 1:30 p.m. The first portion of the meeting included a review of the May meeting summary, review of the structure and function of the IAGs, and discussion of the geographic scope. As stated above, the meeting summary was finalized with minor revisions to the attendee list. The whitepaper on the structure and function of the IAGs was reviewed and there were no comments.

### ***Discussion of 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. There were some questions as to the definition of “project boundary” for the Smith and Bankhead developments. APC explained that the project boundary was defined as the area within the full pool elevation of the lake including the flood easements. Elrand Denson noted that the USFS has a congressionally mandated charge to protect federal lands that are affected by the project. The USFS noted that limiting the project boundary to strictly 200 feet from the lake would not allow the USFS to address the areas (as defined in FERC's regulations at 18 CFR Section 4.51) affected by the project. The discrepancies between the USFS's and FERC's definition of the project boundary were noted. FERC representatives answered questions regarding the application of various protection, mitigation and enhancement (PM&E) measures to other projects or lands outside the “project boundary”. FERC explained that due to different license requirements, multiple licensees and expiration of licenses, the application of PM&E measures to other projects or lands are not easy or automatic. Each case is specific and that some of the items can be addressed in a cumulative impacts analyses under NEPA.

### **Presentation on Aquatic plant & mosquito management**

Before the individual breakout session Scott Lankford (APC) presented APC's aquatic plant and mosquito management plan. Scott fielded several questions regarding the mosquito control programs.

### **Breakout sessions:**

The WCRT split into two groups to discuss recreation and environmental issues, concurrently. These issues were previously identified and listed in the Issue Sheets. A list of participants for each group is as follows.

### **Recreation Breakout**

Jim Beason	Amy Bennett	Deb Berry	Bill Campbell
Ray Cline	Shannon Dewberry	Keith Floyd	Bruce DiGennaro
Bob Huffaker	Janet Hutzel	John Eisenbarth	Jim Hillhouse
Barry Lovett	Ron McKitrick	Joe Nicholson	Jon Strickland
Karen Pulliam	Monte Terharr	Stephanie White	

## Environmental Breakout

Carl Couret	Tom Counts	Jim Crew	Elrand Denson
Jeff Duncan	Mike Eubanks	Jon Hornsby	Darryl Harley
Steve Kartalia	Jim Lochamy	Ron McKittrick	Henry Mealing
Jason Moak	Jim Moore	Jerry Moss	Dan Murchison
Malcolm Pierson	Bill Sim	Dave Sligh	Kelly Schaeffer
Beth Wentzel	Diana Woods		

## Recreation Issues (Facilitator: Bruce DiGennaro)

### *WR1 – Recreation Facilities and Inventory*

All specific issues and questions on the WR1 issue sheets were categorized and handed out in a numbered list (Attachment D). The purpose of this breakout session was to briefly review the issue sheet, discuss information needs and geographic scope. The group reached consensus that #1 through #5 and #8 on the handout are principles and goals of this issue.

- Number 6 – Several team members believed that this bullet is a general principle, however consensus was not reached on this.
- Deb Berry thought that #7 and #9 were basically saying the same thing as #5. Team members decided that number #5 and #9 were to be incorporated together and #7 was to be discussed further.
- Number 7 – ADCNR discussed their interest in access for shoreline/bank fishing. ADCNR was asked if they had any plans or ideas of where to develop the shoreline. ADCNR stated that they have recognized demand, but had no specific plans. The team members identified that one specific area for shoreline/ bank fishing was the tailwater section from the Birmingham Water Pump Station downstream to the County Road 69 Bridge that runs from Highway 69 to the pump stations. Anglers use this area now, but there is currently no formally developed access. The issue of ADA compliance for this area was also discussed. Currently the banks are too steep for ADA access, however access should be provided, if possible. The point was raised that this area is stocked with rainbow trout and is a unique fishery to the state.

ADCNR stated that shoreline development has increased, which conversely decreases the amount of land available for public access. Thus, leaving the vast majority of the public unable to use the reservoir. ADCNR would like to see more developed (free) recreation areas for public access. Several other team members also felt that public access on the reservoir and tailrace is very limited. However, Deb Berry believes that there is enough free public access around Smith Lake. This discrepancy between availability and knowledge of public shoreline access was identified as a problem statewide. Several public locations around the lake that individuals may not know about were defined at this time. The use fee system for fishing areas and recreation areas was also discussed at this time. For this discussion, Bill Campbell (EPRO) explained that commercial areas don't let people fish there because of overcrowding and that there are roughly 10 public access sites fairly evenly distributed around the lake. The USFS suggested that shoreline opportunities be provided at existing recreation facilities,

including ADA facilities. Currently, the USFS can not expand their opportunities because there is a development funding problem.

APC will provide a map and summary report of current bank fishing locations, shoreline type (i.e., public, private, formal, informal), shoreline frontage, and compile information on bank fishing from ADECA (including the SCORP) and USFS information for bank fishing on developed lands. This approach will help determine where public shoreline fishing access currently exists and to eventually determine if and why the sites are being used. Team members were comfortable with this action item, however several team members questioned the purpose of this exercise and how it helps one estimate the demand for bank fishing. Bill Campbell suggested that the existing areas must be defined and then investigated for the fishing productivity of the area.

### *Action Items*

- Define public and private access
  - APC will create a map and summary report of current bankfishing locations, shoreline type (i.e., public, private, formal, informal), and shoreline frontage.
  - APC will contact Jon Strickland and Keith Floyd (ADCNR) in order to compile information on bankfishing. USFS will also provide information on where people are coming from to recreate on Smith Lake.
- 
- Number 11 – APC will create a mini report on ownership, right of way, the number of parking areas available, the slope of areas for potential ADA access and development potential. This issue will require research into property ownership around the lake.
  - Number 12 – John Eisenbarth explained that if someone launches a canoe past his property they can't hear the siren and they are unable to portage until the next public launch located 4 miles downstream. There are some logging roads for access to this stretch of river, but they are not publicly known and ownership is unknown. The logging roads are related to #13. To address this issue the Team should look at the potential for canoe portage areas in this stretch of the river. There is also an informational component that includes the distribution of information about this stretch of river, the location of the canoe portages, and information about releases.
  - Number 17 – For this specific issue, Bill Campbell provided the numbers of boat launches available at extreme drought conditions. Currently on Smith Lake there are 18 ramps including some of those on USFS lands. The USFS stated that all of their ramps could feasibly be improved to accommodate more use throughout the year. Jim Beason explained that many launches become very limited during times of low water. The Team suggested that lake level is as much of an issue as the actual number of boat launches and efforts should be made to improve the existing launches. ADCNR explained that two ADCNR launch areas are accessible at all times except during extreme low water. In order to address this specific issue, APC will provide a map and summary report with the number of boat ramps and lanes, the lake levels at which all are usable, and which ramps can be improved to accommodate more use. Bill Campbell noted that this issue may lead to the formation of an IAG, but the requested information and reports will be presented as soon as possible (by email in late July or August) in case additional information needs to be collected. Bill Campbell has a field visit scheduled for September and may be able to

obtain additional information requested by the team members relative to inventory and lake levels.

- An additional lake level access issue is the effect of the levels on swimming areas. The USFS has problems with their swimming areas during extreme low and high water levels. The USFS has investigated the potential for improving the swimming areas, but no surveys have been conducted to date. The USFS will contact APC with more information regarding the swimming areas, including the site description, time period of lake level problems, a rough idea of the work needed, threshold levels, and the economic impact of lost fishing days. The issues with the lake level conditions may be incorporated into issue WR9. There is also a water quality issue (fecal coliform) at the Corinth swimming area. This issue will be addressed in conjunction with WE1.
- Number 19 - The USFS raised an issue of jet ski use on the Sipsey Fork River into the Wild and Scenic River Corridor. The USFS would like to see the project boundary relative to this area and investigate the impacts, timing, and potential regulation of these vessels.
- Number 10 – ADCNR discussed a potential creel survey to be conducted on the tailwater fishery. The creel study should define what kind of use the fishery receives (fishing pressure), the harvest, and target species. Currently ADCNR stocks 3,500 trout every 2 months and they have no historical or existing creel survey data. The facilitator will check with other team members to work in conjunction on the fishery, if applicable. It was concluded that the fishery is year round, with the majority of the use focused on February through September (with the exception of August when it is too hot). However, some anglers only fish during the winter. The scope of the creel study was discussed and team members thought that it should be from the dam to the 69 bridge (2 miles) or from the dam down to Mulberry (13 miles). The focus should be on the tailrace area because the remainder of this stretch of river is almost exclusively a water craft fishery. More specifically, the east side of the river between the Birmingham water withdrawal facilities and the 69 bridge should be investigated. The Action Item for the creel study is to develop a draft study plan and potentially develop an IAG to work with various team members to draft this plan.
- Numbers 14 and 15 – Jon Strickland suggested that the resource needs to support multiple uses, not just boating and boat fishing. The Team should investigate the potential for ATV and equestrian trail uses, picnicking, etc. These multi-use areas should provide opportunities for more passive recreation. The private sector is more suited for providing campsites. Currently the Clear Creek and Corinth areas have excess capacity. The USFS needs marketing and improvements to campgrounds in order to stimulate camping use to approve their operational efficiency. The USFS has a horse trail system farther north and also multi-use trail in the Flint Creek area (15 miles of trail) that are heavily used. These trails are located 15 miles northeast of the lake. APC expressed concern about equestrian and ATV trail use because of their negative impacts on the resource and also additional liability issues. The question was raised if there are places around the reservoir that would be suitable for trail use and how would they work those areas into existing land uses and recreation demand. Jon stated that there is limited supply in northeast Alabama. The USFS has approximately 25 miles of horse trails roughly 15 miles from the lake. The USFS performed an environmental assessment for

this trail system in which they looked at trail needs in the Bankhead National Forest. USFS explained that the horse trail system is implemented in stages and they have a planned loop. The USFS will provide this report to APC. The USFS also has the Raven Trail, which is a 1.5 mile bike trail in the campground. They could investigate the possibility of extending the hiking trails through easements. Hiking is relatively low impact and has been a good attraction to the recreation areas. These potential trails should be investigated (Action Item).

Hunting lands were the next topic discussed. It was explained that APC currently has no hunting lands around Smith Lake. Some lands are leased to individuals downstream of the dam, but there are no public access hunting areas. APC explained that they have limited property around Smith Lake. The team members also raised the issue of potential wildlife opportunities in the area. Bill Campbell explained that there are currently no public wildlife viewing opportunities on Smith Lake. The Team will coordinate with various members to determine if there are any potential public access and use areas on Smith Lake and to determine the demand. ADECA explained that there may not be a direct demand for hunting lands on Smith Lake, but it is a statewide concern.

- Number 18 – The question was raised whether the potential adverse impacts to forest lands should be moved to another sheet. APC will work with the USFS over the next few weeks in order to discuss specific land issues with the USFS.

The Team will revisit the specific issues on the WR1 issue sheet during the next meeting. Information and Action Items brought up in this breakout session will be distributed to the team members and reviewed for comment.

### ***WR8 – Public Education***

The public education issue sheet was discussed, including a handout that grouped items previously raised at the Issue Workshops (November and December 2000) into education, public outreach, and question categories. Many of the specific items on this sheet categorized just for the Coosa will be added to the Warrior specific issue list.

The facilitator suggested that the items listed in the “questions” category, be answered and handed out to the Team at the September Meeting. Some of these questions will require input from team members in order to develop a response. Shannon Dewberry will head up 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 of APC programs Shannon briefly presented three APC programs as examples to the team (“Renew the Coosa”; Habitat Enhancement – Christmas Tree Program; and Energy Conservation). The successes of APC programs are dependent on the participation of other clubs/organizations/volunteers. The Rec group will work to identify other programs to ultimately identify gaps in public education and outreach. All team members are to provide contact names or program descriptions to Shannon. One suggestion was to contact the Governor’s Commission on Environmental Education for information on state programs.

### ***Action Items***

- Prepare answers to questions to raised at workshops

- Develop an inventory of Existing Education and Public Outreach Programs
- Shannon will obtain Pete Conroy's number from Tom Littlepage in order to get information from the Governor's Commission on Environmental Education.
- Work with the Coosa Rec RAT on this issue

### **Breakout sessions: Ecological Issues (Facilitator – Kelly Schaeffer)**

Three ecological issues were discussed during the breakout session: WE6 - threatened and endangered species, WE12 - wetlands and WE7 - exotic species and aquatic plant management. Handouts containing threatened and endangered species lists, exotic species laws, and an issue-sequencing diagram were distributed to team members at the beginning of the breakout session.

#### ***WE6 – Threatened and Endangered Species***

Malcolm Pierson began this session by briefly summarizing APC's recent and ongoing field studies pertaining to threatened and endangered species. Several team members had comments related to the flattened musk turtle and mussel surveys. Specifically, some team members indicated that data on the flattened musk turtle are old and need to be updated/resurveyed and one team member mentioned that historic mussel populations should be examined in preparation for potential mitigation measures. The team then discussed the potential geographic scope for the threatened and endangered species issue. Suggestions for the geographic scope included the following: the project boundary; the entire watershed upstream of Smith and downstream to Holt Dam; and the entire watershed downstream to the mouth of the Black Warrior River. Some team members thought that a watershed-based scope would be necessary to characterize the "context" of the existing project environment. At this point, the team members decided to form a T&E IAG in order to address the issue. Members include: Carl Couret (FWS), Tom Counts (FS), John Hornsby, Malcolm Pierson (APC), Jeff Duncan (NPS), Henry Mealing (Kleinschmidt), Jim Crew (APC), and Kelly Schaeffer (Kleinschmidt) as needed for facilitation. The IAG will be responsible for compiling a complete species list for the basin and then narrowing the focus of those species directly impacted by project operations.

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

- Obtain land division data from ADCNR database
- Obtain USFS list of T&E and sensitive species
- Review the existing list and narrow the focus down to basin
- Add other list sources as provided by IAG members

#### ***WE12 – Wetlands***

Team members then discussed the various data available for wetlands and geographic scope. To begin the session, Bill Sim made a brief presentation on the status and availability of currently available wetland maps. Some team members expressed concern that the 1981 wetland information may be too old and suggested that such data may need to be "ground truthed" to confirm its accuracy. This point was noted and will be discussed further in the IAG. One team member also noted that the Geological Survey of Alabama has digitized maps of Smith Lake, which could be beneficial for use on this issue. Another team member suggested that sensitive habitat areas be identified and protected, possibly in coordination with the USFS Forest Plan.

Geographic scope for the wetlands issue was then discussed. Suggestions for a geographic scope included the following: project boundary; 100-year flood zone; and the entire Warrior watershed. Some team members suggested that wetlands in the Warrior watershed be used to characterize the “context” of the existing project environment. There was some discussion about the tools that could be used to accurately characterize the wetlands since digitized wetland maps are not available for much of the watershed. Diana Woods volunteered to provide EPA Land-Use cover maps to the Team.

The Team decided to form a Wetlands IAG composed of the following members:

- Diana Woods - EPA
- Ray Albright - USFS
- Bill Sim - APC
- Mike Eubanks ACOE
- Jim Crew - APC
- Kelly Schaeffer -Kleinschmidt

### ***WE7 – Exotic Species***

Some team members suggested summarizing existing information on exotic species in the watershed and then examining the specifics of exotic species within the Project boundary. Sources for additional information on exotic species were identified and will be distributed for review. The team members did not feel an IAG was warranted at this time.

### ***Action Items***

- APC write up their current Aquatic Plant Management and Mosquito Control Programs
- Obtain exotic species/aquatic plant management guidelines from ADCNR
- Obtain Federal program information from Carl Couret (USFWS) and/or Jim Hancock (Balch & Bingham)

### **Handouts distributed during the CCRT/WCRT meeting**

- David Haynes’ Letter
- Geographic Scope white paper
- APC Aquatic Plant and Mosquito Management Program
- R1 recreation issue handout
- R8 recreation issue handout
- Statewide list of threatened, endangered, and sensitive species
- Alabama’s exotic species control laws
- Issue-sequencing diagram for environmental issues

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