

FW IAG priorities.txt

From: AlConDir@aol.com [mailto:AlConDir@aol.com]  
Sent: Monday, January 12, 2004 12:26 PM  
To: wcampbell@eproconsulting.com  
Cc: Lovett, Barry K.  
Subject: IAG priorities

Bill, attached, and hopefully readable is the list of priorities for recreational improvements for the two rivers systems. Give me a call if the note does not cover all of your needs. Thanks for the opportunity to have input. Have a good one (make that a warm one!).

Jim

Subject: Prioritizing for recreational improvements for Coosa and Warrior river systems.

To: Bill Campbell, EPRO

CC: Barry Lovett, APCo

Bill, enclosed is a list of recreational improvements for both river systems combined, representing the priority for the Alabama B.A.S.S. Federation. Number one priority is not necessarily more important than number 2, but both are higher priority than is number 14. Because of the number of sites, cost, and other factors such as parking access, we have indicated bank fishing for all appropriate locations as number 4 on our list. We place the actual prioritizing of individual sites in your and DCNR's hands. Please let me know if you have questions or need additional information.

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>SITE #</u>	<u>ACTION</u>
1	LAY LAKE	18*	PARKING/LAUNCH DEVELOPMENT
2	LEWIS SMITH	49	PARKING/PIER AT CULLMAN CO. PARK
3	MITCHELL LAKE	6	PARKING/LAUNCH AT HIGGINS FERRY
4	ALL LAKES	N/A	BANK FISHING IMPROVEMENTS
5	MITCHELL LAKE	5	BOY SCOUT CAMP IMPROVEMENTS
6	WEISS LAKE 30		RAMP IMPROVEMENT AT CAUSEWAY
7	NEELY HENRY	12A	LAUNCH IMPROV. AT RAINBOW CITY
8	NEELY HENRY	2	PARKING IMPROV. AT TEN ISLANDS
9	MITCHELL LAKE	8	PARKING/LAUNCH AT "BIG FOOT"
10	LAY LAKE	13A	PARKING AT BEESWAX
11	LAKE JORDAN	4	PARKING AT BONNER'S FERRY
12	LEWIS SMITH	48	PARKING/RAMP IMPROV. AT ST. RAMP
13	LAKE JORDAN	20A	LIGHTS AND PARKING AT ROTARY PT.
14	LOGAN MARTIN	57	BOAT LAUNCH AT CHOCCOLOCCO CR.

\* I am not sure if this site is the one we discussed at meetings, but a good ramp with parking is much needed along the Childersburg side of Lay Lake.

Jim Howard  
State Conservation Director  
Alabama B.A.S.S. Federation

Jamie Freeman Proposal - Jim Howard's Comments to Draft APCIAG Response.txt

-----Original Message-----

From: AlConDir@aol.com [mailto:AlConDir@aol.com]

Sent: Monday, February 23, 2004 8:56 AM

To: Lovett, Barry K.

Subject: Smith Lake letter

Read through the letter and have two insignificant comments, other than I agree with the basic direction of the letter. On page 2, second para. (beginning with "Given the historical ---", the last sentence says "APC and the IAG can expect ---", I would change this to "APC and the IAG would expect ---". By saying "can expect" it sounds like we plan to move ahead with the proposal. Finally, the last page (Issue 4. continued), Bill introduces the term "Warrior Project" for the first time. Suggest staying with Smith Lake, or define the basic project earlier in the letter. That's all folks!

I did receive the notice for the SMP meeting. As I noted at the last meeting thst time period has a time conflict for me. BASS is here and I am volunteer coordinator. Will try to adjust schedules and make the meeting, but not sure right now. See you soon.

Jim

072303 Jim Howard Re Draft SMP comments.txt

From: AlConDir@aol.com

Sent: Wednesday, July 23, 2003 7:19 PM

To: Jenkins, Viki R.

Subject: Re: Draft Shoreline Management Plan Reminder

I tried to send my review to Barry (as noted in the 6/19 letter from Bruce) but the e-mail failed to deliver. Not sure why. I am attaching to this message in the hopes you can forward to Barry. Thanks.

Jim

COOSA RIVER HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT  
DRAFT Shoreline Management Plan

Review comments by Jm Howard

Page 2, Section 1.1 (cont.): Should there be a 1.1.1, 1.1.2, etc. for each reservoir for the indicate project descriptions?

Page 2, Section 1.2, 2<sup>nd</sup> para.: the wording is consistent with stated purposes of the SMP, but is not consistent with the statement in para. 3, which indicated that “residential development” is a public interest; further it is hard to see that “residential development” is possible on APC lands earlier defined, i.e. narrow strip or flood easement. I would also argue that “residential development” is not necessarily in the “greater public interest” noted in the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph. Think the reference to “residential development” is in fact not consistent with goals, objectives, or purposes of the SMP.. Finally I think a word like “reasonable” should be inserted in front of public in the last sentence of para. 2.

Page 4, 2.0 Goal: I don’t like the Goal statement in that it refers to a “balance”. Not sure what that is, but things have not necessarily been in balance when it comes to continuing residential development impacting shoreline habitat. I suggest a better (not necessarily best) Goal would be something like: “Ensure that shoreline development and recreational use are consistent with protection and enhancement ---- (from 1<sup>st</sup> para. of 1.2).

Objectives: I note that “residential development” is not listed as one of the objectives. Which I feel is consistent with earlier stated purposes, etc, but not consistent with reference to “residential development” noted in my comments above.

Page 6, 4.1I feel there is a dichotomy (or lack thereof) that is important to effective definition and application of the shoreline mgt. policy that is key to success in meeting the stated purposes above. That dichotomy being APC fee (and flood easement to extent restrictions are available) lands versus lands outside project boundaries. To wit, the 2<sup>nd</sup> para. Under 4.1 starts off by referring to “work cooperatively with other interested parties —“. APC has and should be able to define what its fee land shorelines should look like with out doing so cooperatively (after a SMP developed of course). The BMP section reflects this dichotomy, but this section does not. I think this section should define the two basic land ownership situations and how each will be approached (flood easement being a possible third type).

Page 7, top of page: Cannot BMP’s be implemented more aggressively on flood easement lands? Or at best, these lands should be mentioned as being different from fee and those outside the project boundary.

Section 4.2: I think “wetlands” should be added to the list of “Sensitive Resource

Lands” in the 1<sup>st</sup> para., since they are in fact part of the definition, and are different from “cultural and T & E” reasons. I know this is not an exhaustive list, but one could be left with feeling that only “cultural and T & E” are only reasons for Sensitive classification.

Last para.: The last sentence says “— inform all future permitting activities.” Don’t think you can “inform” an activity. Probably a different word needed here.

Page 8, Class 3: The key here is that this classification would be done only after considering “desired future conditions” as noted in 2<sup>nd</sup> para. under Section 4.2. “Existing condition maps” must not be allowed to restrict in any manner “desired future conditions” of the stakeholders. Even though all desired conditions may not be met.

Page 9, Section 4.3: Cannot APC require some BMP in flood easement lands? Again, these lands are not included in the descriptions that follow (i.e. lands are either fee or outside the project boundary).

Section 4.3.1: Suggest that the word “fish” be added to the list of habitat in the first sentence.

Section 4.3.2: The use of “— runoff of water from cleared lands ---” seems a bit vague to me. In its general use, cleared lands leads one to think of cleared forest or development lands. Once development has occurred (or reforested) we tend not to think of these as “cleared lands”. In the case of residential development, they are, however, a major source of pollution, whether considered as point or non-point. The later wording refers to activities on residential land. Is a septic system non-point? If not than the paragraph misses it by focusing on non-point only. May be a minor issue since the items on next page focus on residences.

Page 10, 4.3.3: What about habitable structures on flood easements? Are they always 30 feet or less from shoreline.

Page 11, 1<sup>st</sup> para.: It is hard to imagine a use that is “---- consistent with purposes of protecting or enhancing the scenic, ----- values of the project” The primary purpose of the SMP is to minimize impacts or prohibit where they are too severe, but I can’t imagine a case where a development use protected or enhanced the noted values. Which by earlier definition are for the “greater public interests”.

Page 13, 4.7: This item should not be listed under 5.0 (earlier statement said Smith would have it own section), and should this list be 5.1, 5.2, etc.? Actually the title of 5.0 may not be correct, in that the following sentence mentions things other than Issues. Not sure what a better title should be.

The overall draft SMP is rather good in its intent and processes. What I find most lacking is a reference to a clear policy statement for fee lands that is more restrictive than noted in Section 4.1. The lack of a clear dichotomy noted in my comments above is one reason for my concern. I look forward to further refining this good start.