

RE E4 comments on June 19 2003 document.txt

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

From: DebbieCBerry@aol.com [mailto:DebbieCBerry@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2003 3:44 PM
To: Bruce.DiGennaro@KleinschmidtUSA.com; Lovett, Barry K.
Cc: Beasonjimdot@aol.com
Subject: E4 comments on June 19, 2003 document

These are some comments on the E4 paper. I have also attached them in case you wanted them in that format.
Deb

July 1, 2003

Comments submitted by Deb Berry on E4 Water Quantity, Water Use and Water Withdrawals Paper distributed by APC in June 2003

Note: On the Table of Contents page and on page 3 the text for the large heading 2.0 is missing the last "A" in the word withdrawals.

On page 7 at the top of the page the paper states: "Consequently, additional storage reservoirs are needed in order to meet the growing water needs in the state. APC's water withdrawal compensation methodology should help encourage others to develop these much needed storage reservoirs."

These two sentences will outrage some and please others and I would suggest deleting them both. Is APC really trying to encourage others to build new reservoirs in Alabama or Georgia?

My thoughts and points that you will hear from others now or later:

-Additional storage reservoirs may not be needed if operating systems move more towards closed systems thereby 'recycling' the water they use, or if gray water is recycled more effectively, or if conservation is encouraged, or if more retention ponds are required to prevent runoff and then used as a water source, or

-Any permits/licenses for any new reservoirs (storage or otherwise) are unlikely to be issued at this time or at least not issued without a substantial outcry. Examples: water compact discussions with the proposed ACT reservoirs and associated reservoir limits (how long now 10+ years); the proposed drinking water reservoir on 303d listed Duck Creek in Cullman County (still with the judge going on about 4 years).

-I do not think that it is advisable in the relicensing scheme of things to state that APC is trying to 'encourage' others to build 'reservoirs' in a region where even the proposal will bring heated debate. Again, is APC really trying to encourage others to build reservoirs and if so why?

Summary, I would suggest deleting the two sentences or changing the wording in the first sentence to say "additional storage reservoirs MAYBE needed in order to meet ..." and change the second sentence to say "should encourage others to think about future water needs and resources and ways to conserve this resource."

Also, suggest this change be reflected on page 6 in the next to last sentence: "Third, the charges are intended to encourage others to develop additional storage capacity in this region of the country". Maybe something like: "Third, the charges are intended to encourage others to think about their future needs and smart growth strategies."

On page 15 in the middle of the page: "...limited releases of stored water from APC reservoirsensure that minimum flow requirements to the Alabama River..."---If this sentence is referring to all APC reservoirs, then the Warrior River should also be added since it has minimum flow requirements also.

Page 15 section 4.3: This section refers to only to the Coosa and Tallapoosa Rivers so I think the names of the rivers should be added to the heading. (Required Minimum Releases and Operating Guides for the Coosa and Tallapoosa Rivers).

On page 16 in the second paragraph it states that the operating guidelines in Appendix E, which includes Smith Lake, were a part of the ACT process. Was the Smith Lake Operating Zone Chart really included in the ACT (Alabama, Coosa, Tallapoosa) process?

RE E4 comments on June 19 2003 document.txt

Appendix E Operating Zone Chart for Lewis Smith Lake: The low line of the operating zone is shown on the chart at 487msl, however, the current license states 488msl. Jim and I asked Stephanie White and she believes that it should be 488msl also. Which is correct?

Thanks for considering these comments,

Deb Berry, President
Smith Lake Environmental Preservation Committee

FW Smith Recreation IAG - Response to Jamie Freeman Proposal.txt

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

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

Sent: Monday, February 23, 2004 3:54 PM

To: Lovett, Barry K.

Subject: Re: Smith Recreation IAG - Response to Jamie Freeman Proposal

I, as the relicensing representative for the Smith Lake Environmental Preservation Committee, agree with EPRO's findings and conclusions. While I agree that there may be a need for the availability of this type of off road entertainment, I do not believe that it is a safe, wise, nor an environmentally sound activity within the close confines of the multiple land uses that already exist or are planned on project lands.

Deb Berry