

Meeting Notes & Summary: Meeting – October 25, 2001

Warrior River Project

www.southerncompany.com/alpower/hydro

Meeting Attendees:

Bill Campbell	EPRO	wcampbell@eproconsulting.com
Sarah Lee Chubb	USFS	schubb@fs.fed.us
Michael Cook	USFS	mcook@fs.fed.us
Elrand Denson	USFS	edenson@fs.fed.us
Bruce DiGennaro	Kleinschmidt	Bruce.DiGennaro@Kleinschmidtusa.com
Bill Dykes	APC	WCDYKES@southernco.com
Glen Gaines	USFS	ggaines@fs.fed.us
Darryl Harley	USFS	dmharley@fs.fed.us
Barry Lovett	APC	BKLOVETT@southernco.com
Jay Malone	USFS	jmalone@fs.fed.us
George McEldowney	USFS	gmceldowney@fs.fed.us
Bob Pasquill	USFS	bpasquill@fs.fed.us
Doug Powell	APC	DHPOWELL@southernco.com
Andy Sheppard	APC	ARSHEPPA@southernco.com
Bill Sim	APC	WASIM@southernco.com
Sheila Smith	APC	SCSMITH@southernco.com
Stephanie White	APC	SKWHITE@southernco.com
Bill Young	USFWS	bill_young@fws.gov

Action Items

The following action item was agreed upon by the meeting attendees:

- All Meeting Attendees: Tentatively plan to meet during the next relicensing meeting on January 29th or 30th to further discuss the items below.

Meeting Notes

These notes summarize the major discussion items and are not intended to be a transcript or analysis of the meeting.

1. USFS is having difficulty keeping up with maintenance at existing recreational facilities.
2. At the Clear Creek and Houston Facilities, high lake levels in the spring flood beaches, impacting use. Beaches were designed for water levels less than 510'. Situation may be corrected by design modifications.
3. Maintenance costs are increased due to debris settling on beach areas at Clear Creek and Houston.

Meeting Notes & Summary: Meeting – October 25, 2001

4. Clear Creek boat ramps (2) - at winter pool launching can become difficult as gravel at the end of the ramps develops holes.
5. PWCs are traveling up the Sipsey Fork from the Smith reservoir into the Wild and Scenic River north of the Highway 33 bridge. USFS would prefer to promote non-motorized use.
6. There are shoreline erosion issues at Clear Creek near day use ramp and near playground.

The USFS also provided a meeting summary for the October 25th meeting, which is attached to this document.

Next Steps

This meeting summary will be distributed to meeting attendees and the WCRT prior the January meetings and posted on the Internet at www.southerncompany.com/alpower/hydro.

The next meeting will be held on January 29th or 30th. An agenda for these meetings are to be distributed.

Meeting Notes & Summary: Meeting – October 25, 2001

**USFS
Bankhead Field Trip Notes**

Agenda
Bankhead Field trip
10/25/01

0900 - 0945

- All parties meet at Oak Leaf Shelter at Clear Creek
- Forest Service presents overview of FS recreation on Smith Lake
- Overview of Meaningful Measures process.

0945 – 1100

- Group tours Clear Creek swimming beach, boat ramp, shoreline at playground, and bank-fishing opportunities.

1100 – 1200

- Group visits areas of recreation user conflicts and resource damage (illegal OHV use, dispersed camping, etc) in the general forest area around Clear Creek.
- Discuss law enforcement, erosion, water quality and etc.

1200 - 1300

- Lunch (Paw Paws Restaurant)

1300 – 1430

- Group travels to Houston Rec. Area
- Tour site and discuss deferred maintenance needs.
- Effects of lake levels on flood debris cleanup, vegetation, archeology and etc.

1430 – 1600

- Group travels to Corinth
- Meet with concessionaire and discuss operations, needed improvements at Corinth, bank-fishing opportunities, etc.

1600

- End of the Field Trip

The discussion topics and site visits where as follows:

WR9 Federal Lands & Waters – Potential impact of the project on federal lands including, but not limited to designations, such as Wilderness area and Wild and Scenic Rivers.

Meeting Notes & Summary: Meeting – October 25, 2001

Description of Issue:

The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) operates several facilities within or adjacent to the project that may be supporting project recreation and/or impacted by project operations. In addition, adjacent federal lands may be potentially impacted by recreational activities associated with the project. USFS is concerned about the need to repair and/or upgrade several facilities to accommodate current use (also see WR1). The USFS has also expressed concern regarding increased demands for shoreline development and requests for additional private access across public land to access the shoreline (see WR6).

Specific issues or requests identified that were discussed include:

- Increased demand on USFS land and facilities as a result of lake cumulative impact.
- Recreational conflicts occurring on USFS lands.
- Concern about more access and more use leading to the potential for impacts.
** Discussed the large number of encroachments and trespass cases that have occurred from landowners around the Lake.*
- Continued operation of USFS facilities require that they remain economically viable for operating concessionaires.
** It was noted that we have lost one concessionaire and the new concessionaire is a non-profit and has a few more benefits with the new change in the Forest Service policy to maintain and repair large infrastructure components with the 6.5 percent that the FS receives back from the operator.*
- USFS facilities are behind on O&M. Consequently, there has been a steady decline in the quality of services/facilities, including increased closures, which result in less use and less revenue for upkeep.
** Talked about meaningful Measures process.*
- Residential development and request for access and infrastructure across federal lands is impacting USFS staffing.
** It was brought up that the Forest Service has a huge burden to provide access across NF's lands for developments around the lake. Also, it was made known that our road systems were not designed to handle the level of traffic that are being placed on them!*
- Potential impact to the West Fork and the Sipsey Fork Wild and Scenic River.
** It was noted that there are affects on the Wild & Scenic River from the varying fluctuations in the lake*
- Potential impacts to water resources and aquatic habitat, due to increased levels of recreation use due to the presence of Smith Lake.
** This topic was tabled for later discussion in one or all of the ecological Issue Action Groups (IAG's).*
- Potential impact to the scenery resource on federal lands due to transmission lines.
 - *This was discussed and could be dropped because of no project transmission lines across NF's lands.*
- **Potential impacts of project operations on lake and tributary fisheries and associated fishing activity.**

Meeting Notes & Summary: Meeting – October 25, 2001

- *This was a new concern that was discussed and later voiced that it would need to be addressed as one of the issues. This was not on the original WR-9 Issue Sheet.*

Also, the Forest Service beaches were discussed and it was noted that some of the spring high water time was our most productive swimming days. APC noted that they could help with the redesign of the swimming beaches.

The debris clean up would start back and the Forest Service would only have to identify the areas and APC would have them cleaned before the swimming season.

Boat launching areas could be improved using one of the methods discussed by Bill Campbell.

THE MEANINGFUL MEASURES PROCESS

The objective of the Recreation Meaningful Measures process is to:

- Define the recreation program of work in terms that are measurable, attainable, realistic, and concrete, while clearly showing tradeoffs, accomplishments, and shortfalls.
- Make customer preference and quality service an integral part management.
- Provide consistency among Forests in measuring and defining recreation services.
- Provide a rational, consistent basis for distribution of limited operating funds.
- Provide a concrete basis for evaluating and rewarding achievement in day-to-day management.
- Provide a communication tool within the agency, to Congress, publics, partners, and other agencies.

The six steps to the process are:

- Identify measurable components (recreation inventory).
- Establish measurable standards of quality (see below).
- Determine and “level” realistic costs.
- Prioritize work to be accomplished.
- Allocate the program of work and agree to management attainment targets.
- Monitor, measure, and report actual management attainment.

The Forest Service nationally is in step 3 of the process – leveling costs for similar tasks to accomplish the standards described below.

DEVELOPED RECREATION – National Quality Standards

Meeting Notes & Summary: Meeting – October 25, 2001

Developed recreation sites: Managed to enhance opportunities for recreation, at sites with relatively high visitor use, that serve as portals into a range of experiences with the natural environment. Delivery of appropriate recreational experiences, visitor safety and comfort, and resource protection are factors in site design and management.

Elements of the Developed Recreation component include facilities such as campgrounds, day use areas, trailheads, improved boat ramps, sewage or solid waste disposal facilities and visitor centers (physical or facility operation only).

Critical national standards are identified with an asterisk (*). If these standards are not met, the resulting conditions pose a high probability of immediate or permanent loss to people or property. If they cannot be met, due to budget or other constraints, immediate action must be taken to correct or mitigate the problem. Immediate action may include closing to public use the site or affected portions of the site.

HEALTH AND CLEANLINESS

1. ***Visitors and workers are not exposed to human waste**
2. ***Water, wastewater, and sewage treatment systems meet local, state and federal water quality regulations.**
3. Garbage does not exceed the capacity of the garbage containers.
4. Individual units and common areas are free of litter including domestic animal waste.
5. Facilities are free of graffiti.
6. Restrooms and garbage locations are free of objectionable odor.
7. Constructed features are clean.

RESOURCE SETTING

1. ***Effects from recreation use do not conflict with environmental laws (ESA, NHPA, Clean Water, TES, etc.).**
2. Recreation opportunities, site development, and site management are consistent with Recreation management system (ROS, SMS, BBM) objectives, development scale, and the Forest land management plan.
3. Landscape character at the developed recreation site is consistent with the Forest scenic integrity objectives.
4. Numbers of visitors and vehicles do not exceed site capacity.

SAFETY AND SECURITY

1. ***High-risk conditions do not exist in developed recreation sites.**
2. ***Forest Service personnel and their representatives have dependable communications.**
3. Activities prohibited under the 36 CFR261 sections pertinent to recreation use of developed sites are dealt with appropriately.
4. Forest Service presence is sufficient to provide visitors a sense of security.

Meeting Notes & Summary: Meeting – October 25, 2001

RESPONSIVENESS

1. * **When signed as accessible, constructed features meet accessibility requirements as stipulated in the Access Board’s proposed interim Accessibility Guidelines for developed sites.**
2. The developed recreation site entrance is well marked, easily found, and the visitor feels welcome.
3. Information boards are posted in a user-friendly and professional manner.
4. Forest Service personnel and their representatives demonstrate good customer service practices.
5. Site manage is responsive to visitor input, needs, and satisfactions; identified needs are based on measurement of trends and user satisfaction.
6. Visitor center are staffed appropriately during seasons of use and current information is available.
7. Recreation site information is accurate and available from a variety of sources and outlets.

CONDITION OF FACILITIES

1. * Inspections meet federal, state, and local requirements
2. Constructed features are in good condition throughout their service life.
3. Constructed features not in good condition, or beyond their life, are replaced or decommissioned.
4. Constructed features meet current Forest Service design standards and are placed in accordance with FSM and FSH guidelines and consistent with current Site Plans.
5. Constructed features are free of vandalism.

Meeting Notes & Summary: January 30, 2002

Warrior River Project

www.southerncompany.com/alpower/hydro

Meeting Attendees:

Jim Beason	Smith Lake Civic Association	jimdot5@netzero.net
Amy Bennett	Kleinschmidt	Amy.Bennett@Kleinschmidtusa.com
Deb Berry	Smith Lake Environmental Preservation Committee	debcberry@aol.com
Keith Bryant	APC	kebryant@southernco.com
Heather Bunce	EPRO	hbunce@eproconsulting.com
Bill Campbell	EPRO	wcampbell@eproconsulting.com
Elrand Denson	USFS	edenson@fs.fed.us
Bruce DiGennaro	Kleinschmidt	Bruce.DiGennaro@Kleinschmidtusa.com
Keith Floyd	ADCNR	kbfloyd@hiwaay.net
Glen Gaines	USFS	ggaines@fs.fed.us
Janet Hutzal	FERC	janet.hutzal@ferc.fed.us
Patti Leppert	FERC	patricia.leppert@ferc.fed.us
Barry Lovett	APC	BKLOVETT@southernco.com
Ashley McVicar	APC	ammcvica@southernco.com
Joe Nicholson	USFS	jnicholson@fs.fed.us
Sheila Smith	APC	SCSMITH@southernco.com
Dan Thompson	ADCNR	dthompson@dcnr.state.al.us
Stephanie White	APC	SKWHITE@southernco.com

Action Items

- APC: Distribute the draft meeting summary from this meeting and the final October 25th meeting summary to all meeting attendees.
- APC and USFS: Woody Woodall to provide as built drawings to APC by late February. Joe Nicholson will contact Woody for this information.
- USFS: Provide APC with a list and location of all lands experiencing problems, including recreation pressures, resource impacts and isolated lands.
- APC and USFS: Identify areas experiencing access demands. The USFS will develop this information that will particularly focus on areas of special use. This action item may include a visit by EPRO or APC staff to the USFS District Office. Also look at other proposed development and

Meeting Notes & Summary: January 30, 2002

lands being bought and sold within the USFS lands. Karen Pulliam is the key contact for this action item.

Introduction

This meeting began with general introductions and notification that all sites closed after September 11th were reopened.

The following agenda was reviewed and agreed upon for this meeting:

1. Introductions
2. Background and Meeting Goals
3. Issue Refinement and workplan Development
4. Next Steps

Background and Meeting Goals

A brief introduction of the background of the WR9 issue and goals for the meeting were provided at this time. The primary objective of this meeting was to organize all issues for WR9 and investigate ways in which to move forward on the issue. Also, the meeting summary from the October 25, 2001 was reviewed. No comments were provided and the October 25th summary, as supplemented by the USFS, will be placed on APC's relicensing website.

Issue Refinement and work plan development

This discussion focused on issue refinement and development of an organized list of the WR9 issues. This portion of the meeting was very productive and resulted in issues being condensed, clarified and placed under various categories. From this discussion, APC will revise the WR9 issue sheet and begin on developing a more formal work plan.

Next Steps

All WR9 materials will be distributed to work group members prior to meetings and posted on the Internet at www.southerncompany.com/alpower/hydro. A meeting will be scheduled on March 12th, 2002 at 1:15 PM to continue our progress on this issue. This meeting will be held at the Sheraton Perimeter Park South Hotel in Birmingham.

**Issue Action Group: WR 1, 3, 4, & 5 Smith and
WR9 Federal Lands and Waters**

Final 4-2-02

Meeting Notes & Summary: March 12, 2002

Warrior River Project

www.southerncompany.com/alpower/hydro

Meeting Attendees:

Amy Bennett	Kleinschmidt	Amy.Bennett@Kleinschmidtusa.com
Deb Berry	Smith Lake Environmental Preservation Committee	debcberry@aol.com
Keith Bryant	APC	kebryant@southernco.com
Bill Campbell	EPRO	wcampbell@eproconsulting.com
Bruce DiGennaro	Kleinschmidt	Bruce.DiGennaro@Kleinschmidtusa.com
Bill Dykes	APC	WCDYKES@southernco.com
John Eisenbarth	Trout Unlimited	Iflyfish@bellsouth.net
Bruce Hamrick	Walker County Commission	wcadm@sonet.net
Jim Howard	Alabama B.A.S.S. Federation	alcondir@aol.com
Patti Leppert	FERC	patricia.leppert@ferc.fed.us
Barry Lovett	APC	BKLOVETT@southernco.com
Joy Malone	USFS	jmalone@fs.fed.us
Joe Nicholson	USFS	jnicholson@fs.fed.us
Walter Ramey	APC	WRRAMEY@southernco.com
Haley Sankey	Kleinschmidt	Haley.Sankey@KleinschmidtUSA.com
Sheila Smith	APC	SCSMITH@southernco.com
Dan Thompson	ADCNR	dthompson@dcnr.state.al.us
Stephanie White	APC	SKWHITE@southernco.com

Action Items

The following action items were agreed upon by the WR 1, 3, 4 & 5 Smith IAG and should be completed prior to the next IAG Meeting.

- APC: Distribute the March Meeting Summary and WR9 workplan by March 26, 2002.
- USFS Contact APC with the USFS staff that will participate on the WR9 IAG.
- EPRO: Distribute the GIS map with the Wild and Scenic River Designation overlay to interested meeting attendees.

**Issue Action Group: WR 1, 3, 4, & 5 Smith and
WR9 Federal Lands and Waters**

Final 4-2-02

Meeting Notes & Summary: March 12, 2002

- USFS: Provide APC with a list and location of all lands experiencing problems, including recreation pressures, resource impacts and isolated lands.
- APC and USFS: Identify areas experiencing access demands. The USFS will develop this information that will particularly focus on areas of special use. This action item may include a visit by EPRO or APC staff to the USFS District Office. Also look at other proposed development and lands being bought and sold within the USFS lands. Karen Pulliam is the key contact for this action item.
- All IAG Members: Review Recreational Use Figures handout and prepare questions/comments for the next meeting.
- All IAG Members: Develop a list of recreation sites with potential capacity issues. Send the list to Barry Lovett by April 1st. The compiled list will be discussed at the next meeting.
- All IAG Members: Prepare for the WR1, 3, 4 & 5 IAG meeting on April 2, 2002 at 11 AM.

Meeting Notes

These notes summarize the major discussion items and are not intended to be a transcript or analysis of the meeting.

Introduction and IAG Update

The meeting began with participant introductions, review of the agenda, and a brief review of the WR1, 3, 4 & 5 IAG progress to date. The following agenda was agreed upon for this meeting:

1. Introductions and WR1, 3, 4 and 5 IAG Update
2. Review WR1, 3, 4 and 5 IAG January Meeting Summary
3. WR1, 3, 4 and 5 IAG - Step 2 Questions 9 and 11 through 14
4. Review Recreational Use Study
5. WR1, 3, 4 & 5 Next Steps
6. WR9 Update
7. Review WR 9 January Meeting Summary
8. Discuss WR9 Revised Issue Sheet
9. WR9 Next Steps

**Issue Action Group: WR 1, 3, 4, & 5 Smith and
WR9 Federal Lands and Waters**

Final 4-2-02

Meeting Notes & Summary: March 12, 2002

After the WR1, 3, 4 & 5 IAG update, Bruce Hamrick, a new WR1, 3, 4 & 5 IAG participant, stated the Walker County Commission's issues. The issues and pursuant discussion are summarized below:

- Request to change the water temperature of the project releases below Smith Dam. Bruce stated that the Commission would like to see increased water temperatures below the dam in order to support a warmwater fishery. Several other IAG members explained that the issue of cold water releases below Smith Dam has been identified and is being dealt with in the E10 IAG.
- Request for development of a park (similar to Clear Creek) in the proximity of the boat launch located in the Smith forebay. This item was noted and will be discussed in future WR1, 3, 4 & 5 IAG meetings.

Review WR 1, 3, 4 & 5 January Meeting Summary

The January Meeting Summary was reviewed. There were no comments on the summary. Therefore, this document will be posted as final on APC's relicensing website.

Step 2 Questions 9 and 11 through 14

Questions 9 and 11 through 13 were discussed at this time. The discussion for Question 14 was tabled due to time constraints. These Step 2 questions will be addressed in the next IAG meeting.

9. Are there known management issues associated with use?
 - a. Are there areas of congestion, and if so where?
 - Several issues were raised regarding congestion in areas that have two recreation facilities located in close proximity to each other. These areas realize a relatively high volume of boat traffic. During periods of low water, the navigable portion of the waterway decreases causing increased congestion. The areas specifically noted were:
 - Smith Lake Park and the Smith Lake Fishing Resort;
 - Castle Rock and Ryan's Creek Marinas (near County Rd 222); and
 - Duskin Point and Richards Marinas.
 - The parking lot at Smith Lake Park experiences heavy use, primarily during spring and summer months. There is a potential capacity issue at this site.
 - There is some congestion at the boat launch located near the Smith spillway. The congestion occurs on several weekends throughout the year and is due primarily to large fishing tournaments. This, however, is not a chronic problem. Congestion at this site could be alleviated through improved coordination of fishing tournaments.
 - b. Are there known conflicts, and if so where and when?

Meeting Notes & Summary: March 12, 2002

- Jet ski use was noted as a general conflict around the lake. Specific items noted for this conflict were jet ski use in the Wild and Scenic River Corridor, near fisherman and near shore.
 - There is a conflict between large boats on the lake and other recreational boaters and shoreline property owners.
 - Motorized use of the Wild and Scenic River Corridor.
 - USFS recreation facilities experience use by people illegally docking boats and utilizing the parks facilities.
- c. Are there known management issues, such as littering, trespassing, etc.?
- Litter around the lake was identified as a management issue. In particular, large pieces of styrofoam from docks was identified.
11. Identify current local benefits from recreation and any local detriments.
- Many of the local benefits and detriments are noted in the Smith Lake recreation Vision Statement.
12. Identify information on specific public safety issues.
- Some of the above conflicts (Question 9b) could be considered public safety issues.
13. Identify specific shoreline problems.
- The use of “Goat Island”, which exists only under low water conditions, was noted as a potential shoreline problem. Individuals utilize this island for boat docking and camping.
 - Informal camping causes sanitation and littering problems.

Recreational Use Figures

EPRO presented the approach for developing use figures primarily for the Coosa River Projects. The approach was presented and a summary was distributed to all meeting attendees. During this presentation, EPRO explained that the Smith Lake existing recreational use figures would be developed from the Fishery Information Management Systems (FIMS) data. The expected future use for Smith Lake will be determined by applying the USDA growth coefficients to the FIMS data. All meeting attendees agreed with this preliminary suggestion/recommendation. Recreational use figures for Smith Lake will be distributed and further discussed at a future IAG meeting.

**Issue Action Group: WR 1, 3, 4, & 5 Smith and
WR9 Federal Lands and Waters**

Final 4-2-02

Meeting Notes & Summary: March 12, 2002

The USFS will send EPRO existing recreational use figures for their sites on Smith Lake to supplement the FIMS data. The USFS also noted that they would be conducting a survey from October 2002 through October 2003 to collect additional recreation use numbers at their sites.

WR1, 3, 4 & 5 Next Steps

All WR1, 3, 4 & 5 Smith IAG materials will be distributed to work group members prior to meetings and posted on the Internet at www.southerncompany.com/alpower/hydro.

The next WR 1, 3, 4 & 5 Smith IAG conference call meeting will be held April 2, 2002 at 11 AM.

WR9 Update

There was also a discussion of the Wild and Scenic River Designation at this time. FERC noted that they are currently researching information on Wild and Scenic River Designations within FERC boundaries. Information will be made available to WR9 meeting participants after completion of the research.

Review WR 9 January Meeting Summary

The January Meeting Summary was reviewed. There were no comments on the summary. Therefore, this document will be posted as final on APC's relicensing website.

Action Items from the January Meeting Summary were reviewed at this time. At this meeting the USFS provided as-built drawings of their recreation facilities and a map with the Wild and Scenic River boundaries to EPRO. All other tasks are still underway and should be completed prior to the next WR9 meeting.

Discuss WR9 Revised Issue Sheet

There were no comments on the revised WR9 Issue Sheet. The IAG agreed that this issue sheet captured previous meeting discussion and USFS issues. Therefore, this document is considered final and will be posted along with this meeting summary on APC's relicensing website.

WR9 Next Steps

All WR9 IAG materials will be distributed to work group members prior to meetings and posted on the Internet at www.southerncompany.com/alpower/hydro.

There is no meeting scheduled for WR9 at this time. The group will proceed on completing the action items identified above.

US Forest Service & Alabama Power Meeting

Meeting Summary: USFS Bankhead District Office, Double Springs, Alabama January 23, 2003

04-04-03

List of Attendees

Attendee	Organization
Elrand Denson	USFS
Darryl Harley	USFS
Sara Lee Chubb	USFS
Glen Gaines	USFS
Joel Gardner	USFS
Joe Nicholson	USFS
Michael Cook	USFS
Michael Crump	USFS
Tom Counts	USFS
Allison Cochran	USFS
Jim Crew	APC
Barry Lovett	APC
Andy Sheppard	APC
Bill Sim	APC
Stephanie White	APC
Malcolm Pierson	APC
Jim Lochamy	APC
Sheila Smith	APC
Rick Allums	APC
Bill Campbell	E/PRO
Heather Seiders	E/PRO
Kelly Schaeffer	Kleinschmidt
Henry Mealing	Kleinschmidt
Jason Moak	Kleinschmidt

ACTION ITEMS:

Recreation

- Provide a detailed summary of the FIMS study to the USFS
Bill Campbell – February 28, 2003
- Provide recreational use data on USFS developed recreation sites at Smith Lake to APC
Michael Cook – February 28, 2003
- USFS and APC technical group will meet to discuss the above information; primary goal is to discuss and come to consensus on the baseline recreation use figures.
- Provide as-built drawings of USFS developed recreation sites at Smith Lake to APC
USFS – February 7, 2003. The Forest Service agreed to provide E-Pro/APC with a courtesy disk of developed recreation site as-built drawings that was recently developed.

US Forest Service & Alabama Power Meeting

Meeting Summary: USFS Bankhead District Office, Double Springs, Alabama January 23, 2003

04-04-03

- APC and USFS to meet again on February 11, 2003 in Birmingham to discuss recreation issues.

Ecological

- Provide copies of court decision(s) regarding pre-project conditions to USFS
Patti Leppert – February 7, 2003
- Provide copies of TE&S species database to USFS
Jason Moak – February 7, 2003
- Erosion survey of USFS developed recreation sites on Smith Lake
Pam McDaniel – February 20, 2003
- Prepare and distribute bibliography for studies in the Warrior Basin
USFS and APC – February 12, 2003
- ****Tentative:** APC and USFS to meet again on February 12, 2003 in Birmingham to discuss ecological issues. Elrand will check with Eco technical staff and let APC know if USFS would like to meet in Double Springs or in Birmingham.

MEETING NOTES:

These notes summarize the major items discussed during the meeting and are not intended to be a verbatim transcript or analysis of the meeting.

Kelly Schaeffer began the meeting with a review of the agenda and made sure that everyone had copies of the Issue Matrix prepared by APC. Kelly explained that the Issue Matrix was prepared using the comment letter that the USFS filed in response to Scoping Document I. The Issue Matrix document includes the USFS comments, organized by major categories and is intended to be used as a tool to track the discussion and ultimate resolution of USFS issues. Major issue categories listed in the Issue Matrix include Developed Recreation, Dispersed Recreation, Land Management, Aesthetics, Wild and Scenic River, Fish and Wildlife, Water Quality, Botanical, and Cultural Resources. At the time of the meeting, the Forest Service had not had prior opportunity to review the matrix and therefore was not able to agree that the matrix is appropriate as the official tracking document of USFS issues.

US Forest Service & Alabama Power Meeting

Meeting Summary: USFS Bankhead District Office, Double Springs, Alabama January 23, 2003

04-04-03

RECREATION ISSUES DISCUSSION

Meaningful Measures

The USFS representatives explained their Meaningful Measures (MM) process. The MM process is a tool that the USFS uses to determine the most cost-effective methods to develop, maintain, and operate recreation sites at an established quality level based on a predetermined conditions and management goals.

The USFS indicated a strong preference for using the MM process to evaluate specific site characteristics and cost information for its developed recreation areas on Smith Lake. The USFS noted that existing and future use estimates are significant inputs for the MM process. The USFS also said that it doesn't want any deliberations on the figures once they've gone through the MM process. APC agreed to use the USFS MM process as the basis for determining recreation deferred and operation maintenance cost. However, the group agreed that model assumptions around cost will remain open for discussion.

Recreational Use Numbers

Bill Campbell explained that he is currently using the Fisheries Information Management System (FIMS) study information to characterize recreational use on Smith Lake. He stated that, rather than perform new recreation studies, APC would prefer to use existing information from recent studies in combination with USDA methods to estimate existing and future use. The USFS generally agreed to review the FIMS data and determine if any additional data would be needed. The USFS requested a detailed description of the FIMS study, which Bill agreed to provide by the end of February.

The USFS noted that it has at least three years of monthly recreational use data for its Clear Creek and Corinth Creek sites. The USFS agreed to provide this information by the end of February, but noted that the information may include gaps or incomplete data on specific uses.

Patti Leppert suggested that the Alabama SCORP might be a good source of recreational use data. Bill Campbell noted that in the past, the Alabama SCORP has not provided such information but the new version, under development at ADECA, will likely provide much more information. Bill agreed to contact ADECA to explore whether such data will be available soon.

Bill Campbell cautioned against using existing data to project recreational use patterns too far into the future. Bill suggested that APC might use the FERC Form 80 process to reassess recreational use every 6 years over the term of the license and make appropriate adjustments to the recreation plan, rather than try to plan for the entire license term using existing data and future use projections. Both APC and the USFS indicated that using FERC Form 80 is reasonable.

US Forest Service & Alabama Power Meeting

Meeting Summary: USFS Bankhead District Office, Double Springs, Alabama January 23, 2003

04-04-03

Woody Debris

There was some discussion about the removal of woody debris from USFS properties on Smith Lake. It was noted that this issue is currently being addressed under the existing license.

Inundation and Erosion at Developed Recreation Sites

The USFS explained that lake level fluctuations at Smith Lake are impacting developed recreation sites. Some sites are actually inundated when Smith Lake is operated in flood storage mode. The USFS noted that this inundation and associated erosion is severe at the Clear Creek area and should be addressed this year, possibly through shoreline stabilization.

It was suggested that the immediate need at Clear Creek might be addressed based on existing license provisions. The USFS and APC agreed to examine erosion at the three USFS developed recreation sites in February. APC suggested using the existing erosion survey process employed by the E2 Erosion IAG. Surveys are tentatively scheduled for February 20, 2003 from 12:00 PM to 4:00 PM.

The USFS agreed to provide APC as-built drawings of these recreation sites. Subsequent discussions between USFS and APC technical experts will explore possible site redesigns to address the inundation issue. It was suggested that any redesign discussions take into account future capacity needs of those sites.

ECOLOGICAL ISSUE DISCUSSIONS

The USFS noted that since several technical experts were unavailable for this meeting, they would prefer to discuss more specific resource issues at subsequent meetings.

Pre-Project Conditions and the Baseline

APC began the discussion by stating its opposition to the consideration of pre-project conditions during analysis of the impacts of current project operations on ecological resources. Patti Leppert (FERC) cited regulations and adjudications that supported APC's position on pre-project conditions, and established that the baseline is the existing condition. It was noted that NEPA and Section 7 (ESA) analyses will describe pre-project conditions to put current conditions in a historical context. The USFS did not agree that pre-project conditions appear inconsistent with the established policy and that the USFS comments were grounded in the Federal Power Act and 18 CFR. The USFS agreed that it would hold internal discussions on these court cases to determine how they apply to their comments and policy. Patti agreed to provide copies of court decisions that she cited to the USFS.

US Forest Service & Alabama Power Meeting

Meeting Summary: USFS Bankhead District Office, Double Springs, Alabama January 23, 2003

04-04-03

Project Study Area

The USFS noted that it considers the project study area to be the areas that are or could be influenced by the project. APC recognized that there may be areas outside of the project boundary that are affected by project operations and should be considered in the effects analyses.

The USFS indicated that impacts in the project headwaters, including the entire watershed upstream of the project, should be considered when assessing impacts. The USFS noted that the flattened musk turtle study included both the headwaters and the lake in its study area.

Study and Data Needs

The USFS and APC agreed that an effort should be made to identify and use existing data to address ecological issues, and that field studies should only be considered when significant data gaps preclude a reasonable assessment of specific issues. The USFS conversed on the issue of data collection, but there was not an agreement that existing information would suffice for project related studies. The USFS noted that aquatic, botanical, and terrestrial surveys have been conducted within the project area; however, the USFS believes there are remaining data gaps that may require additional investigation, assessments, and surveys. APC noted that it has identified several sources of existing information that may be useful in addressing USFS issues. Both the USFS and APC agreed to share this existing information and work together to identify areas where available information is sufficient or insufficient.

It was noted that the E6 IAG developed a database containing information on rare, threatened, endangered, and sensitive species, which should be helpful in addressing some issues. Jason Moak previously provided a copy of this database to Sara Chubb, and will provide additional copies to other USFS personnel (Allison Cochran and Tom Counts). APC agreed to provide a bibliography of potentially relevant studies within the project area. USFS will cross-check with their reference library and provide a list of any additional studies not already identified.

Protection, Mitigation, and Enhancement Measures

APC stressed the need for the USFS to identify and propose potential protection, mitigation, and enhancement (PME) measures to address specific issues. APC explained that, if solutions to specific problems are evident and fairly straightforward, those solutions should be identified early in the process.

The USFS agreed to future meetings to discuss FS ecological concerns. The USFS noted that they considered this the first meeting to discuss the SD1 comments, which were filed with FERC on April 12, 2002. APC noted that many of the USFS issues contained in their April 12, 2002 SD1 comments had been discussed during the past year at IAG and relicensing team meetings.

US Forest Service & Alabama Power Meeting

**Meeting Summary: USFS Bankhead District Office, Double Springs, Alabama
January 23, 2003**

04-04-03

Conclusion

- APC and the USFS will meet on February 11th at 10 AM in Birmingham to further discuss recreation issues. A tentative date of February 12th was mentioned for further discussion of ecological issues. Elrand will check with USFS technical staff and let APC know of potential dates and preferred meeting locations.

Alabama Power Company (APC) & United States Forest Service (USFS)

Recreation Meeting

**Meeting Notes Summary: APC Headquarters Birmingham, Alabama
February 11, 2003**

04-04-03

Meeting Attendees

Attendee	Organization
Elrand Denson	USFS
Darryl Harley	USFS
Glen Gaines	USFS
Joe Nicholson	USFS
Michael Cook	USFS
Barry Lovett	APC
Stephanie White	APC (via telephone)
Sheila Smith	APC
Rick Allums	APC (via telephone)
Bill Campbell	E/PRO
Kelly Schaeffer	Kleinschmidt

Action Items

Recreation

- USFS comments on January 23, 2003 meeting notes to Kelly Schaeffer.
Elrand Denson – February 17, 2003
- Schedule recreation technical meeting for March 27, 2003.
APC – February 17, 2003
- Clear Creek field trip on March 20, 2003 at 12:00 p.m.
USFS and APC
- USFS comments on Boat Ramps (provided at the meeting by Michael Cook)
- Denote recreation sites that are out of compliance with the LRMP on a map, including a description of the problem and notation of problematic time (seasonal vs. year-round).
E/PRO– March 1, 2003

Ecological

- Contact Joe Nicholson regarding erosion survey method.
Pam McDaniel – February, 2003
- Think about potential management actions for eroded sites.

Alabama Power Company (APC) & United States Forest Service (USFS)

Recreation Meeting

**Meeting Notes Summary: APC Headquarters Birmingham, Alabama
February 11, 2003**

04-04-03

USFS and APC – March 20, 2003

Other

- Discuss how to address operational information regarding how much of the Sipsey Fork Wild and Scenic River segment is inundated during winter and summer pool conditions.
APC – March, 2003
- Review the Sipsey Fork Wild and Scenic River Environmental Impact Statement.
APC – March, 2003
- Recreation and Ecological meeting scheduled for April 24, 2003. Elrand to check with environmental staff to see if this date is acceptable.
APC and USFS
- Response to January 2003 USFS letter.
APC – After February 19th meeting

Meeting Notes

These notes summarize the major items discussed during the meeting and are not intended to be a verbatim transcript of the meeting.

Comments on Draft January 23, 2003 Meeting Summary

The USFS expressed dissatisfaction with the January 23, 2003 meeting summary in that they felt the summary did not accurately reflect the dialogue and decisions between APC and the USFS. Elrand Denson noted that the summary portrayed the USFS acquiescence on items where they did not feel that decisions were made. Specifically, the USFS noted that the meaningful measures summary did not accurately reflect the discussion and that the USFS would like the notes to reflect APC's agreement with the meaningful measures process. Elrand Denson will forward the USFS's comments to Kelly Schaeffer.

The USFS said that specific to "pre-project conditions and the baseline", the USFS is not in agreement with the FERC on FERC's definition of baseline and that the court cases that Patti Leppert forwarded to the USFS are based on the Federal Power Act Sections 10(a) and 10(j) conditions, not Section 4(e). Some discussion ensued but APC noted that this issue is primarily between the USFS and FERC and further discussion between the two federal agencies was suggested.

Alabama Power Company (APC) & United States Forest Service (USFS)

Recreation Meeting

**Meeting Notes Summary: APC Headquarters Birmingham, Alabama
February 11, 2003**

04-04-03

Clear Creek Meeting

APC and the USFS agreed to meet at Clear Creek on March 20, 2003 to discuss several ecological and recreation issues. In preparation for this meeting, Pam McDaniel (APC) will contact the Art Goddard – Erosion Specialist with the USFS, to discuss the erosion survey methodology previously employed on other areas including the Smith Tailrace and multiple locations on the Coosa River.

USFS January 2003 Letter

We discussed the January 2003 USFS letter to Mike Akridge, APC, regarding woody debris, immediate erosion concerns and sand needed this year at the USFS's three recreation sites. The USFS notes sand at the Clear Creek beach area is typically put down in October and/or November but no sand has been replaced on these sites for three years. The USFS would like APC to commit to some permanent annual help with this project and will follow up with APC on the type and amount of sand they generally use to address visitor satisfaction. With input provided by the USFS and following the February site visit, APC then make a decision on how to respond to the USFS request. The USFS requested that APC respond in writing and if need be, to have further face-to-face meetings or telephone conference calls.

Following this discussion, the meeting participants continued discussing the matrix of USFS scoping document 1 comments.

Recreation Capacity

Bill Campbell asked the USFS to discuss their expectation with regard to assessing recreational capacity and identifying areas of greatest suitability. Elrand noted that the USFS might not be the best entity to meet the public demand and that we all need to recognize the site capacity and recreational/population trends. For example, Elrand noted that the USFS might not be the area experiencing the highest recreational use and that recreation use includes more than what is occurring on public land. Bill then proceeded to provide the group with a map and handout listing the various boat ramps on the Lewis Smith Reservoir. The USFS provided feedback on the categories in which these facilities were listed, revised the number of ramps and lanes available, and clarified whether various facilities were informal or formal".

The Michael Cook provided Bill Campbell with the FS comments regarding the maps he presented at the meeting.

Facility Needs at Established Sites

Alabama Power Company (APC) & United States Forest Service (USFS)

Recreation Meeting

**Meeting Notes Summary: APC Headquarters Birmingham, Alabama
February 11, 2003**

04-04-03

Part of the USFS's mission is make the recreation sites more accessible and to have return visitors. Funding for these sites is allocated annually from the USFS recreation and O&M budget however, the FS is experiencing a serious budget shortfall and concessionaires take about 93% of revenue at Clear Creek and Corinth. In addition to site specific needs, there are a few repairs that are common to the USFS's recreation facilities at Bankhead National Forest including:

- Water fountain replacements/repairs
- Removal of in-ground trash cans
- Bathroom facilities at the boat ramps
- Supplemental parking
- Electrical upgrades
- Additional bank fishing areas

Clear Creek

Site specific repairs and improvements include:

- Additional power / wiring infrastructure (this site was originally designed for a 15 amp electrical structure)
- Reengineering of the sewage system lift pumps which fail frequently
- The asphalt on paved path is worn out and needs repaving
- Playground (Corinth also has a need for a playground)
- Extending or installing a new courtesy pier

The USFS noted that the most requested improvements are the playground and courtesy pier.

Houston

There are several infrastructure needs at this site including:

- Hot water heater
- Grills
- Water system
- Paved parking and repainting of existing parking facilities

Education / Environmental Interpretation

Alabama Power Company (APC) & United States Forest Service (USFS)

Recreation Meeting

**Meeting Notes Summary: APC Headquarters Birmingham, Alabama
February 11, 2003**

04-04-03

Concessionaires at the Clear Creek and Corinth sites are supposed to provide educational and interpretation services; however, the USFS feels that the concessionaires efforts have not produced the results they would like to see. The USFS is looking for a half or full time person to help them with these efforts, specifically with the Clear Creek interpretative trail.

Land Resources Management Plan (LRMP)

There are 10 sites not in conformance with the LRMP (A public draft of the LRMP will be available in early March, 2003). The sites noted by the USFS are remote sites with high dispersed use and some exhibit severe erosion and trash issues. Through the discussion, APC and the USFS discussed further ground-truthing and agreed to visit the sites to better determine the problems and investigate possible solutions.

Recreation Realignment

There is a USFS effort to align recreation opportunities with public demands/needs and within the USFS's existing budget.

Sipsey Fork

The USFS is concerned that operation of Smith Lake is having an adverse impact on the Sipsey Wild and Scenic River (WSR). The USFS noted that conditions have changed that allow additional access to the WSR and the original environmental impact statement (EIS) for the designation of the Sipsey as a WSR did not address the condition changes. The USFS requested that APC evaluate and discuss with the USFS their operational information including a map of the Sipsey at summer and winter pool. They also asked APC to determine if there has been an operational change/policy since the designation of the Sipsey as a WSR, which occurred in 1988.

Conclusion

APC and the USFS will meet on April 24th, 2003 to further discuss ecological and recreation issues. The time and meeting location to be determined.

Meeting Notes Summary: March 19, 2003

Warrior River Projects

www.southerncompany.com/alpower/hydro**Meeting Attendees**

Mike Akridge	APC	RMAKRIDG@southernco.com
Rick Allums	APC	RKALLUMS@southernco.com
Amy Bennett	Kleinschmidt	Amy.Bennett@KleinschmidtUSA.com
Keith Bryant	APC	kebryant@southernco.com
Jim Crew	APC	JFCrew@southernco.com
Bruce DiGennaro	Kleinschmidt	Bruce.DiGennaro@Kleinschmidtusa.com
Bill Dillahunt	APC	WRDILLAH@southernco.com
Jim Hancock	Balch & Bingham	JHANCOCK@balch.com
Darryl Harley	USFS	dmharley@fs.fed.us
Patti Leppert (via telephone)	FERC	patricia.leppert@ferc.fed.us
Barry Lovett	APC	BKLOVETT@southernco.com
Joe Nicholson	USFS	jnicholson@fs.fed.us
Walter Ramey	APC	WRRAMEY@southernco.com
Kelly Schaeffer	Kleinschmidt	Kelly.Schaeffer@KleinschmidtUSA.com
Heather Seiders	EPRO	hseiders@eproconsulting.com
Andy Sheppard	APC	ARSHEPPA@southernco.com
Sheila Smith	APC	SCSMITH@southernco.com
Dana Valleau	EPRO	dvalleau@eproconsulting.com
Stephanie White	APC	SKWHITE@southernco.com

Action Items

The following action items were agreed upon by the meeting attendees:

Recreation

- Joe Nicholson and Bill Campbell will conduct a Recreation Technical Meeting via conference call. - March 27, 2003
- USFS comments on January 23, 2003 meeting notes to Barry Lovett and Kelly Schaeffer. Elrand Denson – February 17, 2003
- Revise and redistribute January and February Meeting Summaries. USFS and APC –April 2003
- USFS comments on Boat Ramps (Attachment A) to Bill Campbell. USFS – February 25, 2003
- Denote recreation sites that are out of compliance with the LRMP on a map, including a description of the problem and notation of problematic time (seasonal vs. year-round). E/PRO– March 1, 2003

Meeting Notes Summary: March 19, 2003

- Joe Nicholson agreed to discuss the FIMS review time with USFS staff members and provide APC and FERC with a proposed time line for the USFS's review and comment
USFS – April 2003
- Joe Nicholson to provide Bill Campbell with a contact name regarding the Cradle of Forestry data.
USFS – April 2003
- APC will revise the matrix of issues to identify/clarify the perceived “nexus” to the project and indicate those items in need of clarification and to APC, those items where there is no clear nexus to the project.
APC – April, 2003

Other

- Discuss how to address operational information regarding how much of the Sipsey Fork Wild and Scenic River segment is inundated during winter and summer pool conditions.
APC –March 2003
- USFS to send a copy of the Sipsey Fork Wild and Scenic River Environmental Impact Statement to APC for review.
USFS and APC – March 2003
- Recreation and Ecological meeting scheduled for April 24, 2003. Elrand to check with environmental staff to see if this date is acceptable.
APC and USFS
- Response to January 2003 USFS letter.
APC – After February 19th meeting
- APC to develop a GIS map with overlays that display full pool and winter pool levels on the Sipsey Fork Wild and Scenic River.
APC – April 2003
- The USFS and FERC will continue to discuss the environmental baseline policy “off-line” and will discuss with APC.
FERC and USFS – April 2003

Meeting Notes

These notes summarize the major discussion items and are not intended to be a transcript or analysis of the meeting.

Introduction

Meeting Notes Summary: March 19, 2003

The meeting began with participant introductions and review of the agenda. The following agenda was agreed upon for this meeting, with the caveat that agenda items may be altered during the course of the meeting due to limited USFS representation:

- Introductions
- Meeting Summaries Update
- Follow-up on Action Items
- Summary of Feb 20th Site Visit (woody debris; erosion; beach sand)
- Discussion on Matrix Issues
- Moving Forward (areas of common concern; areas without project nexus)

At this time, the meeting attendees were reminded that the focus of this meeting was recreation issues related to the USFS lands. .

Meeting Summaries Update

APC stated that the January Meeting Summary notes would be revised in order to further clarify and address outstanding issues. APC will incorporate Elrand Denson's comments to the draft summary, where there is agreement, and distribute the notes in early April.

APC will also complete an internal review of the February Meeting Summary and distribute the February 2003 summary by early April. APC and the USFS will then discuss making these final at the April 24, 2003 meeting.

Follow-up on Action Items

The following list summarizes the review of action items by USFS and APC:

- Joe Nicholson checked with Glen Gaines regarding the boat ramp issue and will provide revisions to Bill Campbell. Bill will incorporate the revisions and redistribute the text to the USFS.
- EPRO will send a recreation map to Glen Gaines, which denotes dispersed recreation "hot-spots". These "hot spots" are sites that are out of compliance with the USFS Land Management Plan. Upon receiving the map, the USFS will have the district staff conduct field visits to these sites and compile information that will be discussed at the next meeting. APC stated that a joint USFS and APC field trip could be scheduled in April or May to visit these sites—all parties agreed with having a site visit, and APC and the USFS will attempt to schedule a field visit in May. During the site visit, APC will compile GPS coordinates for each "hot spot" and further refine the map to reflect this information. The group may have difficulties visiting all sites because some "hot spots" are not accessible by boat. The group also decided to view several of the formal recreation sites from the water.
- APC will develop a GIS map with overlays that display full pool and winter pool levels at the Sipsey Fork Wild and Scenic River. APC would like to assess these operational differences

Meeting Notes Summary: March 19, 2003

and use the map as a basis for future discussions. APC will distribute the map to the USFS by April 24, 2003. In response, the USFS reiterated that they would always defer back to their SD1 comment letter regarding slack water issues on the Sipsey Fork Wild and Scenic River. APC also acknowledged that it owes the USFS a whitepaper on Sipsey operations before April 24.

- The USFS will send a copy of the Sipsey EIS to APC.
- Joe Nicholson informed the meeting attendees that he has not had the opportunity to review the FIMS study and evaluate it to see if it can and/or should be used. The USFS is trying to determine if Ken Cordell's methodology dovetails with the FIMS study. Joe would like to forward the study to several USFS research staff in order to obtain their opinions. Joe estimates that the USFS review of the study will take a couple months. FERC encouraged the USFS to review the FIMS study in a shorter period of time and offered their assistance with any recreation use review. Joe agreed to discuss the review time with USFS staff members and provide APC and FERC with a proposed time line.
- The USFS noted that it has been collecting demographic data that could provide beneficial information in the context of potential future recreation analyses. Joe will provide Bill Campbell with a contact name regarding the Cradle of Forestry data.
- APC provided a preliminary response to an update on the January 2003 USFS letter. The following summarizes the response and ensuing discussion.
 - APC will draft a written response to the USFS's January 2003 letter. In the response, APC will separate relicensing and compliance related issues; will determine if the issues are directly related to project operations, and may provide the cost of resolving each issue.
 - APC stated that it did not see any urgent erosion issues during the February site visit, as were identified/depicted by the USFS in previous meetings. However, APC will continue to process information as it becomes available and evaluate this issue.
 - Barry Lovett stated that APC, in its opinion, is working cooperatively with the USFS to address the woody debris issue. APC interprets this to be a license compliance issue.

At this time, the USFS staff, during recent recreation site visits, noted that several sites were inundated with water, which was creating debris problems (trees and lake debris). The USFS stated its three recreation sites need to be cleared of debris. The USFS acknowledged that in the past, it has removed debris from these sites, but was hoping for a cooperative effort with APC this year.

Rick Allums (APC) explained that APC has been working with Mike Cook (USFS) to determine the debris removal needs, frequency, and clean up schedule.

Meeting Notes Summary: March 19, 2003

APC has continuous dialogue with Mike Cook (USFS) and stated that Mike would inform APC of the debris removal schedule/needs prior to Memorial Day. APC explained that the most effective approach to debris removal is to delay the removal until late May because lake levels should be stabilized at that time and then only one clean up would be necessary. Darryl will contact Mike regarding this issue and will let APC know if any changes to current practices are warranted. Darryl will also check with USFS staff to determine if they are requesting APC remove debris after every flood event or just once per year before the recreation season opens.

- Patti Leppert of FERC reminded the meeting attendees that she circulated a link to the Circuit Court of Appeals decision upholding FERC's Environmental Baseline Policy. The USFS, after consulting with its national team, stated that it has a different opinion than FERC regarding the way the decision was rendered and the applicability of the case to current relicensing issues. The USFS and FERC will continue to discuss this issue "off-line" and will report findings back to the group.
- The next step in the process is to plan for the April 24th meeting on ecological and recreation issues.

Summary of Feb 20th Site Visit (woody debris; erosion; beach sand)

APC is still working on a written response to issues raised in connection with this site visit. The woody debris issue was discussed in this meeting.

Discussion on Matrix Issues

Due to the limited USFS representation, the detailed review of the issues matrix was tabled, with the exception of one comment. Darryl Harley mentioned that some USFS issues were missing on the matrix. APC agreed to review the list and revise the document, as necessary. The discussion will be conducted at the next USFS meeting.

At this time, Darryl noted that Elrand Denson would not be available for a relicensing meeting until April 19th. Darryl will also contact Elrand to determine his availability for the meeting on April 24th. The USFS explained that the upcoming wild land fire season might disrupt meetings and force the USFS to put a hold on some of these meetings. However, the USFS will make every effort to keep APC updated.

Moving Forward (areas of common concern; areas without project nexus)

The following summarizes this discussion:

- APC has spent a significant amount of time discussing SD1 comments internally and meeting with the USFS regarding the issues.

Meeting Notes Summary: March 19, 2003

- APC acknowledged that this meeting was still an opportunity to respond to several USFS issues in a general manner.
- APC explained that there is a critical need to have further dialogue on issues with a clear “nexus” to the project.
- APC restated that it remains very interested in working with the USFS on beach sand; erosion, woody debris, boat ramps, and other relicensing oriented issues.
- APC stated that some issues (*i.e.*, USFS operation and maintenance funds and improvements to facilities outside of the FERC project boundary) have no clear “nexus” to APC’s hydro project. Therefore, APC sees little value in additional dialogue on those items at this time or in this process. However, APC encouraged the USFS to provide information on potential project “nexus” on any issues where there is disagreement between the USFS and APC. The USFS’s explanation would be discussed and APC would reevaluate each issue. Darryl suggested that APC submit a formal written response to Mr. James A. Gooder, Forest Supervisor. APC noted that the alternative licensing process is designed to facilitate discussion face to face or via telephone to resolve issues and that there were not in favor of writing a letter. At this time, APC would like to put some of these “non-nexus” issues in the parking lot and move forward with those issues with a clear nexus and/or those where additional information and clarification from the USFS would render the issue as “project nexus”.
- In response to APC’s statements, the USFS noted that APC was becoming very positional and that if they wanted to state these non-nexus issues, the USFS preference would be to do it in writing, formally to Mr. Gooder. The listing of a disagreement in letter format will allow the USFS to elevate to the correct level for a management decision to be made in resolving the area of disagreement.
- To better understand what items APC considers “project nexus” and “no project nexus” and those that need clarification, APC will insert a column in the SD1 issues matrix to identify/clarify its perceived “nexus” to the project. Categories in this column will include: philosophical differences; “nexus” – continue dialogue; and need clarification. APC proposes to color code these items to develop an easier method of reading the categories. APC also stated that at some point, they may provide written documentation to Mr. Gooder regarding philosophical disagreements and “non-nexus” issues.
- Patti Leppert mentioned that the USFS and FERC can cooperatively prepare the environmental document based on APC’s filing of the final license application and applicant prepared environmental assessment (APEA). FERC also stated that the USFS and FERC could conduct joint scoping meetings, be involved in settlements, and discuss project “nexus” definitions and issues. Patti has compiled a list of other FERC projects that include USFS lands and she will provide this list to all meeting participants.

Meeting Notes Summary: March 19, 2003

Darryl stated that the USFS loses standing (*i.e.*, the USFS can not be an intervening party if it becomes a “cooperating agency” with FERC) when they agree to the above approach. The USFS wants to maintain their standing and is concerned about the potential of USFS issues being “dropped” by the Commission if the USFS chooses to cooperate with the FERC in the development of any environmental assessment. Therefore, the FERC and the USFS will discuss how they can potentially proceed and address the USFS concerns. Patti also suggested that the two agencies could sit down with Mona Janopul regarding relicensing issues and then provide information to this group and the Forest Supervisor.

- The USFS has reviewed the project’s operations, existing license and scoping information and believes that their letter captures the USFS issues. The USFS also expressed concerns regarding APC’s determination that some issues have no “nexus” to the project, particularly before all existing information has been gathered or presented.

This group will plan to meet again at 9:00 am on April 24th in Birmingham to discuss recreation and ecological issues relating to the USFS lands.

Meeting Notes Summary: March 19, 2003

Warrior River Projects

www.southerncompany.com/alpower/hydro**Meeting Attendees**

Mike Akridge	APC	RMAKRIDG@southernco.com
Rick Allums	APC	RKALLUMS@southernco.com
Amy Bennett	Kleinschmidt	Amy.Bennett@KleinschmidtUSA.com
Keith Bryant	APC	kebryant@southernco.com
Jim Crew	APC	JFCrew@southernco.com
Bruce DiGennaro	Kleinschmidt	Bruce.DiGennaro@Kleinschmidtusa.com
Bill Dillahunt	APC	WRDILLAH@southernco.com
Jim Hancock	Balch & Bingham	JHANCOCK@balch.com
Darryl Harley	USFS	dmharley@fs.fed.us
Patti Leppert (via telephone)	FERC	patricia.leppert@ferc.fed.us
Barry Lovett	APC	BKLOVETT@southernco.com
Joe Nicholson	USFS	jnicholson@fs.fed.us
Walter Ramey	APC	WRRAMEY@southernco.com
Kelly Schaeffer	Kleinschmidt	Kelly.Schaeffer@KleinschmidtUSA.com
Heather Seiders	EPRO	hseiders@eproconsulting.com
Andy Sheppard	APC	ARSHEPPA@southernco.com
Sheila Smith	APC	SCSMITH@southernco.com
Dana Valleau	EPRO	dvalleau@eproconsulting.com
Stephanie White	APC	SKWHITE@southernco.com

Action Items

The following action items were agreed upon by the meeting attendees:

Recreation

- Joe Nicholson and Bill Campbell will conduct a Recreation Technical Meeting via conference call. - March 27, 2003
- USFS comments on January 23, 2003 meeting notes to Barry Lovett and Kelly Schaeffer. Elrand Denson – February 17, 2003
- Revise and redistribute January and February Meeting Summaries. USFS and APC –April 2003
- USFS comments on Boat Ramps (Attachment A) to Bill Campbell. USFS – February 25, 2003
- Denote recreation sites that are out of compliance with the LRMP on a map, including a description of the problem and notation of problematic time (seasonal vs. year-round). E/PRO– March 1, 2003

Meeting Notes Summary: March 19, 2003

- Joe Nicholson agreed to discuss the FIMS review time with USFS staff members and provide APC and FERC with a proposed time line for the USFS's review and comment
USFS – April 2003
- Joe Nicholson to provide Bill Campbell with a contact name regarding the Cradle of Forestry data.
USFS – April 2003
- APC will revise the matrix of issues to identify/clarify the perceived “nexus” to the project and indicate those items in need of clarification and to APC, those items where there is no clear nexus to the project.
APC – April, 2003

Other

- Discuss how to address operational information regarding how much of the Sipsey Fork Wild and Scenic River segment is inundated during winter and summer pool conditions.
APC –March 2003
- USFS to send a copy of the Sipsey Fork Wild and Scenic River Environmental Impact Statement to APC for review.
USFS and APC – March 2003
- Recreation and Ecological meeting scheduled for April 24, 2003. Elrand to check with environmental staff to see if this date is acceptable.
APC and USFS
- Response to January 2003 USFS letter.
APC – After February 19th meeting
- APC to develop a GIS map with overlays that display full pool and winter pool levels on the Sipsey Fork Wild and Scenic River.
APC – April 2003
- The USFS and FERC will continue to discuss the environmental baseline policy “off-line” and will discuss with APC.
FERC and USFS – April 2003

Meeting Notes

These notes summarize the major discussion items and are not intended to be a transcript or analysis of the meeting.

Introduction

Meeting Notes Summary: March 19, 2003

The meeting began with participant introductions and review of the agenda. The following agenda was agreed upon for this meeting, with the caveat that agenda items may be altered during the course of the meeting due to limited USFS representation:

- Introductions
- Meeting Summaries Update
- Follow-up on Action Items
- Summary of Feb 20th Site Visit (woody debris; erosion; beach sand)
- Discussion on Matrix Issues
- Moving Forward (areas of common concern; areas without project nexus)

At this time, the meeting attendees were reminded that the focus of this meeting was recreation issues related to the USFS lands. [FS notes do not reflect this as being said.](#)

Meeting Summaries Update

APC stated that the January Meeting Summary notes would be revised in order to further clarify and address outstanding issues. APC will incorporate Elrand Denson's comments to the draft summary, where there is agreement, and distribute the notes in early April.

[The FS position is "record the notes as accurately as is possible and if there is disagreement – so state it." APC must record what is said not just what it wants to.](#)

APC will also complete an internal review of the February Meeting Summary and distribute the February 2003 summary by early April. APC and the USFS will then discuss making these final at the April 24, 2003 meeting.

Follow-up on Action Items

The following list summarizes the review of action items by USFS and APC:

- Joe Nicholson checked with Glen Gaines regarding the boat ramp issue and will provide revisions to Bill Campbell. Bill will incorporate the revisions and redistribute the text to the USFS.
- EPRO will send a recreation map to Glen Gaines, which denotes dispersed recreation "hot-spots". These "hot spots" are sites that are out of compliance with the USFS Land Management Plan. Upon receiving the map, the USFS will have the district staff conduct field visits to these sites and compile information that will be discussed at the next meeting. APC stated that a joint USFS and APC field trip could be scheduled in April or May to visit these sites—all parties agreed with having a site visit, and APC and the USFS will attempt to schedule a field visit in May. During the site visit, APC will compile GPS coordinates for each "hot spot" and further refine the map to reflect this information. The group may have difficulties visiting all sites because some "hot spots" are not accessible by boat. The group also decided to view several of the formal recreation sites from the water.

Meeting Notes Summary: March 19, 2003

- APC will develop a GIS map with overlays that display full pool and winter pool levels at the Sipsey Fork Wild and Scenic River. APC would like to assess these operational differences and use the map as a basis for future discussions. APC will distribute the map to the USFS by April 24, 2003. In response, the USFS reiterated that they would always defer back to their SD1 comment letter regarding slack water issues on the Sipsey Fork Wild and Scenic River. APC also acknowledged that it owes the USFS a whitepaper on Sipsey operations before April 24.
- The USFS will send a copy of the Sipsey EIS to APC.
- Joe Nicholson informed the meeting attendees that he has not had the opportunity to review the FIMS study and evaluate it to see if it can and/or should be used. The USFS is trying to determine if Ken Cordell's methodology dovetails with the FIMS study. Joe would like to forward the study to several USFS research staff in order to obtain their opinions. Joe estimates that the USFS review of the study will take a couple months. FERC encouraged the USFS to review the FIMS study in a shorter period of time and offered their assistance with any recreation use review. Joe agreed to discuss the review time with USFS staff members and provide APC and FERC with a proposed time line.
- The USFS noted that it has been collecting demographic data that could provide beneficial information in the context of potential future recreation analyses. Joe will provide Bill Campbell with a contact name regarding the Cradle of Forestry data.
- APC provided a preliminary response to an update on the January 2003 USFS letter. The following summarizes the response and ensuing discussion.
 - APC will draft a written response to the USFS's January 2003 letter. In the response, APC will separate relicensing and compliance related issues; will determine if the issues are directly related to project operations, and may provide the cost of resolving each issue. [On this date – APC did not agree to submit a response letter to the FS. The FS appreciates APC willingness to comply with the original request made on March 19, 2003.](#)
 - In the February site visit, APC stated that it did not see any urgent erosion issues, as were identified/depicted by the USFS in previous meetings. However, APC will continue to process information as it becomes available and evaluate this issue. [FS notes indicate this was not expressed at the March 19 meeting.](#)
 - Barry Lovett stated that APC, in its opinion, is working cooperatively with the USFS to address the woody debris issue. APC interprets this to be a license compliance issue.

At this time, the USFS staff, during recent recreation site visits, noted that several sites were inundated with water, which was creating debris problems (trees and lake debris). The USFS stated its three recreation sites need to be cleared of

Meeting Notes Summary: March 19, 2003

debris. The USFS acknowledged that in the past, it has removed debris from these sites, but was hoping for a cooperative effort with APC this year.

Rick Allums (APC) explained that APC has been working with Mike Cook (USFS) to determine the debris removal needs, frequency, and clean up schedule. APC has continuous dialogue with Mike Cook (USFS) and stated that Mike would inform APC of the debris removal schedule/needs prior to Memorial Day. APC explained that the most effective approach to debris removal is to delay the removal until late May because lake levels should be stabilized at that time and then only one clean up would be necessary. Darryl will contact Mike regarding this issue and will let APC know if any changes to current practices are warranted. Darryl will also check with USFS staff to determine if they are requesting APC remove debris after every flood event or just once per year before the recreation season opens.

- Patti Leppert of FERC reminded the meeting attendees that she circulated a link to the Circuit Court of Appeals decision upholding FERC's Environmental Baseline Policy. The USFS, after consulting with its national team, stated that it has a different opinion than FERC regarding the way the decision was rendered and the applicability of the case to current relicensing issues. The USFS and FERC will continue to discuss this issue "off-line" and will report findings back to the group.
- The next step in the process is to plan for the April 24th meeting on ecological and recreation issues.

Summary of Feb 20th Site Visit (woody debris; erosion; beach sand)

APC is still working on a written response to issues raised in connection with this site visit. The woody debris issue was discussed in this meeting.

Discussion on Matrix Issues

Due to the limited USFS representation, the detailed review of the issues matrix was tabled, with the exception of one comment. Darryl Harley mentioned that some USFS issues were missing on the matrix. APC agreed to review the list and revise the document, as necessary. The discussion will be conducted at the next USFS meeting.

At this time, Darryl noted that Elrand Denson would not be available for a relicensing meeting until April 19th. Darryl will also contact Elrand to determine his availability for the meeting on April 24th. The USFS explained that the upcoming wild land fire season might disrupt meetings and force the USFS to put a hold on some of these meetings. However, the USFS will make every effort to keep APC updated.

Moving Forward (areas of common concern; areas without project nexus)

Meeting Notes Summary: March 19, 2003

The following summarizes this discussion:

- APC has spent a significant amount of time discussing SD1 comments internally and meeting with the USFS regarding the issues. **The FS position is APC has not spent enough time with this document nor the issues cited therein.**
- APC acknowledged that this meeting was still an opportunity to respond to several USFS issues in a general manner.
- APC explained that there is a critical need to have further dialogue on issues with a clear “nexus” to the project. **FS stated, “ Until studies are completed and the related data analyzed a project nexus can’t determined or ruled out”.**
- APC restated that it remains very interested in working with the USFS on beach sand; erosion, woody debris, boat ramps, and other relicensing oriented issues.
- APC stated that some issues (*i.e.*, USFS operation and maintenance funds and improvements to facilities outside of the FERC project boundary) have no clear “nexus” to APC’s hydro project. Therefore, APC sees little value in additional dialogue on those items at this time or in this process. However, APC encouraged the USFS to provide information on potential project “nexus” on any issues where there is disagreement between the USFS and APC. **Again, the FS position is until all requested studies are complete and the data analyzed, we find it premature to determine categorically what constitutes a project nexus.** The USFS’s explanation would be discussed and APC would reevaluate each issue Darryl suggested that APC submit a formal written response to Mr. Goodard (**Mr. James A. Gooder, Forest Supervisor**) APC noted that the alternative licensing process is designed to facilitate discussion face to face or via telephone to resolve issues and that there were not in favor of writing a letter. At this time, APC would like to put some of these “non-nexus” issues in the parking lot and move forward with those issues with a clear nexus and/or those where additional information and clarification from the USFS would render the issue as “project nexus”.
- In response to APC’s statements, the USFS noted that APC was becoming very positional and that if they wanted to state these non-nexus issues, the USFS preference would be to do it in writing, formally to Mr. Goodard. (**Gooder**) **The listing of a disagreement in letter format will allow the FS to elevate to the correct level for a management decision to be made in resolving the area of disagreement.**
- To better understand what items APC considers “project nexus” and “no project nexus” and those that need clarification, APC will insert a column in the SD1 issues matrix to identify/clarify its perceived “nexus” to the project. Categories in this column will include: philosophical differences; “nexus” – continue dialogue; and need clarification. APC proposes to color code these items to develop an easier method of reading the

Meeting Notes Summary: March 19, 2003

categories. APC also stated that at some point, they may provide written documentation to Mr. Goodard ([Gooder](#)) regarding philosophical disagreements and “non-nexus” issues.

- Patti Leppert mentioned that the USFS and FERC can cooperatively prepare the environmental document based on APC’s filing of the final license application and applicant prepared environmental assessment (APEA). FERC also stated that the USFS and FERC could conduct joint scoping meetings, be involved in settlements, and discuss project “nexus” definitions and issues. Patti has compiled a list of other FERC projects that include USFS lands and she will provide this list to all meeting participants.

Darryl stated that the USFS [loses standing](#) (*i.e.*, the USFS can not be an intervening party if it becomes a “cooperating agency” with FERC) when they agree to the above approach. [The USFS wants to maintain their standing and is concerned about the potential of USFS issues being “dropped” by the Commission if the FS chooses to cooperate with the FERC in the development of any environmental assessment.](#) Therefore, the FERC and the USFS will discuss how they can potentially proceed and address the USFS concerns. Patti also suggested that the two agencies could sit down with Mona Janopul regarding relicensing issues and then provide information to this group and the Forest Supervisor.

- APC expressed hope that they can work with the USFS in a similar manner as they have been working with the USFWS and ADCNR. [This statement was not mentioned during the meeting of March 19, 2003.](#)
- The USFS has reviewed the project’s operations, existing license and scoping information and believes that their letter captures the USFS issues. The USFS also expressed concerns regarding APC’s determination that some issues have no “nexus” to the project, particularly before all existing information has been gathered or presented.

This group will plan to meet again at 9:00 am on April 24th in Birmingham to discuss recreation and ecological issues relating to the USFS lands.

Meeting Notes

USFS/APC Technical Conference Call

March 27, 2003

Attendees

Bill Campbell	Joe Nicholson
Sheila Smith	Michael Cook
Keith Bryant	Glen Gaines

- FS has just started reviewing the FIMS Study. They are attempting to coordinate with USDA people who are more familiar with the accepted recreational use projection methodology. They are currently not prepared to discuss the adequacy of the FIMS study, or APC's use of the study.
- FS has supplied APC with three years of recreational use data (2000, 01 & 02) for Clear Creek and Corinth facilities. Data includes; age profile (adult or child), type of camping unit, camper origin by state, Golden age/access card and day use numbers. Mike Cook is currently working on data for the Houston facility. The Houston data will not be as accurate as the Clear Creek and Corinth data and there will also be significantly fewer users.
- FS suggested that E/PRO contact Cradle of Forestry of America Interpretation Association (Shawn Amacher, 828-884-4185 and Judy Doyle, 828-862-5368) for additional information or clarification on the Clear Creek and Corinth facilities.
- The group discussed the need for a joint fieldtrip to review informal recreational use sites on FS property. It was decided that it should be a joint Eco/Rec exam.
- Prior to a fieldtrip both the FS and APC would review their current information to determine if there are other informal sites not currently documented. (Mike Cook indicated that development may have disrupted some existing sites and possibly other sites may be in use.)
- E/PRO will transfer FS information on informal site locations (copies of topo maps provided earlier) to a GIS map and forward to the National Forest District Office. FS will then review the information and add any sites they feel were overlooked.
- E/PRO and APC will review their existing information by making additional contacts with local fishing guides, APC surveillance contractors and the Marine Police to see if anyone is aware of additional informal sites.

- E/PRO discussed other existing sources of information, if there was agreement that additional data was necessary to clarify issues within the FS Administrative District, after a fieldtrip to the informal sites.
- FS discussed issues that could affect recreational use within the National Forest. In addition to beach flooding, woody debris and some erosion areas at recreation sites, the FS brought up ADA bank fishing at both high water and low water conditions. (There appeared to be more concern with low water access) They also brought up the issue of some of the boats ramps may need hardened extensions at extreme low water conditions. This past year there have been no problems with boat launching conditions. E/PRO indicated there was good information available on low water ramp conditions at their facilities.
- Joe Nicholson requested that the original ACT/FIMS IAG package (on recreational use projections) be sent to him to review. E/PRO indicated they would do so.
- Joe Nicholson asked how the FS data would be used in relation to the FIMS data. E/PRO explained that the FS data would not be related to the FIMS study at all. The FIMS Study is being used to characterize overall use of the Smith Project. The exact use of the FS data could not be decided until all the information was collected, however, the data would probably be presented independently from the FIMS data as site specific characterization of use at FS sites.
- Joe Nicholson also requested a written summary of how APC intended to use and present recreational use data that has been supplied by the FS for the individual recreational facilities. The FS asked if was possible to project future use from that data. E/PRO explained the data would have to be studied and discussed with the statistician who prepared the FIMS projections. E/PRO indicated a brief summary could be prepared.
- Glen Gaines asked when the "meaningful measures" information would be available for discussions. Joe Nicholson indicated that early summer was as close as he could estimate.
- E/PRO asked about the availability of the new Forest Management Plan. Apparently there has been a problem with the printer but both APC and E/PRO are on the mailing list. In the interim Joe will send a Website address to E/PRO where the document can be located.

Meeting Notes Summary: April 24, 2003

Warrior River Projects

www.southerncompany.com/alpower/hydro

Meeting Attendees

Mike Akridge	APC
Ramsay Brown	APC
Bill Campbell (via telephone)	EPRO
Sara Chubb	USFS
Tom Counts	USFS
Jim Crew	APC
Tony Crump	UFSF
Elrand Denson	USFS
Darryl Harley	USFS
Wit Holden (via telephone)	FERC
Steve Kartalia (via telephone)	FERC
Jim Lochamy	APC
Barry Lovett	APC
Ron McKittrick (via telephone)	FERC
Joe Nicholson	USFS
Kelly Schaeffer	Kleinschmidt
Heather Seiders	EPRO
Andy Sheppard	APC
Sheila Smith	APC

Action Items

The following action items were agreed upon by the meeting attendees:

- Revise matrix including column to address April 10th study request letter
- Set up meeting on May 8th in Montgomery to discuss aquatic and terrestrial habitat fragmentation.
- Work with recreation group (APC/FS) to finalize list of “hot spots”
- Go on a site visit to see hot spots
- Hire expert to address eco impacts
 - T&E - plant (terrestrial)/animal (aquatic)
- Convene the flattened musk turtle study group
 - Discuss the scope and costs for additional turtle research
 - Make sure USFWS has what it needs for consultation on ESA

Meeting Notes Summary: April 24, 2003***Other*****Meeting Notes**

These notes summarize the major discussion items and are not intended to be a transcript or analysis of the meeting.

Introduction

The meeting began with participant introductions and review of the meeting purpose and agenda. The primary meeting purpose was to work with the SD1 matrix tool and the USFS's April 10, 2003 letter on ecological studies, discuss items that need clarification and work primarily with the ecological technical experts to clarify and discuss studies to address the ecological issues relative to the relicensing of the Smith development. Some portion of the meeting would be spent discussing the status of recreation issues.

Since some of the USFS technical experts had other commitments that afternoon, the group agreed to expedite the discussions on ecological issues to ensure appropriate USFS participation.

Kelly Schaeffer began by explaining the purpose of the color coded matrix, which was distributed to all meeting participants. The matrix is a compilation of the UFSF SD1 comments and is the "tracking" document used in the meetings. She explained the use of green, yellow and red color coding and briefly summarized the matrix. Green color coding signifies areas where existing studies are on-going and where there is consensus between APC and the USFS on developing more information regarding a particular issue. Yellow color coding indicates areas where APC would like more information from the USFS on the issue or the study request, as applicable. Yellow does not indicate that APC is opposed to the issue or study request but that further information is needed to determine an appropriate course of action. Red color coding indicates areas where APC disagrees with the issue or language presented in the SD1 letter. This most often applies to areas of legal interpretation (*i.e.*, pre-project conditions and/or nexus to the project). APC indicated that a red color coding does not mean that APC is not willing to discuss these items, only that it has fundamental disagreement with the USFS position/statement.

Ecological Issues - Discussion of April 10 Study Request Letter

APC asked the USFS to clarify if the April 10, 2003 study request letter answered all the scoping document questions. Elrand Denson stated that the study requests contained in the April 10, 2003 were developed to address the USFS SD1 comments. APC noted that it might be beneficial to add a column to the matrix that indicates where the SD1 comments and the April 10 Study request letter overlap. Sara Chubb noted that not everything in both of the documents would be a complete overlap.

Meeting Notes Summary: April 24, 2003

APC also noted that they have problems with the time frames specified in the study requests primarily because the license application needs to be filed at FERC in July 2005 and APC was expecting preliminary 4(e) conditions from the USFS by January 2005. This is typical process for a project using alternative licensing procedures. The final 4(e) conditions would be filed with FERC after the USFS reviews FERC's Environmental Assessment. Elrand Denson stated that some items can be bumped up but others will need the time requested to perform the studies, especially if they are multi-year studies to answer the USFS questions. Sara Chubb noted that some 4(e) conditions actually contain a study request.

Illegal Access Study – The Recreation group is looking at “hot spots” of illegal access to the reservoir that are located on or affect USFS lands. The USFS identified problem sites and the Recreation group conducted a site visit and plans to conduct additional field visits in May/June. APC plans to get an expert to look at those previously identified sites and determine if any T&E species reside at or around those locations, or whether appropriate habitat for T&E species is available. As a first step, APC will focus on areas close to reservoir. The USFS will need to explain a nexus to the project for interior sites on the USFS properties. The USFS explained that they have only 1 law enforcement person to perform surveillance on 181,000 acres. From the USFS perspective, Smith Lake is the draw that encourages people to cross USFS lands to the reservoir. The USFS noted that they would like to have their botanist involved in the study plan and they want approval of the study contractor.

Flattened Musk Turtle (FMT) – APC is in the 2nd year of cooperative studies with the USFS. The USFS wants to continue efforts to better understand the distribution of FMT on Smith Lake. Sarah sees this as a multi-year study on a federally threatened species that will be at about the same level of work being performed now (40K /yr). Sarah Chubb and Malcolm Pierson will reconvene the FMT study group set up two years ago to discuss this item again. The group will try to schedule a meeting this fall to begin discussion on future study work.

Water Quality studies - The USFS believes that the reservoir may be impacting the water quality of the tributary streams around Smith Lake. Since no data is available, APC proposed to perform a preliminary study this summer and fall (2003) on the Sipsey "Wild & Scenic" portion of the river to see how water quality changes with time and lake levels. The details of this proposed study will be discussed at a USFS meeting on May 8th in Montgomery.

Aquatic Habitat Fragmentation - APC believes that there is a significant amount of information available to begin discussion of aquatic habitat fragmentation around the Smith project. Henry Mealing displayed a map with rare, threatened and endangered species, wetlands, dams locations (from the national inventory of dams), and Project boundary GIS overlays. This information along with USFS information may be adequate to do a preliminary risk analysis as a first step. APC and USFS agreed to meet in Montgomery on May 8th to discuss this study plan and to share available information.

Meeting Notes Summary: April 24, 2003

Terrestrial Habitat Fragmentation - APC needs the USFS to provide more information on the nexus to the project for this study. Some questions raised include, what exactly is the study area? This will also be discussed at subsequent meetings with USFS.

Recreation

Joe Nicholas noted that he had not received the CD-Rom of the E2 Erosion Study conducted by Pam McDaniels, which contained the report outlining the study methods. APC provided Joe a copy of the E2 CD-Rom at the meeting.

Joe also noted that relative to the recreational use data, the FIMS study probably did not capture any Forest Service recreation use. Joe stated that without this data, we would not be able to get at the long term recreational use of the Forest Service lands. Joe is particularly interested in the demographic and economic information of these users. Bill Campbell stated that in fact the FIMS study did cover commercial properties on Forest Service lands. Joe noted that Ken Cordell still needs to review the report prepared by APC and EPRO and also said that Ken is very busy and it may take some time to get that review.

The group then discussed the Sispey Wild and Scenic River. The USFS would like to understand how the various winter and summer pool elevations (496 feet and 510 feet respectively), effect the portion of the Sispey Fork that is designated as Wild and Scenic. The USFS noted that there are user conflicts on the Sispey Wild and Scenic River. They would like to be able to characterize how motorized access is occurring in places where it historically wasn't occurring. The group discussed changes in recreational use trends, such as the use of jet skis, etc. The USFS noted that Deborah Caffin, the USFS Wild and Scenic River Coordinator, would be participating in discussions on the Sispey Fork Wild and Scenic River.

APC and the USFS agreed to schedule a meeting in June to review the illegal access issues in the field. Bill Campbell and Joe Nicholas will meet in the near future on the FIMS data.

US Forest Service & Alabama Power Meeting

Meeting Summary: USFS Office, Montgomery, Alabama May 8, 2003

05-22-03

List of Attendees:

Jim Crew	APC	205-257-4265
Henry Mealing	Kleinschmidt	803-822-3177
Jim Lochamy	APC	205-664-6036
Malcolm Pierson	APC	205-664-6177
Allison Cochran	USFS – Bankhead	205-489-5111
Darryl Harley	USFS	334-241-8138
Tony Crump	USFS	
Patric Harper	USFWS	
Sara Chubb	USFS	
* Rhonda Stewart	USFS – Botanist	
* Bill Sim	APC	
* Ron McKittrick	FERC	Attended part of meeting
* Steve Kartalia	FERC	
* Patti Leppert	FERC	Attended part of meeting
* Janet Hutzal	FERC	Attended part of meeting
Rick Morgan	USFS	opened meeting representing Mr. Gooder
Stanley Glover	USFS – GIS	Attended part of meeting

* participated via telephone conference call

Action Items:

- Send copy of draft Water Quality Study Plan and draft Aquatic Habitat Fragmentation Study Plan to Steve Kartalia
- Send Tony Crump a copy of the E1 CD – Point and Non-point sources
- Send Allison Cochran a copy of the E6 T&E Database.
- Tony Crump and Jim Lochamy to get together to finalize Water Quality Study Plan and begin sampling in June 2003.
- Henry Mealing to prepare draft timeline for the Aquatic Habitat Fragmentation Study Plan and circulate to meeting attendees.
- Meeting attendees to have short conference call on May 19, 2003 to discuss draft Timeline for AHFSP. (Note: rescheduled due to personnel conflicts.)
- APC will follow up on surveys for the Illegal Access Study.
- Jim Crew will follow up on scheduling a Terrestrial Habitat Fragmentation Study meeting with USFS in June.
- Jim Crew will do some research on how far lake levels extend up the tributaries with various operating levels (e.g., elevations 510, 514, 522)
- APC & USFS will try to meet on either June 18 or 19 during regular IAG meetings to continue discussions on water quality and aquatic habitat fragmentation studies

US Forest Service & Alabama Power Meeting

Meeting Summary: USFS Office, Montgomery, Alabama May 8, 2003

05-22-03

Summary Notes:

Rick Morgan (representing Mr. Gooder - USFS) opened the meeting and stated that the USFS had completed their Draft Land Resource Management Plan for the Bankhead Forest. He noted that the USFS is accepting comments on the Plan until July 3, 2003.

Tony Crump presented his review of the SD1 matrix from the standpoint of cross-indexing the USFS April 10, 2003 letter with the USFS SD1 matrix items – pertaining to water quality and the requested water quality study plan. Henry Mealing noted the items that were cross-indexed and will include them in the revised SD1 matrix.

The meeting participants discussed APC's proposed Water Quality study plan. Major points include:

- Water level change and how it impacts stream flow and water quality in general should be the focus on the water quality study; lake stratification shouldn't be the primary focus of the study.
- APC should consider more intensive sampling on W. Sipsey Branch, some limited sampling on Brushy Creek, and then compare data to see if there are any similarities or problems detected at that level.
- USFS requested fecal coliform sampling which could be a sampling problem due to the limited "hold times" before a sample can be processed. Meeting attendees suggested that APC try to collect a few fecal coliform samples during the year to detect/characterize any existing problems.
- USFS noted a concern about the transition from flowing to standing water in tributary streams associated with reservoir levels.
- Punctuated data characterizing particular events (storms, low flows, *etc.*) would be an appropriate approach but some long-term monitoring is important also.
- The inventory request (No. 3 of the USFS April 10, 2003 letter) is important in determining the appropriate mitigation measures – pertaining to W. Sipsey, Brushy Creek, and Clear Creek primarily.
- A series of white papers will be sufficient to address No. 4 of the USFS April 10, 2003 letter.
- Information from APC's operations models and an understanding of how flood events are regulated would be useful for USFS.
- Periodicity of floods and drought events is available from NOAA. This can be used to determine probabilities of normal and extreme hydrologic events.
- Photographs during sampling would be very valuable as part of sampling record. Should pick "photo points" at all sampling sites.
- Tony Crump and Jim Lochamy will get together and develop a plan to start water quality sampling in June 2003.

US Forest Service & Alabama Power Meeting

Meeting Summary: USFS Office, Montgomery, Alabama May 8, 2003

05-22-03

The participants discussed APC's proposed Aquatic Habitat Fragmentation Study Proposal. Handouts included the study proposal, a map of Smith watershed, GIS map with T & E Species, Wetlands, and other basin dams GIS overlays.

- The participants agreed that the scope of the study should focus on riverine species in the Smith watershed, which focuses efforts on about 16 endangered and sensitive species.
- The participants also noted that, in general, main-stems of streams and not the headwater reaches of streams should be the focus of the study.
- There are data gaps that may take a couple of months to define (locations of T&E species, dams, appropriate habitat, culverts, etc) as outlined in the study plan.
- USFS shared a list of species of concern for the Bankhead National Forest. They noted that this is a master list of all possibly affected species and may be much more extensive than we need.
- USFS GIS representative (Stanley Glover) does have GIS information on road crossings and culverts that could be used, but may not be complete. The participants want to focus on main stem road crossings, culverts, bridges *etc.*
- USFS has aerial photos of all USFS lands from flyover in 2000. Henry will see if Bill Campbell (EPRO) has this information. The participants will consider how to use this information during this study.
- The participants agreed that Stanley Glover and Donald Moore (APC – GIS) need to get together to share GIS information.
- Henry agreed to generate a general timeline for the study plan and get it out to the participants for review and discussion.
- The next meeting will be a conference call Monday, May 19, 10:00 AM central. (Note: This was rescheduled due to personnel conflicts).

The meeting participants discussed a few additional items at the end of the meeting:

- APC proposed Dr. Whetstone (UJS) as a terrestrial specialist for the Illegal Access Studies. USFS may have additional recommendations for terrestrial specialists.
- APC will follow up on scheduling a Terrestrial Habitat Fragmentation Study meeting with USFS in June.
- APC will investigate how far lake levels extend up the tributaries with various operating levels (e.g., elevations 510, 514, 522)
- IAGs are planned for June 18 & 19. The participants discussed the possibility of scheduling a meeting during those two days to continue discussions on water quality and aquatic habitat fragmentation.

**U.S. Forest Service Ecological Issue Action Group Meeting
Meeting Summary: June 18, 2003**

Revision 7-10-03

Meeting Location – APC Corporate Headquarters – Birmingham, AL

Warrior and Coosa Relicensing Projects Combined

Meeting Attendees

Jim Crew - APC	Elrand Denson - USFS	Sara Chubb - USFS
Michael Crump - USFS	Malcolm Pierson - APC	Henry Mealing - KA
Jim Lochamy - APC	Jim Hancock – B&B	Corey Wigginton - USFWS
Patric Harper - USFWS	Ralph Thompson - USFWS	Mike Akridge - APC
Rick Allums - APC	Stephanie White - APC	Jason Moak - KA
Shane Boring - KA		

By telephone: Darryl Harley - USFS, Kelly Schaeffer- KA, Ron McKitrick - FERC

Action Items

- Schedule Aquatic Habitat Fragmentation call for July (Week of July 14th)
Jim Crew: Due – June 30, 2003
- Develop schedule of monthly USFS meetings for remainder of 2003
Jim Crew: Due – July 31, 2003
- Schedule Terrestrial Habitat Fragmentation Study Plan meeting with Sara and Rhonda (Week of July 21st)
Jim Crew, Henry Mealing: Due – June 30, 2003
- Meet to discuss water quality study issues, identify disagreements, proceed on agreements
Jim Lochamy, Tony Crump : Due – July 7, 2003
- Proceed with evaluation of informal access hotspots
Jim Lochamy, Dr. Whetstone: Due – July 11, 2003

Meeting Notes

These notes summarize the major items discussed during the meeting and are not intended to be a transcript or analysis of the meeting.

Problems with Progress

Jim Crew began the meeting by discussing the USFS June 11, 2003 letter regarding requested water quality studies. Jim pointed out that APC believes the progress made at the May 8, 2003 meeting seemed to have been invalidated by the June 11, 2003 letter. Specifically, APC perceived that the USFS backed out of agreements reached at the May meeting. Also, APC expressed their opinion that the June 11 letter did not accurately reflect their efforts to resolve water quality study request issues. The USFS indicated that there may have been a misunderstanding about what was agreed to at the meeting. Also, Elrand Denson noted that individual USFS technical experts did not have the ability to agree to changes in study requests that are materially different from those laid out in its April study request letter. Such deviations must be approved by the District Ranger.

**U.S. Forest Service Ecological Issue Action Group Meeting
Meeting Summary: June 18, 2003**

Revision 7-10-03

Alabama Power expressed their belief that members should first attempt to resolve differences and misunderstandings within working groups and with Alabama Power, rather than resorting to filing letters with FERC. The USFS noted that it needs to create a record of the process. The USFS expressed its frustration with APC's inaction on certain issues and feels that they need to have data in order to make 4(e) conditions. Also, the USFS believes that meeting notes are not accurately reflecting what occurs at meetings. Kelly Schaeffer suggested that meeting summaries could be done differently to address this issue. Some ideas included, but not discussed in detail, were to 1) attach USFS comments to APC's draft if agreement is not reached on comments/edits; or 2) have attending FERC staff take notes.

All members agreed that the following are major hindrances to future progress:

1. APC is unclear as to what specific items in the April study request letter are negotiable,
2. USFS is not aware of which specific items in the April study request letter that Alabama Power agrees or disagrees with, and
3. Neither Alabama Power nor the USFS have a clear understanding of what has already been agreed to.

Kelly Schaeffer suggested that APC prepare a document that compares their proposed study plans to the USFS requested studies to highlight differences between the two. This document could be the basis for additional meetings and discussion.

Status of Study Requests

Water Quality Study – Jim Lochamy and Tony Crump agreed to meet soon to identify areas of disagreement relative to the water quality study requests. Where there are areas of agreement, APC will begin collection of data. APC will prepare a study plan of their proposed water quality studies for 2003 - 2004

Flattened Musk Turtle (FMT) – Second year of FMT studies are in progress. Subsequent studies have not been discussed in detail.

Informal Recreation Access Hotspots – Dr. David Whetstone will begin his evaluation of areas identified by the USFS and report back to the group upon completion. He is expected to complete his surveys by July 11, 2003.

Terrestrial Habitat Fragmentation – APC has developed a draft study plan that will be distributed by July 11, 2003. Jim Crew and/or Henry Mealing will schedule a meeting for the week of July 21st with Sara and Rhonda to discuss the study plan.

Aquatic Habitat Fragmentation – A revised study plan and a list of proposed aquatic species for study were distributed at the meeting. The work group will plan to meet (by conference call) in July to discuss the species list.

Conclusion and Next Meeting

Jim Crew will contact USFS representatives to schedule July meetings and begin developing a schedule of monthly meetings for the remainder of the year. Meeting minutes will be posted on Alabama Power's Hydro Relicensing website (www.southerncompany.com/alpower/hydro).

**USFS Ecological IAG – Aquatic Fragmentation Work Group
Conference Call Summary – July 18, 2003**

Revision 7-22-03

Henry agreed to modify the species list and resend it to the group (see Table 1). Malcolm has begun to gather some general information or to identify sources of information for each of the species. Patric offered to share USFWS information with Malcolm on this effort. Based on the amount of information available, the group will prioritize the level of detail needed for each species.

Habitat Fragmentation GIS Maps

Henry noted that work on developing the “habitat fragmentation GIS maps” that incorporate both APC and USFS data doesn’t appear to be moving forward. Henry will talk with Jim Crew to develop a plan for getting Donald Moore (APC) and Stanley Glover (USFS) “together” to share GIS data.

General Discussions

Sara suggested that the general goal of habitat fragmentation analysis efforts ought to be to develop an adaptive management plan that will protect/enhance species that are present and possibly reintroduce species that were historically present in the Warrior basin.

Sara also requested that part of the habitat fragmentation analysis relate to the possible impact of invasive species (Asiatic clam, striped bass, and zebra mussels). If aquatic fragmentation is modified, will invasive species impact native species that are currently un-impacted? She also asked to include ways to reduce the threat of invasions and impacts to native species.

Henry and Malcolm will review the proposed timeline (Table 2) to see if modifications need to be made and to identify general dates where USFS and USFWS need to make input.

Conclusion and Next Meeting

Henry and Malcolm will contact USFS and USFWS representatives to schedule the next meeting. Meeting minutes will be posted on Alabama Power’s Hydro Relicensing website (www.southerncompany.com/alpower/hydro).

**USFS Ecological IAG – Aquatic Fragmentation Work Group
Conference Call Summary – July 18, 2003**

Revision 7-22-03

Table 1. Potential Species to evaluate for the Warrior Aquatic Habitat Fragmentation Study

7/22/2003

Scientific Name	Common Name	Type	Federal Status	USFS Status	State Status	State Rank	Global Rank	Priority of Review Comments
Necturus alabamensis	black warrior waterdog	Amphibians	Candidate	Sensitive		S2	G2	Proposed Threatened
Etheostoma douglasi	Tuscaloosa darter	Fish		Sensitive		S2	G2	
Etheostoma phytophilum	rush darter	Fish		Sensitive		S1	G1	
Etheostoma bellator	Warrior darter	Fish		Sensitive		S2	G2	
Etheostoma zonistum	blueface darter	Fish	Now being described					
Elliptio arca	Alabama spike	Mussels		Sensitive		S2	G3	
Lampsilis altilis	fine-lined pocketbook	Mussels	Threatened		SP	S2	G2	
Lampsilis perovalis	orange-nacre mucket	Mussels	Threatened		SP	S1	G2	
Medionidus acutissimus	Alabama moccasinshell	Mussels	Threatened		SP	S1	G1	
Pleurobema furvum	dark pigtoe	Mussels	Endangered		SP	S1	G1	
Ptychobranchus greenii	triangular kidneyshell	Mussels	Endangered		SP	S1	G1	
Strophitus subvexus	southern creekmussel	Mussels		Sensitive		S2	G3	
Villosa nebulosa	Alabama rainbow	Mussels		Sensitive		S3	G3	
Graptemys pulchra	Alabama map turtle	Reptiles			SP	S3	G4	
Sternotherus depressus	flattened musk turtle	Reptiles	Threatened		SP	S2	G2	

Species to be added to list 7/18/2003

Percina sp. - undescribed	bridled darter	fish						Undescribed species - medium sized river species Determine if this is of Rare occurrence or a bad data point
Obovaria jacksoniana	southern hickorynut	mussell						
(Leptoxis plicata)	plicate rocksnail	snail						Locust Fork Drainage - may have reintroduction potential
(Pleurocera annularis)	ringed hornsnail	snail						

Species to perform investigation of "Historic Presence" in Upper Warrior Drainage.

(Pleurobema perovatum)	ovate clubshell
(Medionidus parvulus)	Coosa moccasinshell
upland combshell	(Epioblasma metastriata)

**USFS Ecological IAG – Aquatic Fragmentation Work Group
Conference Call Summary – July 18, 2003**

Revision 7-22-03

Table 2. Smith Watershed Aquatic Habitat Fragmentation Timeline	2003							2004		
	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB
1 Identify the Project Study Area	[REDACTED]		This was discussed at the May 8, 2003 meeting - Group will focus on the Smith Watershed.							
2 Identify blockages and categorize them	[REDACTED]			APC has begun this process. Donald Moore and Stanley Glover will coordinate to add USFS GIS information to this analysis.						
3 Develop a list of species of concern	[REDACTED]		APC recommended that we use only T&E species. USFS provided a list of additional species that they are concerned about.							
4 Develop historical and current distributions for these species	[REDACTED]			Malcolm Pierson will coordinate this activity based on the species that the group identifies						
5 Identify areas of “concern”	[REDACTED]					In October the Group will begin to identify areas of concern and areas where restoration / mitigation efforts can make a difference.				
6 Identify Range of Alternatives	[REDACTED]							The Group will also identify a range of alternatives to consider as part of restoration / mitigation efforts		
7 Identify PM&E measures	[REDACTED]								APC will determine what PM&E measures that they want to include in the License Application. This does not prevent other PM&E measures from being considered as Alternatives for the EA analysis.	

US Forest Service and Alabama Power Meeting

February 6, 2004

List of Attendees:

Mike Akridge	APC
Jim Crew	APC
Kent Davenport	USFS
Glen Gaines	USFS
Barry Lovett	APC
Steve Rickerson	USFS
Kelly Schaeffer	Kleinschmidt

Action Items:

1. During the week of February 9th, Jim and Kent will discuss by telephone the status of the ecological issues.
2. Barry will set up a telephone conference call meeting between Bill Campbell (EPRO), Mike Cook and Joe Nicholson with the intent of making progress with the technical experts on the remaining recreation issues.
3. USFS will meet to determine their interests in each of the remaining ecological and recreational issues.
4. If items 1-3 are covered to the satisfaction of the meeting participants, and the USFS determines it is ready to negotiate, decision makers will meet to begin negotiations on final remaining issues.
5. Week of March 1st – hold meeting with same attendees as February 6, 2004 meeting