

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MORGAN FALLS HYDRO
INTEGRATED LICENSING PROCESS
STUDY RESULTS MEETING

April 19, 2006

8:45 a.m.

J.K. Davis Conference Center
Georgia Power Company
241 Ralph McGill Boulevard, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia

Linda E. Cheek, CCR-A-752

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

LIST OF ATTENDEES

Facilitator:

Tom Sullivan - Gomez & Sullivan Engineers

David M. Moore, Esq. - Troutman Sanders
Hallie Meushaw, Esq. - Troutman Sanders

George Martin - Georgia Power Company - Project
Manager - Hydro Relicensing

Larry Wall - Georgia Power Company
Greg Boortz - Georgia Power Company
Tom Broadwell - Georgia Power Company
Michael Abney - Georgia Power Company
Scott Hendricks - Georgia Power Company
Nancy DeShazo - Georgia Power Company
Mike Nichols - Georgia Power Company
Glenn Ivie - Georgia Power Company
Eldon Watts - Georgia Power Company

Alexandra Adams - Upper Chattahoochee Riverkeeper
Betsy Nicholas - Upper Chattahoochee Riverkeeper

Jim Long - National Park Service

Pat Stevens - Atlanta Regional Commission
Jim Santo - Atlanta Regional Commission

Gregory Hogue - Department of the Interior
Joyce Stanley - Department of the Interior

Janet Hutzell - FERC
Elizabeth Molloy - FERC

Winnie Simpson, Esq. - Independent Consultant
L.G. Byrnes - Independent Consultant

Steve Layman - GeoSyntec Consultants
Cristin Krachon - GeoSyntec Consultants

Jim Scarbrough - Gwinnett County Public Utilities

- 1 Fred Cox - Southern Company Hydro Services
- 2 Joel Galt - Southern Company Hydro Services
- 3 Arthur Lee - Atlanta Rowing Club
- 4 Linda Bain - Sandy Springs Conservancy
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

1 (Reporter disclosure made pursuant to Article
2 8.B. of the Rules and Regulations of the Board of
3 Court Reporting of the Judicial Council of Georgia.)

4 GEORGE MARTIN: Good morning everyone.
5 Welcome to day number three of the Morgan Falls ILP
6 Study Results Meetings. I see everybody migrated to
7 our meeting location without -- our new meeting
8 location without too much trouble.

9 Today we are going to cover recreation and
10 land use resources as well as our cultural resources
11 which include historic hydro and historic properties.
12 And that will be the agenda for today.

13 And what we want to do is introduce one
14 another again since we do have some folks that have
15 come in today that weren't with us previously.

16 And if we can move ahead one slide. I
17 want to put the timeline back up again. Can
18 everybody hear me if I stand out here and talk, like,
19 loud? Just to point out where we started in January
20 of 2004 and the major milestones getting us to the
21 bottom bullet point of today and our study results
22 meetings. As we go around and introduce one another
23 you feel free to read through the milestones at your
24 leisure. I won't bother reading them for you. And
25 today as we conclude we will have a next steps

1 summary of what comes next as we have done in the
2 previous two days.

3 Just as far as introductions. I'm George
4 Martin, I'm the project manager for hydro relicensing
5 focusing currently on Morgan Falls. And I'm with our
6 Environmental Affairs Department. And one thing I
7 want to mention housekeeping wise, you may have not
8 noticed on your way in the restrooms. As you finally
9 exit the cafeteria if you just continue walking
10 straight, the restrooms are right in front of you.
11 There are some war commemorative plaques on the wall
12 to the left, they are just right straight out of the
13 cafeteria area.

14 And with that, I want to ask us to
15 introduce one another, and we'll just start right
16 here with Winnie.

17 WINNIE SIMPSON: I'm Winnie Simpson, I'm a
18 consultant to Georgia Power.

19 GREG BOORTZ: I'm Greg Boortz. I'm in
20 Georgia Power's Land Department.

21 SCOTT HENDRICKS: Scott Hendricks, Georgia
22 Power Land Department.

23 LARRY WALL: Larry Wall, Georgia Power
24 Land Department.

25 CRISTIN KRACHON: Cristin Krachon with

1 GeoSyntec Consultants.

2 STEVE LAYMAN: Steve Layman with GeoSyntec
3 Consultants.

4 JIM LONG: Jim Long, National Park
5 Service.

6 JIM SANTO: Jim Santo, Atlanta Regional
7 Commission.

8 PAT STEVENS: Pat Stevens with the ARC.

9 HALLIE MEUSHAW: Hallie Meushaw with
10 Troutman Sanders.

11 JIM SCARBROUGH: Jim Scarbrough, Gwinnett
12 County.

13 LINDA BAIN: Linda Bain, Sandy Springs
14 Conservancy.

15 MIKE NICHOLS: Mike Nichols, Georgia
16 Power, Department of Environmental Affairs.

17 DAVID MOORE: David Moore with Troutman
18 Sanders.

19 NANCY DeSHAZO: Nancy DeShazo, Georgia
20 Power, Environmental Affairs.

21 FRED COX: Fred Cox, Southern Company
22 Hydro Services.

23 JOYCE STANLEY: Joyce Stanley, Department
24 of the Interior.

25 GREGORY HOGUE: Gregory Hogue, Department

1 of the Interior.

2 L.G. BYRNES: L.G. Byrnes, independent
3 consultant.

4 JOEL GALT: I'm Joel Galt, Hydro Services
5 in Southern Company.

6 ELDON WATTS: Eldon Watts, Morgan Falls
7 Hydro Plant, plant mechanic.

8 GLENN IVIE: Glenn Ivie, Georgia Power,
9 Land Department.

10 BETSY NICHOLAS: Betsy Nicholas, Upper
11 Chattahoochee Riverkeeper.

12 ALEX ADAMS: Alex Adams, Upper
13 Chattahoochee Riverkeeper.

14 ELIZABETH MOLLOY: Elizabeth Molloy, FERC.

15 JANET HUTZEL: Janet Hutzel, FERC.

16 TOM SULLIVAN: I'm Tom Sullivan with Gomez
17 & Sullivan. I have been asked to facilitate your ILP
18 session this morning. I will tell you just from
19 doing the introductions we are the ones experiencing
20 the buzz this morning, so if you could please speak
21 up. We'd appreciate it.

22 I'm going to turn the floor over to Janet
23 here in a minute just to talk a little bit about the
24 purpose of today's meeting. But first what I'd like
25 to do is just review the agenda. We have an agenda

1 for this morning. And the first thing on our agenda
2 this morning is to review the recreation and land use
3 plan, and then after that we are going to -- not the
4 plan but the study and then after that we are going
5 to review the cultural resources and historic report.

6 Kind of the format that we have used, for
7 those of you that are new, we go through a
8 presentation first on the report, then we open it up
9 for discussion. You'll hear me ask a couple of
10 questions after we are all done with the discussion,
11 and those questions are usually in the form of does
12 anybody else have anything on the report? Does
13 anybody have any additional information requests? We
14 pretty much have consistently done that each day.

15 We are keeping a transcript of the
16 meeting. This is Linda, she does the transcription
17 for this. That will be filed as a record at FERC of
18 the meeting. Just logistically, it helps a lot if
19 you actually say your name and your affiliation when
20 you start to talk. It just helps us to be able to
21 identify you.

22 We are also keeping a meeting summary.
23 Winnie is keeping the meeting summary with me and we
24 tend to review that, and then I'll review that
25 summary with you at the end of the day. The

1 summaries the last two days have been short and
2 sweet. You know, we reviewed the technical studies,
3 there were technical questions, there were no
4 additional information requests. That pretty much
5 summarizes each of the last two days and how things
6 have gone.

7 We are set up to be able to capture areas
8 of agreement and action items, if that is how this
9 works. But it really hasn't worked that way the last
10 two days, and so not desiring to artificially create
11 something summaries have been very basic.

12 I am going to save everybody the trouble
13 of hearing my background because most of you are the
14 same people and I have told you this twice. If any
15 of you that are new want to know a little bit about
16 me, at the first break I'd be happy to tell you about
17 who I am and where I come from.

18 With that, Janet, if you want to just give
19 an overview of the purpose of the meeting that would
20 be good.

21 JANET HUTZEL: Sure. This is Janet Hutzell
22 from FERC. The purpose of the meeting is to go over
23 all the study results, have a discussion, if you have
24 any questions, try to have those answered. And if
25 you believe there is some information gaps, then we

1 are here to discuss how those could be filled. And
2 if necessary, additional studies could be discussed.

3 TOM SULLIVAN: Very good. Any questions
4 for Janet or for FERC at all before we start? All
5 right. Just a little add on to that in terms of
6 where we are time wise, and I have kind of said this
7 the last two days, too.

8 You started your ILP process in January of
9 '04. We are here in April of '06 at the study
10 results meeting. And basically we are reviewing
11 study results, trying to go over what's been done and
12 that's kind of almost end of the phase and we are
13 ready to move into preliminary license proposal.

14 Georgia Power has scheduled three days of
15 meetings to discuss preliminary licensing proposal in
16 July. They have asked me to also facilitate those
17 meetings. Their preliminary license proposal is due
18 on October 2nd, I believe, and their license is due
19 at the end of February.

20 And as Liz told us yesterday, just so
21 everybody knows, that license due date doesn't move.
22 Okay? That's set in statute, it has to be met, type
23 of thing. So that's kind of where we are in the
24 process for the project.

25 That all being said, if there is no other

1 questions about the agenda or what it is that we are
2 about today, what I'm going to do is turn the floor
3 over to Greg to talk about recreation and land use.

4 Before I do that I do want to just make
5 sure everybody realizes you have a new web site as
6 part of the process which I think has probably
7 enhanced your process significantly. Greg did the
8 heavy lifting on the web site. So, he is the one you
9 want to thank or he is the one you want to give
10 suggestions to maybe, I don't know. So, but thank
11 you because I have used the web site, it is very
12 helpful. So with that, Greg.

13 GREG BOORTZ: Well, good morning. Again,
14 my name is Greg Boortz, and I'm a land management
15 specialist with Georgia Power. This morning I'm
16 going to be giving an overview of the recreation and
17 lands use resource study. I'll describe the
18 objectives and methodology and then I'm going to go
19 into a little bit more detail on the results of the
20 study.

21 The objectives of this study were to
22 characterize the existing recreation, land use and
23 visual aesthetics at the project. And this area of
24 the Chattahoochee River has been very well studied in
25 terms of these resource areas. So we started by

1 compiling existing information. Another large part
2 of the study was to inventory the current recreation
3 facilities and access points on the river and then at
4 the project and to also measure the current usage.
5 And then, lastly, we evaluated the sufficiency of
6 those facilities and access points.

7 The study area I'll be referring to is the
8 project area. And this encompasses everything inside
9 the project boundary, and then additionally that
10 2000-foot buffer that, by now, you are probably
11 familiar with. That extends 2000 feet beyond the
12 project boundary. And additionally, we considered a
13 downstream stretch of river 12 miles down to
14 Peachtree Creek.

15 Study approach followed the approved study
16 plan, and really there was four key elements to the
17 study. As I mentioned, it's a well studied area so
18 we were able to compile some information from some
19 recent studies.

20 We conducted 14 interviews with various
21 user groups and organizations that are regular
22 recreation users at the project area. We also
23 conducted our own field surveys to gather our own
24 data, and then we also analyzed all of this
25 information.

1 Some of the key sources of existing
2 information, we used the National Park Service
3 General Management Plan. A pretty elaborate visitor
4 study conducted by the Park Service in 1998. A
5 couple of flow preference studies and then a variety
6 of resource management plans local to the area.

7 To go into some more detail about our
8 field surveys, as you can see in this chart we
9 conducted a total of 14 survey days, and we
10 strategically spaced those out to cover various days
11 of the week, all seasons of the year. And I
12 personally was involved with these pretty heavily. I
13 attended all 14 of these and coordinated a team of
14 surveyors. And we would arrive at the project
15 30 minutes before sunrise and remain there all day
16 until 30 minutes after sunset. So, I spent quite a
17 few hours at this area. And we had a total of four
18 surveyors each day and we would be located at three
19 parks on the project.

20 Up under SR 400 where it crosses the river
21 is Don White Memorial Park. And we had a surveyor
22 there. We'd have one at Azalea Park which moving
23 east is right here, and it's the biggest of the parks
24 we focused on. And additionally we had a surveyor
25 down at the tailrace below the dam. Then a fourth

1 surveyor would be roaming the rest of the project
2 boundary and area and conducting field surveys.

3 Each surveyor was equipped with these two
4 forms. And if you want to take a closer look, they
5 are in the appendix of the report. The one on the
6 left is our questionnaire, and it typically took
7 respondents about five to seven minutes to fill out
8 and we also had it available in Spanish. It gathered
9 information such as demographic information, user
10 preference information, and then also opportunity for
11 people to just make general comments.

12 Now, the form on the right was our count
13 form and we would fill these out throughout the day,
14 and they measured aspects such as vehicles, number of
15 vehicles, and also we tracked where those vehicles
16 came from by looking at their license plate. It also
17 measured boats visible in the reservoir, a number of
18 trailers in the parking lot and just other various
19 recreation activities.

20 The next few slides I'm going to get into
21 some of our results from these field surveys. And as
22 many of you know the project is situated in Fulton
23 and Cobb counties, so the light blue area you see
24 here represents people coming from those counties.
25 The dark blue is other counties in Georgia and,

1 really, a lot of those were from metro Atlanta or
2 other counties very nearby. So, what we found was a
3 pretty localized use of the project area.

4 As far as group sizes, most people came
5 either in groups of one or two. And Azalea Park
6 actually averaged the largest group sizes, whereas at
7 Don White and the tailrace it was predominantly
8 individuals, you know, doing recreation activities
9 such as fishing or running or walking. Not
10 surprisingly the group sizes tended to average larger
11 sizes on the holidays. Holiday weekends.

12 In terms of age range, about half of our
13 visitors were in their mid-20s to mid-40s, and then
14 another quarter had at least one child in their group
15 when at one of the city parks, Azalea or Don White.

16 Now, this chart, hopefully everybody can
17 read that, but this chart is a breakdown of the
18 various recreation activities that people
19 participated in. And the five on the left are
20 water-based activities and the most popular of those
21 was canoeing, kayaking and rowing. And then the
22 overall most popular activity was running and
23 walking. That's the 19 percent in the middle there.

24 Overall, most visitors spent a little less
25 than two hours at the project area. And 80 percent

1 come at least ten times per year and another
2 61 percent reported to come at least once per week.

3 So, I did want to point out Don White
4 averaged the shortest visit times and the most return
5 users. And we observed that's likely due to the
6 facts it's at the trail head of the river walk. So,
7 we would see a lot of people come use the parking
8 facilities there and then go run or walk or bicycle
9 and then return to their vehicles as part of a
10 regular exercise routine.

11 These were the top five replies for other
12 parks and lakes in the area that the users frequent.
13 And the top response was the CRNRA units, and of
14 course the project is here. And the other two top
15 responses were the big lakes in the area which is
16 Lanier and Allatoona.

17 Several of the questions on our
18 questionnaire asked users to rate various facilities
19 at the park that they were being surveyed at. And
20 I'm just going to go over a few of those. There was
21 11 total and people were asked to rate good, fair or
22 poor for each category. Parking fared well at all
23 three parks. Bank fishing access, it again fared
24 well at all the parks. And there is a lot of
25 shoreline available to the public at this particular

1 project area. So, people appreciated that. Fishing
2 quality similar for all three parks on the results
3 there.

4 The fewest poor marks came at the tailrace
5 below the dam and it may have to do with it being a
6 little bit of a different fishing environment than
7 actually fishing in the impoundment.

8 Picnic areas, Azalea and Don White faired
9 about the same in this category. And Morgan Falls
10 tailrace does not currently have a pavilion or picnic
11 tables at this time. This chart is specific
12 amenities that were only at either one or two of the
13 parks. The boat launch is at Azalea Park and there
14 is one at the tailrace. Both of those faired well.

15 In the middle there is Azalea Park's
16 restrooms, and that was the only park of the three
17 that actually had restroom facilities. And I did
18 want to point out that this information is already
19 outdated because as soon as we finished conducting
20 our surveys they started constructing brand-new
21 restroom facilities that are much larger and nicer.
22 Then to the right there is the tailrace, the canoe
23 portage and hours of operation ratings to the right.

24 Some of the improvements desired by users.
25 This was an open-ended question on our questionnaire

1 and it just asked people to specify any improvements
2 they would like to see at the particular park they
3 were at. And some of those common answers were
4 amenities such as water fountains, lighting and
5 picnic tables. I mentioned the restrooms. They are
6 being updated at Azalea. And some other comments
7 included geese control. And then additionally park
8 hours and improvement of the parking area down at the
9 tailrace.

10 Moving on to our group interviews that we
11 conducted, these were the 14 groups that we were able
12 to obtain information from. Get some feedback. And
13 they include recreation facility providers, nonprofit
14 organizations, homeowners organization, rowing,
15 canoeing and kayaking clubs and additionally some
16 local fishing organizations and guides.

17 Some of the main takeaways from these
18 interviews are listed in these bullets. And there
19 are some plans for recreation facilities to be added
20 and upgraded by some of the governmental and private
21 organizations. Some of the important issues for the
22 rowing clubs were portage and facilities. And for
23 fishing organizations, it was release schedules and
24 fishing quality. Roswell and Trout Unlimited did
25 mention that they would like to see a dredging

1 operation take place.

2 And then finally Chattahoochee Outfitters
3 sees the need for more public access although not
4 specifically in our project area but just upstream
5 and downstream as well. You can actually find the
6 full interviews in our appendix, it's at appendix C
7 in the report if you'd like to take a further look at
8 people's responses.

9 So, based on our findings in the field
10 surveys we estimate that there were over 200,000
11 recreation day trips made to the study sites last
12 year. And these pie charts further break that down
13 by season and then by park. By season it's spread
14 out about how you would expect. And you can see that
15 Azalea Park by far gets the highest usage of the
16 three. And tailrace is the smaller sliver.

17 So, projecting out into the future there
18 is an assumption that recreation demand will grow
19 proportionately with population increase. And it's
20 forecasted that the usage at our project area will
21 increase by 16 percent between now and 2040.

22 And based on carrying capacity estimates
23 it's projected that some of the major amenities like
24 parking and the boat lanes will be sufficient through
25 that time. There may be some overflow at a park like

1 Azalea Park that does get busy on holiday weekends.

2 Now moving on to the land use and
3 aesthetic resources portion of this study. This is
4 actually figure 20 in the report. This is a land use
5 classification map. And --

6 TOM SULLIVAN: Greg, can I interrupt you
7 just for a second?

8 GREG BOORTZ: Yes.

9 TOM SULLIVAN: I want to make sure that
10 people don't have to hold questions for too long or
11 stuff. Is the land use part the same length as the
12 recreation?

13 GREG BOORTZ: No. This is just a couple
14 slides.

15 TOM SULLIVAN: All right. So we'll do
16 that and then do all the questions. Sorry about
17 that.

18 GREG BOORTZ: You can see a good portion
19 of the land use is in the dark green, that's just
20 park areas and forest land. There is a good amount
21 of medium density residential use and there is some
22 high and low density residential as well. The purple
23 is high density residential, I believe, and then
24 there is a few commercial operations in the project
25 area too.

1 As for the aesthetic resources at the
2 project area, generally positive. There is a lot of
3 places you can be out on this reservoir or even on
4 the shoreline where you feel like you are nowhere
5 near a major city and don't see much development. We
6 asked the question on our field surveys to rate
7 scenic views, and 80 percent responded as good. The
8 dam and powerhouse are historic structures and have
9 some visual appeal. There are a few areas that
10 detract from the aesthetic value and mainly those are
11 at the public access points.

12 Eroded shorelines, just due to heavy usage
13 and also in some cases geese populations that are
14 pretty much there 24/7 at some of these parks. And
15 then also you have some highway and bridge crossings
16 over the project area.

17 So, to summarize, there were many
18 different recreation opportunities at the project.
19 And most users we find to reside locally and to
20 return often. The existing facilities that are there
21 are adequate and are projected to be so for the next
22 few decades. However, there are some desired
23 improvements by the public. And developing new
24 facilities will be sort of a difficult task because
25 most land around the project now is either already

1 designated for public use or is in private hands.

2 So, at this time that concludes my
3 presentation.

4 TOM SULLIVAN: Any questions for Greg
5 about the recreation, land use and aesthetics?

6 JANET HUTZEL: I do.

7 TOM SULLIVAN: I'm sorry, Janet, go ahead.

8 JANET HUTZEL: Janet Hutzel, FERC. I have
9 a couple questions so bear with me. You had had
10 where the future demand is going to increase about 16
11 percent. Did you have any data that you came across
12 where those parks or like the picnic facilities would
13 exceed capacity to 2040? Was there any data that you
14 came across? Or if they would be -- if the capacity
15 would never exceed given the increase?

16 GREG BOORTZ: You mean data from our
17 existing -- the existing information out there that
18 we reviewed?

19 JANET HUTZEL: Yeah. Because I know it
20 wasn't in the report. I know you did like the boat
21 ramps and the parking lots and that wouldn't exceed
22 capacity further on, but was there any other
23 information?

24 GREG BOORTZ: The boat lanes and the
25 parking was how we defined the carrying capacity, we

1 didn't look at other aspects beyond those two
2 categories.

3 JANET HUTZEL: Do you know if like the
4 City of Roswell's report had said if their parks
5 would exceed capacity with future demand?

6 GREG BOORTZ: I'm not sure.

7 LARRY WALL: I'll answer that, Janet.
8 Larry Wall with the Land Department. In our
9 discussions with Joe Glover who is the director of
10 the Roswell Parks and Recreation, Joe indicated to us
11 that Roswell is presently in the process of planning
12 and developing additional access points for the
13 public. Most of them are outside of the project
14 area.

15 I say outside of the project boundary on
16 the river above the project. And that's primarily to
17 accommodate the canoeing and kayak groups. Also
18 rafters that the City of Roswell encourages as part
19 of their commercial endeavors to enhance the business
20 opportunities around the community.

21 And that's primarily where they have
22 the -- they see a choke point, is that they do need
23 additional access points. But they have those and
24 they are in the process of planning the development
25 of those.

1 JANET HUTZEL: And they think the existing
2 facilities in the near future would be adequate for
3 the recreation demand except for the access points?
4 Along with what they are adding?

5 SCOTT HENDRICKS: Scott Hendricks, Land
6 Department, Georgia Power. One of the things that
7 factored into this projection capacity and use was
8 the population data for that surrounding area. One
9 thing that you see is these are very much local
10 population use, same thing that the CRNRA found in
11 their studies, very heavy Fulton Cobb County. And
12 the population information 15, 20 years ago, these
13 counties around the project were growing by leaps and
14 bounds.

15 But in the last five years I think in
16 northeast Cobb County and also in the Sandy Springs
17 area actually saw a slight drop in the population
18 immediately around the project. So, when you really
19 look at the population trends going out into the
20 future, I think it tells a lot about what you expect
21 and the capacity to be going out into the future.

22 JANET HUTZEL: Okay. And I had two more
23 questions. You mentioned in your report on page 42
24 something about a shoreline management policy. Could
25 you explain a little bit about that? Is that with

1 the Commission or is that just something internal?

2 SCOTT HENDRICKS: We have shoreline
3 management guidelines; on this particular reservoir
4 there is very little actual activity. We also have a
5 management oversight by the National Park Service and
6 also with the ARC, so there is a multiple level of
7 permitting that goes on there.

8 JANET HUTZEL: Okay. And table 3 was very
9 well done, but when you file your license application
10 we need to know in that table which parks are inside
11 the project boundary and which parks are outside.
12 And that's just for our knowledge.

13 SCOTT HENDRICKS: You said table 3?

14 JANET HUTZEL: Yeah, table 3. Because it
15 has the operators and the park facility, and all that
16 information is needed, we just then need you to
17 delineate which parks are inside, which parks are
18 outside the project boundary. Because this was for
19 the whole project area.

20 SCOTT HENDRICKS: Okay. We can do that.

21 CRISTIN KRACHON: Yes.

22 TOM SULLIVAN: Other questions on this
23 report?

24 LINDA BAIN: Yes. Linda Bain with Sandy
25 Springs Conservancy. Greg, I have two questions.

1 The first one is, I was surprised to see 20 percent
2 usage from seniors. I suspect that's going to
3 increase in the future and I wonder if you had made
4 any projections in terms of the age, basically the
5 age ranges of the people that will be using this area
6 over, say, the next 20 years, 25 years?

7 GREG BOORTZ: Well, I think -- I'm not
8 sure that we've done that in the report, but if we
9 are correlating with sort of the population increases
10 we could probably use the U.S. Census Bureau to kind
11 of correlate that. But I'm not sure that we did that
12 in the report.

13 LINDA BAIN: Okay. The second question I
14 have involves a project that we are looking at and
15 that has to do with the desire for some groups to see
16 the Morgan Falls area dredged. Could you speak a
17 little more to that issue and what might be the
18 prospects for dredging?

19 GREG BOORTZ: Well, most of the
20 information we gathered on people's desire as far as
21 in terms of recreation with the dredging came in
22 those group interviews. And, you know, not a whole
23 lot of comments on that but some people would like to
24 see, you know, just a small path in the reservoir
25 that would just accommodate the row boats and things

1 like that.

2 TOM SULLIVAN: And, Linda, just so you
3 know, yesterday afternoon we went over a geology and
4 soils report that has in it a dredging analysis or an
5 analysis of what dredging costs would be and what the
6 logistics of that would be. So, in terms of the
7 factual information, if you take a look at that, it's
8 all in there.

9 LINDA BAIN: I'll take a look at that.
10 Thank you so much.

11 TOM SULLIVAN: Other questions or comments
12 on this report? Okay. Are there any additional
13 information requests relative to this report? Okay.
14 Hearing none, what we'll do is we'll move on next to
15 the cultural and historic report. And Larry. Yes,
16 George.

17 GEORGE MARTIN: I just want to throw it
18 out, do we need a five-minute bio break? We have
19 been sitting here for about 45 minutes with fresh
20 coffee. I just wondered do we need a break?

21 TOM SULLIVAN: Want to take a break? Why
22 don't we do that. It's about 20 after 9:00, why
23 don't we reconvene at 9:30, okay? Does that work?

24 (Recess from 9:15 a.m. until
25 9:35 a.m.)

1 TOM SULLIVAN: I know we have at least one
2 new person that has joined us. If anybody else has
3 I'm going to ask them to introduce themselves. But
4 sir, if you could introduce yourself.

5 ARTHUR LEE: Sure. I'm Arthur Lee and I
6 represent the Atlanta Rowing Club.

7 TOM SULLIVAN: Good morning, Arthur.
8 Thank you for joining us. I'm Tom Sullivan with
9 Gomez and Sullivan and I facilitate these sessions.
10 Let me tell you where we are because I think we may
11 have covered a topic that you may have been
12 interested in here already. We did the recreation
13 and land use report a little while ago. We have gone
14 through that. We are about ready to start on the
15 cultural and historic.

16 However, if -- I suspect that's where your
17 interest might be, in recreation, if you have
18 questions about that you can feel free to ask them
19 now. Or Greg is the guy you probably want to talk
20 to, he can summarize the report for you and he can
21 answer any specific questions that you may have about
22 that. Okay?

23 ARTHUR LEE: Okay.

24 TOM SULLIVAN: Anyone else new has joined
25 us since we broke? All right.

1 The next part of our meeting is to review
2 the cultural and historic report. Larry is going to
3 take us through that. It will be the same format
4 we'll go through, it's about a 15-minute
5 presentation, we'll go through that and then at the
6 end of that we'll answer questions about that.
7 Larry.

8 LARRY WALL: Thank you, Tom. Good morning
9 ladies and gentlemen. As Tom told you, I am here to
10 give you the results of our studies for the
11 archaeological and historic properties, and also the
12 historic hydro engineering report. We'll begin with
13 our archaeological and historic properties.

14 The study objectives for this component of
15 the cultural resources study for the project were to
16 identify the known and unknown archaeological and
17 historic resources there at the project. Now, I want
18 to clarify one thing here. This is the studies for
19 these components are limited to an area that would be
20 determined by the State Historic Preservation Office
21 as an area of potential effect for the operation of
22 the project as opposed to the normal 2,000-foot
23 project area that you have seen on all of the other
24 studies.

25 And the reason for that is the State

1 Historic Preservation Office who reviews all the
2 components of areas that are determined to be
3 potentially eligible for the National Register of
4 Historic Places, they look for any effects that any
5 action might have on those archaeological or historic
6 properties.

7 And, of course, our component is the
8 immediate use of the project itself and any impacts
9 that our operation would have. And there would be
10 very limited effects beyond just the immediate
11 project boundary itself. And I'll explain a little
12 bit more about that as we go along.

13 The second area of the study objective was
14 to identify areas on the project that possessed
15 either a high or moderate probability of possessing
16 these cultural resources, the archeological sites
17 that may not be evident to anyone that would be
18 viewing the project along the shoreline or along the
19 trails. And then, of course, also any historic
20 properties such as structures.

21 The third item that the objectives were to
22 present was to prepare a report for the State
23 Historic Preservation Office and the Commission of
24 the archaeological resources present at the project
25 area. And also not just the archaeological resources

1 but the cultural properties also, historic
2 properties. And the final item is the development of
3 a history of the Morgan Falls project itself.

4 A little bit of background. Of course
5 this area has been used along the river since
6 prehistory. The river side on the west side of the
7 river there is a series of bluffs with a lot of
8 outcropping rock areas. And in prehistoric times
9 these areas and these overhangs, rock overhangs were
10 used by the meandering people for shelters for
11 short-term camps. But by the mid-1600s the project
12 area was inhabited by smaller populations of
13 historically identified tribes. And these were
14 primarily the Creek and Cherokee people.

15 We made contact simply because we knew
16 that this area had a cultural affiliation back to the
17 17- and 1800s with the Cherokee and Creek people. We
18 made contact with the Bureau of Indian Affairs to
19 determine who they might identify as tribes that
20 would have had a historical presence in the area.

21 And the Cherokee nation was easy to
22 identify. They were a more closely assimilation of
23 confederated groups, but the Creek people were looser
24 bands and each one had its own tribal groups. Or
25 they call them towns for identification purposes.

1 But they weren't as easy to identify as the Cherokee
2 people.

3 So, we contacted the Bureau of Indian
4 Affairs and they provided us a list along with the
5 FERC with ten known tribes that were identified as
6 having a presence in the project area. And we
7 went -- first we sent letters asking them for their
8 interest in participating in the process. We did get
9 letters of interest from eight of the ten tribes that
10 we contacted.

11 And in an effort to see what kind of
12 interest they might have in participating in the
13 licensing process, we set up a meeting in Tahlequah,
14 Oklahoma at the Bacone College, which is an
15 institution that was developed to educate the Indian
16 youth there in Oklahoma. And Scott Hendricks,
17 myself, George and our vice president went to Tulsa
18 and met with Janet and J.T. Griffin and seven tribe's
19 members representatives showed up at the meeting.
20 One individual did not make it to that meeting just
21 by mistaken location on his part. But we had a very
22 good session, a meeting with them. Found out what
23 their concerns and interests were in the project.

24 And since that time we have had
25 correspondence, conversations with them, particularly

1 the ones who had showed a higher interest in
2 participating.

3 In the project area as you can see on the
4 slide right there, the project area is bisected, the
5 project itself is bisected by what was known and is
6 still identified by historic marker as the Hightower
7 Trail. And it was the trail that connected the Coosa
8 River area to the Appalachia River area, and it was
9 traversed along that route by the Indian traders and
10 also white traders. And it later became the -- they
11 were recognized between the Cherokee and the Creek
12 people as the official boundary between those
13 nations.

14 This is just a photograph of one of the
15 rock shelters that was used in pre history by the
16 indigenous people as they moved through the area. As
17 I told you, we did background research. We went to
18 the state site files. This is the information that's
19 retained at a location at the University of Georgia
20 that has all of the identified cultural resource
21 areas in the state.

22 And that background survey, that
23 background research indicated that within the one
24 mile buffer area of the project there were 89 sites
25 that were identified. And of those 89 sites eight

1 were previously recorded as sites that are either
2 within or adjacent to the project boundary. And one
3 of those eight sites is recommended as being eligible
4 for the National Registry of Historic Places. And it
5 is a historic place, historic location being Ivy
6 Mill.

7 This slide just shows the eight sites that
8 are reported adjacent to the project boundary. And
9 as you see, the 9FU228 is a 19th century mill. It
10 was Ivy Mill. And it is the only one of those eight
11 that has been determined as eligible for the National
12 Register.

13 The results of our archaeological survey.
14 We hired a professional firm of Brighton & Associates
15 to perform our archaeological research. They did
16 this by performing a shoreline survey of the project,
17 and they were primarily searching for areas that did
18 have this high to moderate probability of possessing
19 archaeological resources.

20 In performing the survey from the
21 reservoir they determined that there were three areas
22 that did possess this, the potential for having the
23 archaeological presence. They performed field
24 investigations, what's determined as a level 1 survey
25 of those three areas. But their investigation didn't

1 turn up any presence of artifacts.

2 Which was a little bit surprising to us.

3 But that may be the fact that these areas are covered
4 with material that would be much deeper in the strata
5 than would be revealed by a level 1 testing.

6 This slide right here just indicates the
7 three areas that possess that high to moderate
8 probability. The archeologists typically are able to
9 determine this from their experience. They know
10 areas that have a higher degree of potential
11 occupation where people might have left artifacts.

12 As part of the surveys the archeologists
13 went back and revisited the sites that were listed.
14 There were seven sites that were revisited out of the
15 eight. One site that's listed is an area that is on
16 private property and it was or is an area that is
17 antidotal in information.

18 There is a private home there and it's
19 just been told that over the years that this might
20 have been an Indian camp, encampment area. But
21 simply because it is private we couldn't go on it to
22 do any verification.

23 But they did go there to the other seven
24 for the purpose of verifying the location as to where
25 it's shown on the state site forms, to evaluate the

1 present conditions, see if there has been any
2 activity potentially by the public who a lot of times
3 get out and hunt for artifacts. And also, to
4 determine whether or not these sites require any
5 further management either by the Park Service because
6 many many of these sites were on Park Service lands
7 or else on property that we may have the ability to
8 affect.

9 As I said, the one site that's determined
10 eligible is a 19th century mill. This was a mill
11 that was operated as a textile facility. It had a
12 dam that's adjacent to the reservoir, and parts of
13 the old mill are still there. It's the National Park
14 Service trail there, the Vickery Creek unit goes just
15 right by this site. It's protected and managed by
16 the Park Service staff. It is immediately adjacent
17 to the confluence of Vickery Creek or Big Creek and
18 the river itself.

19 This is a photograph of part of the old
20 mill and the trail goes just on the other side of
21 that unit there.

22 Now going to the historic
23 hydro-engineering study. This report was prepared as
24 to provide the background information. We know that
25 because of the type of history that the Morgan Falls

1 Dam and powerhouse has that it is eligible for the
2 National Register. We have not submitted that to the
3 State Historic Preservation Office yet but we know
4 simply because it possesses certain criteria, it will
5 be eligible.

6 So, the report was done in a great amount
7 of detail to provide this information to the SHPO and
8 to the Commission. The report begins -- well, let me
9 talk about the methodology.

10 The first thing we did was to outline the
11 general history of hydro in America and particularly
12 in the Southeast. It was meant to provide the
13 summary of the development of hydro operations in
14 Georgia and in the surrounding Southeastern states.
15 It was also meant to provide construction detail and
16 operational detail on the history of the project.

17 Have to give credit to L.G. Byrnes, he is
18 the one -- he is the person who went to the archives
19 here in the company and pulled all this information
20 together for the development of the report. And if
21 it hadn't been somebody with his experience of
22 knowing the project, I don't know that it would have
23 been quite as easy a task as it turned out to be. It
24 was easy for us once L.G. provided all that
25 information. So, give him credit right there.

1 But the fourth item was the report is
2 meant to describe the project structures, equipment
3 and noting any alterations that may have occurred in
4 the past and also the present condition of those
5 facilities.

6 And finally, the report is meant to
7 provide a method to evaluate the resources according
8 to the eligibility requirements by the keeper of the
9 National Register and the requirements of the
10 National Historic Preservation Act.

11 I don't know whether anybody has read the
12 report other than just the people who may be
13 interested in it. But the initial construction of
14 the project began in 1902. It was undertaken by
15 Mr. S. Morgan Smith who was an early developer of
16 hydropower turbine in the U.S. He actually began the
17 collection of information for development of places
18 in the state to develop hydro sites in 1898. Though
19 it was not until 1902 that the work formally began.
20 In 1920 the turbines were upgraded due to demands on
21 the system energy.

22 And so, those in 1920, the generators were
23 changed out because the demand on the system could
24 not be supplied with generators that operated at
25 25 cycles per second. So, they went to what's still

1 used today as a generator that provides electricity
2 on a frequency of 60 cycles per second. And provided
3 about 25 percent more energy than the original
4 25-cycle generators.

5 And no changes were made to it between
6 then and 1960 when the spillway was added with
7 mechanical gates to raise elevation of the reservoir
8 6 feet to provide additional water storage and to
9 ameliorate the effects of the operation of Buford Dam
10 which was built in the late '50s.

11 This is just a slide to give you an idea
12 of what they faced in 1902 with trying to do, harness
13 that Chattahoochee River out there using the
14 technology that we had at that time. Pretty amazing
15 still when I look at it.

16 Study results, the Morgan Falls
17 facilities, as I said, will be recommended as
18 eligible for the National Register at the state
19 level. There are two levels, it can be either state
20 significance or national significance and this will
21 be eligible at the state level of significance.

22 For those three criteria -- there are four
23 criteria that can make a property eligible for the
24 National Register, and the Morgan Falls hydro
25 facility meets three of those criteria. Just one or

1 two of them can generally be -- can make something
2 eligible.

3 But because this had quite significant
4 importance for its pattern in the development of the
5 area which is criterion A, its association with
6 someone who is significant in history in that field
7 criteria being also is a good representative of the
8 type of construction of powerhouses and equipment for
9 that period.

10 So, we haven't, as I said, we haven't
11 finished our consultation with the State Historic
12 Preservation officer. But we are certain that it
13 will be recommended as eligible to the people for the
14 National Register. So, our study results summary is
15 that our, as far as the archaeological and historic
16 properties, our research didn't find any new sites
17 that had not already been identified as something
18 that would need management or protection.

19 Secondly, the examination of the
20 previously recorded sites show that they were all
21 being protected or either was not undergoing any
22 activity by anything that would have a negative
23 effect on any of the sites. As I said, one of those
24 sites is eligible. It is not on the National
25 Register but it is eligible and that's the Ivy Mill

1 site.

2 And finally, the historic properties
3 management plan will as a component of the licensing
4 effort, will be developed by Georgia Power Company in
5 consultation with all the entities that have been a
6 part of the process of the cultural resource studies.
7 And once we produce that it will go to the SHPO for
8 review and to the Commission and for finalization
9 later on.

10 That's all of my report.

11 TOM SULLIVAN: Thank you, Larry. Any
12 questions on the cultural or historic report? Betsy.

13 BETSY NICHOLAS: Betsy Nicholas, Upper
14 Chattahoochee Riverkeeper. I was curious about the
15 possible historic designation and what that would
16 mean in terms of any restrictions on use or operation
17 of the project, what protections you would get for it
18 and just sort of overall what would that do if that
19 went forward?

20 LARRY WALL: Well, if it is found eligible
21 and it's listed, it obviously does require a higher
22 level of protection and management. That's something
23 that's worked out through the SHPO, the Commission,
24 if it's actually inside the project boundary or part
25 of the area of potential effect. And also, the owner

1 of the property.

2 In some cases some of these sites are
3 actually on land that's either DOT right-of-way, Park
4 Service or, as I said, one site is on private
5 property. It does restrict some of the activities
6 that can take place around it. Ivy Mill, of course
7 if it's placed on the Natural Register, it would
8 still -- since it's managed to the degree that it is
9 by the Service, it would continue to be available to
10 the public as an area that would provide historical
11 background and an interpretive benefit educationally.

12 BETSY NICHOLAS: What about the dam
13 specifically? That's just something different than I
14 have ever really sort of thought of of historic
15 preservation.

16 LARRY WALL: Well, what we would have to
17 do is to develop as part of the historic properties
18 management plan a maintenance guidelines that would
19 say that if, say, if -- let's just say some of the
20 mechanical properties of some of the equipment failed
21 to the point that we couldn't repair them anymore,
22 typically what you do is as part of the management
23 plan is to provide for the complete documentation of
24 that historic unit, recordation photographically and
25 with the engineering drawings. And then once you do

1 that and get all that submitted then you can replace
2 it.

3 But as long as the properties have a
4 functionality you are limited in to the changes that
5 can be made to it. And that includes equipment and
6 the building also, the facade, they want to keep it
7 in the same appearance to the degree that it's
8 possible as what made it eligible. And, of course,
9 the structure was representative of that period. So
10 the building itself, they wouldn't want you, the
11 company, to go in and do a wholesale change to the
12 exterior of it.

13 You set up those kind of guidelines as
14 part of your management plan.

15 TOM SULLIVAN: Other questions on the
16 cultural or historic report? Janet.

17 JANET HUTZEL: Janet Hutzel with FERC.
18 Not so much a question but just sort of your
19 timeline. Do you guys intend to do an HPMP, a draft
20 when you file your license application?

21 LARRY WALL: Well, Janet, as you may be
22 aware, we have done this both ways. We have done
23 this post licensing and pre licensing. It's my
24 intention to do this prior to the --

25 JANET HUTZEL: Licensing?

1 LARRY WALL: -- the license application.

2 We have --

3 JANET HUTZEL: Had to ask it.

4 LARRY WALL: We have seen that it's easier
5 to get this approved and built in as part of the
6 license once the Commission approves the license,
7 where it's already approved then you don't have a
8 post license obligation that just continues the
9 process on and on for the stakeholders.

10 So, we'll be -- as a matter of fact, I
11 have got the information put together and we'll be
12 sending out the information. As a matter of fact, I
13 have sent out the archaeological and historic
14 properties report to all the tribes and asked them to
15 review it.

16 JANET HUTZEL: All right.

17 LARRY WALL: And I'll be contacting them
18 later on as I get the components of the historic
19 properties management plan put together asking for
20 their comments on it and approval.

21 JANET HUTZEL: And if I could get a copy,
22 that would be good too.

23 LARRY WALL: Absolutely.

24 JANET HUTZEL: That's great. Thanks.

25 TOM SULLIVAN: And, Larry, I just want to

1 make sure this works like other places that I have
2 worked, you said you were going to attempt to do
3 this. Sometimes that depends on consultation with
4 other folks and things. And I know you guys know
5 that but I don't know if everybody else does. Is
6 that the timing of that is not entirely in your
7 control per se, right?

8 LARRY WALL: And I don't know whether
9 anybody -- just some background experience with the
10 tribes, they are their own government and they don't
11 -- as they reminded us when we went to Tulsa to meet
12 with them, they don't operate on the same schedule
13 that we do. And so, where we may tell them we need
14 your comments back in 30 days or 60 days, you know,
15 if we don't finish the process, we wait and try to
16 get through it, give them an opportunity to respond
17 to us.

18 I know that through my recent contacts we
19 have had three tribal historic preservation officer
20 changes. When they change that position the person
21 has to go and sort of catch back up and it makes it
22 difficult for them to participate. But -- and you
23 may not get them all. It's not that we have to have
24 everybody's comments and I guess everybody is aware
25 of that. But we do try to elicit their participation

1 as much as we can because they did have a historical
2 presence.

3 In our meetings with them out there some
4 of them told us, you know, we look at this area of
5 Georgia as part of our homeland because they were
6 taken out and removed from the area. So, it's
7 significant to them.

8 So, we want them to be assured that we are
9 not going to operate the project in any way that
10 would have any negative impact on something that they
11 may hold a cultural significance with. And primarily
12 their concern was the inadvertent find of remains
13 from burials. And, of course, that would only take
14 place through construction.

15 We didn't find any sites that were
16 eroding, as I guess everybody heard in the geology
17 and soils report yesterday. The banks are stable.
18 There was no area that was determined on those three
19 sites as having any erosion. So, we don't believe
20 that we will have any -- again, don't believe we'll
21 have any problem with them agreeing to the management
22 plan.

23 TOM SULLIVAN: Other questions or comments
24 on the cultural or historic report? Any additional
25 information requests relative to the cultural and

1 historic report? Okay. Thank you for your time.
2 Thank you, Larry. We are at that point in the
3 proceedings where I summarize kind of where the
4 things that we have talked about and then George
5 talks a little bit about what the next steps are.

6 In terms of a summary for today it's going
7 to be a very similar summary to the last couple of
8 days but with a couple of additions. In terms of the
9 summary for today I think, you know, technical
10 presentations. There were technical questions and
11 answers. There were no additional information
12 requests.

13 There were a couple of areas that I think
14 we have agreement on and I just want to check on, and
15 they were a couple things that Janet raised.
16 Expanding table 3 in the recreation and land use
17 report in the license application so that it
18 delineates what's in and what's outside the project
19 boundary. And you raised that and I think Scott said
20 that would be fine. Okay.

21 And then the last thing we just talked
22 about which is that Georgia Power will attempt to
23 have a draft HPMP with the license application. And
24 I think those are two areas of agreement.

25 JANET HUTZEL: That sounds great.

1 TOM SULLIVAN: Do you agree with that?

2 JANET HUTZEL: Oh, yeah.

3 TOM SULLIVAN: Okay. Any questions on the
4 meeting summary? Kind of short and sweet. Okay.
5 George, do you want to go through the next steps?

6 GEORGE MARTIN: Sure. Greg is going to
7 put up a closing slide for today. And it's the same
8 slide that we have used for the previous two days.
9 And what it is is just a quick summary of the next
10 steps within the Morgan Falls integrated licensing
11 process proceeding.

12 Of course, this week as of today we are
13 concluding the study results meetings. The next step
14 for Georgia Power is by April the 30th to file the
15 study results meetings summary and to go over the
16 contents of the summary. We will have the court
17 transcript. We will have the PowerPoint
18 presentations that have made up the resource area
19 presentations over the past three days. We will have
20 the daily summaries that Tom and Winnie have provided
21 to us as either the morning or afternoon summary. We
22 will also have any handouts that were provided during
23 the resource reports.

24 And the last piece I believe is the
25 handout with regard to the ILP regulations with

1 respect to additional studies. And I think that's
2 everything that's going to be in the summary.

3 The next milestone or the next step is by
4 May 30th stakeholders may file their responses to the
5 meeting summary. They can provide comments or any
6 other requests that they may have. Then by June the
7 29th Georgia Power will respond to the May 30th
8 filings by the stakeholders. And then what we have
9 done is we have added licensing proposal development
10 meetings.

11 And I was thinking about this this morning
12 and here we have set aside three days on our
13 calendars, and as we move forward and consider the
14 results of these meetings and we look at any feedback
15 that we get further from you-all in writing and any
16 input that you may have with regard to three days of
17 meetings, we may not need three days, folks, we may
18 need a day, a day and a half. If we don't need three
19 days we'll cut it down and we'll discuss that and
20 propose that just as soon as we understand what we
21 have gathered thus far and after these study results
22 meetings.

23 The July 24th, 25th and 26th licensing
24 proposal development meetings are of course an
25 addition or enhancement to the existing process plan

1 and schedule which is in your PAD which was
2 distributed, if you will recall, back in January of
3 2004. So, that schedule has remained intact but it
4 has been enhanced by these three meetings, three days
5 of additional meetings.

6 The next milestone or next step, by
7 July 29th FERC will resolve any disagreements that
8 were not resolved between the stakeholders and
9 Georgia Power prior to the 29th. And then as Tom
10 alluded to earlier this morning, by October the 2nd
11 we will file the preliminary licensing proposal, and
12 then yet again there is another opportunity for
13 comments on the preliminary licensing proposal.

14 But the bottom line, deadline for filing
15 the license application is no later than February the
16 28th, 2007. And that is a drop-dead can't --
17 jurisdictional date. We cannot not file.

18 And with that, is there any further
19 discussion or anything that I have missed or anything
20 anybody wants to say? Do we need a round table
21 discussion? Is there anything anybody wants to say
22 or discuss?

23 Yes.

24 BETSY NICHOLAS: I just noticed like a
25 couple of things I have jotted down and had questions

1 from various times from the day. Is this a good time
2 for that?

3 GEORGE MARTIN: Sure. Yeah.

4 BETSY NICHOLAS: On the first day when we
5 were talking about all of the different species and
6 wildlife and rare and threatened and endangered, Bret
7 I think was presenting. And he had talked about a
8 couple of things that we sort of were going to have
9 further discussion on.

10 One was looking at the maintenance under
11 the power lines and trying to help manage, which
12 Georgia Power is already doing to some extent for
13 things like the Georgia aster. And I wasn't sure if
14 that's somehow reflected in this record in how you
15 are keeping it aside from just obviously the
16 transcript?

17 Is that sort of something that has been
18 jotted down as to be talked about later or --

19 GEORGE MARTIN: Okay. My recollection of
20 that, Betsy -- and let's have an open discussion so
21 we all recall this correctly -- is that Bret pointed
22 out that Georgia Power has an ongoing linear project,
23 I will call them, effort to consider species of
24 concern, rare, threatened, endangered or otherwise
25 when we run upon them, come upon them. And my

1 recollection was that this particular find of the
2 Georgia aster, first of all, is outside of the
3 project boundary.

4 And second of all, I believe Alice
5 Lawrence of Fish and Wildlife expressed an interest
6 in the Georgia aster outside the project boundary on
7 that particular linear corridor. And, Bret, my
8 implication was that that would be taken into
9 consideration, not only noted within this proceeding
10 within our summary but it will be handled under our
11 ongoing efforts to manage such issues.

12 And Mike Nichols the manager of the
13 environmental lab who Bret works for can verify what
14 I think I have heard. And I pass the buck.

15 MIKE NICHOLS: I think that's a fair
16 summary and what we will do is look at and talk to
17 Alice about whether we need to use signs what this
18 area is, and then get with right-of-way management.
19 But there is actually a guideline that covers that
20 and I think that is -- my concept was we will address
21 that under those guidelines.

22 BETSY NICHOLAS: Okay. And a related
23 question in there was about the invasives removal,
24 and that sounded like it was kind of following the
25 same path, that there would be further discussion

1 about maybe some good little projects to remove some
2 invasive species. Is that basically following the
3 same path?

4 GEORGE MARTIN: I recall two areas of
5 exotics or invasives and one is terrestrial and one
6 is aquatic. And to take care of the terrestrial I
7 think it's very similar to what we talked about with
8 the Georgia aster.

9 And here again there is that project
10 boundary within and without, and Bret pointed out
11 that invasive terrestrial species don't necessarily
12 care about any line in the sand. And they are going
13 to be in the project boundary, and in that project
14 area, that 2000-foot buffer that we have -- it's not
15 a buffer, it's a 2000-foot area, whatever. Let's
16 just call it an area. Those will be handled in
17 conjunction with the adjacent situation.

18 As far as aquatic weed management control,
19 I'm going to turn that right over to Tom and see what
20 his perspective is with regard to what may be within
21 the project boundary.

22 TOM BROADWELL: As far as the exotic
23 control?

24 GEORGE MARTIN: Yeah. Aquatic exotics.

25 TOM BROADWELL: Aquatic exotics. There

1 are several and as we mentioned earlier, your Asian
2 watermilfoil. There is Brazilian Elodea, that's
3 common names. I think there is a third one but right
4 now, it's not coming to me.

5 But in any case, they seem to over the
6 last several years, seem to be -- their growth seems
7 to be related to whether or not we have a long
8 extended drought period. If we have little flow then
9 they seem to grow more. And then when we get a big
10 flush or a lot of rainfall it flushes them out of the
11 system.

12 And so, then it takes them a long time to
13 recover. And at this point they haven't quite gotten
14 to the point where it's a severe hindrance to our
15 operations. And as far as we have not gotten
16 complaints from residents about these particular
17 plants.

18 There are some constraints regarding
19 maintenance efforts if we ever had to go to do some
20 control, the only practical solution would be to use
21 a herbicide. And because we have water supply
22 intakes immediately downstream it creates a real
23 problem in doing that. We'd have to change complete
24 operation, we have to be able to stop flow through
25 the reservoir for a day or so in order to get some

1 contact on the herbicide.

2 And then the water supply people will have
3 to not withdraw until that slug of herbicide and
4 chemical passes their intake. And as I understand,
5 there is not much storage to handle that.

6 GEORGE MARTIN: Does that answer your
7 question?

8 BETSY NICHOLAS: Well, I guess, you know,
9 just sort of along the same lines of pulling
10 invasives and stuff like that if there is opportunity
11 to do that so you don't get to that herbicide point,
12 I think probably a lot of the groups here would be
13 interested in helping out on efforts like that.

14 TOM BROADWELL: There certainly are other
15 emergent exotics shoreline type plants, and then
16 others further up on the watershed that we could
17 probably do some efforts with.

18 BETSY NICHOLAS: Okay.

19 GEORGE MARTIN: Tom and Mike, I want to
20 just ask you a question then but get your response.
21 It's safe to say that if the opportunity arises for
22 resource management of that particular concern we'll
23 certainly be involved in that with the resource
24 agencies and any other interested parties. It's
25 definitely in the mix I guess.

1 BETSY NICHOLAS: Okay

2 GEORGE MARTIN: Simply stated. Mike.

3 MIKE NICHOLS: This is Mike Nichols,
4 Georgia Power. I just want to clarify something in
5 my mind. You are bringing up important issues and,
6 George, this is a question for you. I think some of
7 these issues are items we want to identify in our
8 development of a licensing proposal. Is that how we
9 are going to address --

10 GEORGE MARTIN: That's fine.

11 MIKE NICHOLS: -- these questions? Okay.

12 So, we need to have some discussion and
13 figure out what's practical.

14 GEORGE MARTIN: Any other round table
15 discussion, questions, concerns?

16 BETSY NICHOLAS: I have got another one.
17 And I might have written this down incorrectly but
18 this is to you, Steve. When we were talking about
19 the sediment contaminants in geology and soils, I had
20 in my note that you had said there didn't seem to be
21 any evidence of contamination in the fish. Which
22 seems sort of out of line. And like I said, I might
23 have written that down incorrectly because there are,
24 you know, fish consumption guidelines pretty much the
25 whole Chattahoochee. Can you clarify that for me?

1 STEVE LAYMAN: Yes. I meant to say, if I
2 didn't, that there was a consumption advisory
3 upstream Morgan Falls for mercury in large mouth
4 bass. That's the only one I'm aware of.

5 BETSY NICHOLAS: Okay.

6 JIM LONG: How far upstream?

7 STEVE LAYMAN: Buford Dam, I believe. I
8 believe it's that segment from Buford Dam to Morgan
9 Falls Dam, but I would have to verify it in the --

10 JIM LONG: So, it includes the
11 impoundment?

12 STEVE LAYMAN: Includes the impoundment.
13 It's gone down. It used to include trout and the
14 level have gone down generally speaking but --

15 CRISTIN KRACHON: Those fish consumption
16 guidelines are only updated when they get new data,
17 and I don't think there has been any data for quite a
18 few years.

19 BETSY NICHOLAS: It just got updated.

20 CRISTIN KRACHON: They update i every year
21 but they don't update that segment unless there is
22 been new fish issue collected. And in some segments
23 it may be five or six years before they get to that.

24 BETSY NICHOLAS: Okay.

25 GEORGE MARTIN: Anybody else? Art, I

1 don't mean to call you out but you joined us, we are
2 glad you came.

3 ARTHUR LEE: Well, I joined you late and
4 I'm just embarrassed to ask questions I'm sure were
5 covered earlier and we can't row on dry land. So I
6 just -- I assume that something has been said about
7 the dredging of the accumulating silt?

8 I know my grandchildren live in California
9 so I row with the Newport Aquatic Center and they
10 have just started a dredging project in the estuary
11 that goes from Newport Beach up to the Costa Mesa,
12 and I have just hearsay about the way it was welcomed
13 by all of the groups in the area including those
14 interested in wildlife, plants and fish and so forth,
15 and certainly the growing kayaking population both
16 here and there.

17 And so, is that, some of the silt going to
18 be removed just upstream from the dam?

19 GEORGE MARTIN: Where we are right now,
20 Art, is within the geology and soils resource report
21 and the supporting study, and even further back to
22 issues identification, the notion of dredging has
23 been brought forward. And in response to that we did
24 an evaluation of the feasibility and costs of
25 dredging. And we have developed a tool to look at

1 the feasibility and costs of any dredging scenario
2 that one might come up with.

3 And where we are in this proceeding is we
4 are moving forward with discussions with regard to
5 what enhancements could be proposed for this
6 proceeding as we move into a relicensing for the
7 continued operation of the Morgan Falls project.

8 So, where we are right now is in a place
9 where I can't answer your question as to yes or no,
10 there will or will not be a dredging project. We are
11 at the point where we are looking at what the
12 resource study report has told us about the
13 feasibility and cost of doing that. And so that is
14 where we are with this proceeding.

15 Tom, you may have --

16 ARTHUR LEE: That Newport Beach estuary
17 project, that would probably be pertinent and of
18 interest to your study. They just started it I think
19 just a few months ago, and it's a brackish water. In
20 other words, as you get up towards the highlands it's
21 fresh water and it's tidal. As you go further down,
22 marshes, wetlands and possibly a relatively
23 similar --

24 GEORGE MARTIN: Can I ask you one question
25 about that? Again, tell us the name of that project.

1 ARTHUR LEE: This is in Newport Beach. I
2 don't know the official name. When I go out West and
3 visit my grand kids I joined that club for a month
4 for 50 bucks and row with them. And I just noticed
5 in my last visit three weeks ago there was dredging
6 machinery, and I asked one of the local attendants at
7 the club and they said, oh, everybody is in favor of
8 this. And I was astounded to hear that.

9 GEORGE MARTIN: You don't know if it's
10 involved with a federally regulated hydro project?

11 ARTHUR LEE: I'm sure it's regulated by
12 all sorts of organizations, I just --

13 GEORGE MARTIN: I guess is there a dam
14 close by?

15 ARTHUR LEE: No. It's an estuary, it runs
16 into the Pacific Ocean. Pacific Ocean is about four
17 miles downstream from where the dredging starts.

18 GEORGE MARTIN: Okay. Well, that may be a
19 good project for us to consider. Of course, the
20 Devil's in the details when you discuss one project
21 versus another, the stakeholder base, the parties of
22 interest, the parties of responsibility, the intent,
23 the permitting.

24 Some of those aspects we covered yesterday
25 but certainly good reference that we can review.

1 ARTHUR LEE: And I'd also comment that
2 they seem to have an enlightened approach towards
3 combining interest and resources. That aquatic
4 center has a rowing, skulling, high school private
5 masters but also kayaking, public rental of kayaks,
6 all sorts of small water sports. Dragon boats and
7 large gym. And it's partly private and also partly
8 regulated by the town, and perhaps the county. And
9 it's revenue producing because in the summer season
10 the concessionary to rent kayaks brings in an
11 enormous amount of revenue which supports all of the
12 other activities for the high school.

13 GEORGE MARTIN: That's interesting
14 information.

15 LARRY WALL: George, may be Art would like
16 to take a copy of the geology report, the soils
17 report to see what information is in there there on
18 our reports.

19 GEORGE MARTIN: I'll remind everyone
20 again. We do have hard copies, a few left. I
21 noticed I saw a lot of people migrating to them
22 yesterday and I think we have a few left, but we do
23 have a hard copy geology and soils report that covers
24 the dredging feasibility analysis that you might want
25 to pick up on your way out.

1 NANCY DeSHAZO: We don't have any more of
2 the geology reports, we are out of that particular
3 report.

4 GEORGE MARTIN: And it's also available on
5 the web site, and we can give that to you if you want
6 to just download it. It's available on our
7 relicensing web site as well as FERC's e-library.
8 And you can give Nancy a business card and she'll
9 mail you a hard copy.

10 And, Fred, I think you had your hand up.

11 FRED COX: I was just going to say we are
12 out of hard copies.

13 JIM LONG: Jim Long, Park Service. The
14 geology and soils, that's the one with like seven
15 parts?

16 GEORGE MARTIN: Sections.

17 JIM LONG: Now, the last time I was at the
18 web site there was like two parts that wouldn't
19 download.

20 GEORGE MARTIN: We have been constantly
21 fixing those and as of Monday they all are working.
22 Now, if you find them this week, send me an e-mail.
23 And we had -- the most that I ever saw was one
24 section was corrupted and we had to reload it and
25 make some changes to it. But as of Monday

1 everything -- before this meeting I made sure
2 everything was downloadable.

3 TOM SULLIVAN: Jim, we had the same issue.
4 If you go to the FERC e-library site --

5 JIM LONG: Well, that's what I did.

6 TOM SULLIVAN: -- you can get it off of
7 there.

8 JIM LONG: Because it was like part 1 and
9 part 4 or something --

10 TOM SULLIVAN: Yeah. Okay.

11 JIM LONG: -- when I tried it. But, yeah,
12 then I went to the FERC's site.

13 GEORGE MARTIN: L.G., did you have a --

14 L.G. BYRNES: That was the exact point I
15 was going to make, go to the FERC e-library.

16 GEORGE MARTIN: Anybody else? Yes.

17 BETSY NICHOLAS: I just wanted to note and
18 thank you for the changes that you made in response
19 to our comments, more notice, some additional
20 meetings, filing things early, and the web site. So,
21 thank you for that. And thank you for lunch.

22 GEORGE MARTIN: Thank you for noticing.
23 Anything else at this point? Okay.

24 Well, this will be in the meeting summary,
25 and as I said, you have this in your process plan and

1 schedule within your PAD. And I think I have sent
2 this out four or five times in the meantime, and
3 we'll be back with you on exactly whether we have or
4 need three days of licensing proposal development
5 meetings.

6 But with that, I'm going to close it.
7 Thank you all for coming. Thank you for your
8 interest. And get in touch with us if you need
9 anything before we get back to you.

10 (Meeting concluded at 10:30 a.m.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF GEORGIA:
COUNTY OF FULTON:

I hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were taken down, as stated in the caption, and reduced to typewriting under my direction, and that the foregoing pages 1 through 64 represent a true, complete, and correct transcript of said proceedings.

This, the 23rd day of April, 2003.

LINDA E. CHEEK, CCR-A-752