

**Yadkin Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 2197)
Wetlands, Wildlife, and Botanical IAG Meeting
March 13, 2003
Alcoa Conference Center
Badin, North Carolina**

Final Meeting Summary

Agenda

See Attachment 1.

Meeting Attendees

See Attachment 2.

Welcome and Introductions

Gene Ellis, Yadkin, opened the meeting with introductions and a review of the agenda. Jane Peeples, Meeting Director, said that she had distributed copies of “Issue Advisory Groups Outline of Purpose and Suggested Process”, a document distributed originally at the February 28, 2003 Issue Advisory Group (IAG) Organizational Meeting to those who did not have a copy (see Attachment 3). Jane reviewed the three-stage relicensing process schedule. She noted that at the February 28 meeting the following IAG meeting dates were set: April 8-10, 2003; May 20-22, 2003; June 3-5, 2003; July 8-10; August 5-7, 2003; September 2-4, 2003; October 7-9, 2003; November 4-6, 2003; and December 2-4, 2003.

IAG Dispute Resolution Process

Jane Peeples discussed meeting procedures and the proposed dispute resolution process with new meeting attendees prior to the start of the meeting. The proposed dispute resolution process (see Attachment 4) was revised (see Attachment 5) based on earlier comments by Larry Jones, High Rock Lake Association, and Steve Reed, North Carolina Division of Water Resources (see Attachment 5).

Introduction of Technical Consultants

Wendy Bley, Long View Associates, stated that the purpose of the meeting was to scope wildlife and botanical studies based on comments/issues/and study requests submitted to Yadkin in January 2003. She noted that Yadkin has retained Normandeau Associates (NAI) to plan and conduct the studies at the Yadkin Project. Wendy introduced Sarah Allen, NAI, who will manage the studies.

Discussion of Study Requests and Study Scopes

Wendy Bley said that field studies would be conducted over the next two years (2003 and 2004). She said that the goal for the meeting was “to leave with enough understanding of the study requested to develop draft study plans”. Wendy listed several study scoping objectives that should be considered by all when scoping technical studies:¹

1. What is the issue?
2. What is the relationship to the resource and the Project or its operation?
3. What are the study objectives or what questions does the study need to answer?
4. What is the appropriate geographic scope?
5. Are there any timing/scheduling issues?
6. Are there any methodological issues?
7. Are there opportunities to coordinate studies?

After reviewing the issues/comments/study requests received by Yadkin during Stage 1 regarding wetlands, wildlife, and botanical resources (see Attachment 6), Wendy distributed outlines for six studies (see Attachment 7). She acknowledged that the group probably would not have the time to discuss each of the six studies and suggested that the group focus on the proposed Wetland and Riparian Habitat Assessment and the RTE (rare, threatened, and endangered) Species Survey first and then the others as time allowed.

Lawrence Dorsey, North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission (NCWRC), said that the NCWRC had requested a survey of the extent and distribution of the non-native invasive Brazilian elodea in Tuckertown Reservoir. He emphasized the time-sensitivity of such a survey – the growing season for the elodea is in May and early June. Chris Goudreau, NCWRC, also noted the time-sensitivity of the proposed Migratory Bird Evaluation. Wendy said that the Migratory Bird Evaluation would likely be conducted in spring 2004. Gerrit Jobsis, South Carolina Coastal Conservation League (SCCCL) and American Rivers, commented that there might be an opportunity to coordinate the Migratory Bird Evaluation with the Reservoir Aquatic Habitat Assessment.

Wetland and Riparian Habitat Assessment

Wendy explained that the Wetland and Riparian Habitat Assessment would 1) identify vegetative wetlands and important riparian habitats, 2) evaluate the effects of current Project operations and water levels on wetlands, and 3) evaluate the impact of piers on aquatic vegetation.

Mark Bowers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), asked about the geographic extent of the Habitat Assessment and how it related to the FERC Project boundary. He said that the USFWS would like the assessment to include up to the flood elevation in the reservoir tributaries. Wendy said the geographic extent of the assessment would be the

¹ The original list of study scoping objectives (presented at the March 12, 2003 Fish and Aquatics (RTE aquatic) IAG meeting was revised, as presented here.

area potentially affected by Project operations. Sarah Allen said that such an assessment is often topography-based. Mark said that he was also concerned about the riparian habitats in remnant riverine reaches (i.e. tailwaters).

Continuing, Wendy said that NAI plans to delineate and map wetlands using aerial photographs, with some ground-truthing, and then evaluate the effects of Project operations, if any, on the wetlands. She said a related question would be to understand if changes in Project operations change the composition and/or configuration of the wetlands. Wendy noted that if the aerial photos currently available were not sufficient to complete a full wetlands delineation, Yadkin would plan to shoot additional photos in June, during the growing season. Sarah Allen commented that there would not be a lot of field work until the 2004 growing season.

Scott Jackson, North Carolina Watershed Coalition, asked if NAI would also map degraded wetlands. Sarah responded affirmatively.

Ben West, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), asked that the study include an assessment of all operational effects (i.e. “permitted” activities such as piers, recreation, dredging etc.) on wetlands and riparian habitats. Chris Goudreau said that the NCWRC is also interested in data, which can be analyzed to assess the effects on habitats since the implementation of the Yadkin Project Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) to answer the question, “are things better or worse?”

Lawrence Dorsey asked if basic cover types (shoreline use) are available on GIS (geographic information systems). Wendy explained that the information is available in the SMP, but that it is several years old. She said that if it is necessary to take additional aerial photos, Yadkin could update the basic cover types along the shoreline in GIS.

Larry Jones asked if the aerial photos would be available to IAG members. Wendy said that Yadkin might consider making the photos available after the assessment was complete, but would be concerned about any damage to or loss of the photos during the study. She also noted how expensive the photos are. Larry asked that Yadkin make the price of the photos available to him. Robert Petree, SaveHighRockLake.org, suggested that the photos could be made available electronically. Wendy committed to providing the vendor’s contact information.

RTE Species Survey

Wendy said that Yadkin had been asked to survey the Project for RTE species (terrestrial and aquatic). She proposed that surveys for individual aquatic species be handled by the Fish and Aquatics (RTE aquatic) IAG and that surveys for individual terrestrial species be handled by the Wetlands, Wildlife, and Botanical IAG. Wendy said that NAI would begin with a review of North Carolina Natural Heritage Program information and other available literature to first determine which RTE species of concern could be affected by Yadkin Project operations (Phase I). She said that NAI could also review species lists provided by the U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and North Carolina.

She said NAI could then conduct actual field investigations for those species to evaluate the potential impacts of Project operations on the species of concern (Phase II). After naming the Carolina and robust redhorse, mussels, bald eagle, and Rafinesque big-eared bat as species of concern (based on comment letters received by Yadkin), Wendy asked if there were any other species of concern. Mark Bowers mentioned the Yadkin River Goldenrod. Wendy noted that Yadkin was working with North Carolina and the USFWS to transplant Goldenrod below Falls Dam. Mark asked that the Project's transmission lines be assessed for remnant populations of plants that favor disturbed upland meadow habitats.

Andy Abramson, The Land Trust for Central North Carolina, asked that NAI also identify those species historically present at the Project. Wendy questioned the purpose of such a study and the study's nexus to the Project and its operations. Andy said that there might be reason to believe that species that existed historically may still exist at the Project. Randy Benn, Yadkin counsel, reminded the group that FERC considers the existing condition at the Project as the baseline.

Wendy stated that the Center for Conservation Biology (CCB) was currently surveying the Yadkin Project for bald eagles (as they have in the past). She said that the CCB was not planning to change how the surveys are conducted and therefore, there would be no study plan. Mark Bowers asked if the Bald Eagle Management Plan (BEMP) would be updated to include an assessment of future development impacts on the bald eagle and proactive land management recommendations to prevent the loss of the eagle. Wendy replied that there would be little value in revising the BEMP before completing the surveys.

Donley Hill said that a wildlife biologist with the USFS had commented that the riparian areas at the Yadkin Project might be suitable for the Rafinesque big-eared bat. He asked if Yadkin planned to survey the Project area for the bat. Wendy responded that Yadkin wants to discuss the bat survey with the USFS further to better understand the potential for the bat to be affected by Project operations.

Invasive Exotic Plant Species

Continuing, Wendy said that Yadkin had been asked by the USFS to identify exotic plant species located within the Project and evaluate their potential impacts on native species on USFS lands adjoining the Project. She suggested focusing on areas at the Project where invasive exotics have the potential to impact native communities or important habitats. Wendy proposed inventories along portions of the Narrows and Falls reservoirs and around the Narrows Dam and Powerhouse. Wendy also proposed surveys of other invasive exotic plant species such as the Brazilian elodea (the extent and composition of the stands), located in Tuckertown Reservoir. Mark Bowers noted that privet is also a problem at the Project. Ben West suggested an assessment of the encroachment of invasive exotics into conservation zones at the Project.

Summarizing, Wendy said that the study would 1) identify potential impact areas, 2) inventory for the presence of invasive exotics in the potential impact areas, 3) evaluate the current status of known invasive exotics, and 4) identify appropriate management and/or control measures, if necessary.

Transmission Line and Project Facility Habitat Assessment

Before reviewing the outline of the proposed Transmission Line and Project Facility Habitat Assessment, Wendy explained that Yadkin had submitted a request to FERC that all transmission lines with the exception of two lines from the Narrows and Falls powerhouses be removed (not physically) from the Project boundary. The lines being proposed for removal are a part of the regional transmission grid and are regulated under a different part of the Federal Power Act. She said that Yadkin was proposing to include only the two transmission lines remaining within the Project boundary in the study. Roy Rowe, Piedmont Boat Club, asked if Yadkin requested that the lines be removed from the Project boundary because of the curtailment in aluminum production at the Badin plant. Wendy explained that the lines being proposed for removal from the Project boundary also carry electricity generated by others – the two lines that would remain within the Project boundary are exclusive to Alcoa Power Generating Inc. Ben West asked if there were any other upland facilities that are part of the Yadkin Project. Wendy explained that the Yadkin Project boundary, as defined in the Yadkin Initial Consultation Document (ICD, September 2002) is typically the normal full pool elevation of the Project reservoirs. She noted that there are areas where the Project boundary is greater than the full pool elevation. The Project boundary also includes lands around the Project's dams and powerhouses.

Randy Benn said that Yadkin filed the request with FERC in December 2002 and expected approval based on FERC precedent for other hydro projects. Mark Bowers asked if FERC had received any objections or adverse comments. Randy said that he was not aware of any.

Wendy reviewed the study outline. She said the study would 1) delineate vegetative cover and habitat types, 2) evaluate wildlife value and use of the habitats, 3) review Yadkin management practices, 4) assess Project operations on vegetative cover and wildlife use, and 5) identify opportunities to improve wildlife habitat.

Mark Bowers asked again that the Project's transmission lines be assessed for remnant populations of plants that favor disturbed upland meadow habitats.

Chris Goudreau asked how the wildlife value and use of the habitats would be evaluated specifically. Wendy said that the goal of the study would be to understand the potential for improving the habitats for wildlife. She said that based on the basic cover and habitat type information collected, NAI would determine the likely uses of the habitats. Wendy asked the resource agencies if there were any wildlife management goals for the area that should be considered.

Impacts of Shoreline Erosion on Important Uwharrie National Forest Plant Communities

Wendy Bley said that the USFS had commented that reservoir shoreline erosion is negatively affecting aquatic and terrestrial habitats along the Uwharrie National Forest. The USFS asked Yadkin to inventory reservoir shorelines for evidence of erosion and to identify ways to reduce erosion. Donley Hill, USFS, clarified that erosion is also an issue around developed recreational areas. He said areas of erosion where there is a preference for a terrestrial condition rather than an aquatic one are also of concern to the USFS. He asked that Yadkin inventory USFS shorelines and other Project areas for areas of erosion that may be impacting important terrestrial features.

Robert Petree asked if the water level fluctuations at High Rock Reservoir exacerbated the erosion problem at the reservoir. Wendy explained that any hydropower reservoir, and even any natural lake, experiences shoreline erosion. Wendy thought that the goal of the study would be to understand where erosion is threatening an important habitat area or recreation area. Robert said that it might be necessary to rip rap portions of High Rock Reservoir's shoreline to prevent further erosion and sedimentation. Robert asked for a study that documents the effects of fluctuating water levels on erosion. Gene Ellis suggested a literature review as a starting point to determine the impacts of fluctuating water levels on erosion. Wendy noted that there are several very recent Duke University studies that document the transport of sediment through the river basin. Mark Bowers suggested that the following would also be good sources of information: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wilmington District (Experiment Station); U.S. Coast Guard; and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Larry Jones commented that the NCWRC's cut and cable habitat enhancement program contributes to bank erosion (partly because of copy cat activities). Larry suggested that Yadkin study the effectiveness of the NCWRC's lap tree program.

Chris Goudreau said that he was not only concerned about bank erosion and the loss of land, but also bank erosion and the related water quality impacts. Chris suggested that the group identify areas of concern and/or importance for NAI to focus on. The group identified the following areas of concern: recreation areas, SMP conservation zones (islands), and Yadkin-owned gamelands. Mark Bowers asked about the potential for peaking-induced erosion at the Project. He suggested that Yadkin examine riverbank erosion in the tailrace areas below the Project dams to determine the rate of erosion. Mark offered ramping as a potential solution to minimizing erosion in the tailwaters. Wendy said that absent a significant spill event, there is likely no erosion in the tailwaters. Donley Hill said that there are some areas on Narrows Reservoir that are exposed to prevailing winds, which are more prone to vertical bank erosion than others.

Ben West suggested that Yadkin use geomorphic indicators (soil types, topography etc.) to identify areas of severe erosion.

Andy Abramson asked that Yadkin also evaluate the benefits that buffers and conservation zones provide against erosion from developed areas. Wendy said that such an evaluation would be difficult to do. She said that some sort of literature review might help answer the question, “how is shoreline development contributing to shoreline erosion?”

Wrap-up

Wendy said that Yadkin would try to distribute draft study plans for the Wetland and Riparian Habitat Assessment, RTE Species Survey, Invasive Exotic Plant Species Survey, and Transmission Line and Project Facility Habitat Assessment in advance of the next IAG meeting.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:00 noon.

Attachment 1 – Meeting Agenda

**Alcoa Power Generating Inc. Yadkin Division (FERC No. 2197)
Communications Enhanced Three-Stage Relicensing Process**

Issue Advisory Group Meetings

**March 12-14, 2003
Alcoa Conference Center
Badin, North Carolina**

IAG Meeting Schedule

Wednesday, March 12 1:00 to 4:00 p.m.	Fish and Aquatics (RTE aquatic)
Thursday, March 13 8:00 to 10:00 a.m.	Water Quality
Thursday, March 13 10:00 to 12:00 noon	Wetlands, Wildlife, Botanical (RTE terrestrial)
Thursday, March 13 1:00 to 4:00 p.m.	Recreation, Aesthetics, Shoreline Management
Friday, March 14 8:00 to 10:00 a.m.	Operations Model
Friday, March 14 10:00 to 12:00 noon	County Economic Impacts

Agenda

(The following agenda applies to all individual IAG meetings)

1. Review of Meeting Schedule for 2003 and Procedures
2. Discussion of IAG Dispute Resolution Process
3. Introduction of Technical Consultants
4. Review and Discuss Study Requests and Study Scopes
5. Agenda for Next Meeting

Attachment 2 – Meeting Attendees

Name	Organization	Email
Andy Abramson	The Land Trust for Central NC	andy@landtrustnc.org
Ben West	US Environmental Protection Agency	west.ben@epa.gov
Bob Smet	APGI, Yadkin Division	robert.smet@alcoa.com
Brian Strong	NC State Parks	brian.strong@ncmail.net
Carl Davidson	Davie County	carl.davidson@co.davie.nc.us
Chris Goudreau	NC Wildlife Resources Commission	goudrecj@wnclink.com
Coralyn Benhart	Alcoa	coralyn.Benhart@alcoa.com
Don Kretchmer	Normandeau Associates Inc.	dkretchmer@normandeau.com
Donley Hill	US Forest Service	donleyhill@fs.fed.us
Gene Ellis	APGI, Yadkin Division	gene.ellis@alcoa.com
Gerrit Jobsis	SC Coastal Conservation League	scribers@bellsouth.net
Isaac Harrold	NC Wildlife Resources Commission	harroldi@mindspring.com
Jane Peeples	Meeting Director	jpeeples@carolinapr.com
Jody Cason	Long View Associates	jjcason@worldnet.att.net
Julian Polk	APGI, Yadkin Division	julian.polk@alcoa.com
Karen Tysinger	High Rock Business Owners Group	karen@tamaracmarina.com
Larry Jones	High Rock Lake Association	larry@foxhollowfarm.org
Lawrence Dorsey	NC Wildlife Resources Commission	dorseylg@vnet.net
Mark Bowers	US Fish and Wildlife	mark_bowers@fws.gov
Mary Tibbetts	PB Power	tibbets@pbworld.com
Randy Benn	Yadkin counsel	rbenn@llgm.com
Ray Johns	US Forest Service	rayjohns@fs.fed.us
Rick Simmons	Normandeau Associates Inc.	rsimmons@normandeau.com
Robert Petree	SaveHighRockLake.org	pete@savehighrocklake.org
Roy Rowe	Piedmont Boat Club	rrowe@triad.rr.com
Sarah Allen	Normandeau Associates Inc.	sallen@normandeau.com
Scott Fletcher	Framatome-ANP	scott.fletcher@framatome-anp.com
Scott Jackson	NC Watershed Coalition	scott@newatershedcoalition.org
Wendy Bley	Long View Associates	bleylva@aol.com

Attachment 3 - Issue Advisory Groups Outline of Purpose and Suggested Process



Alcoa Power Generating Inc. – Yadkin Division
Communications Enhanced Three-Stage Relicensing Process

Issue Advisory Groups

Outline of Purpose and Suggested Process

Purpose

Issue Advisory Groups (IAGs) are being formed to advise Yadkin on the important resource issues requiring study during the relicensing process. As a member of an IAG, your primary role will be to help identify issues that should be considered in the relicensing process, help determine information and study needs in support of those issues and to review study results.

Membership

IAGs are composed of representatives from state and federal agencies, legislatures, tribes, affected municipalities and recognized non-government organizations (NGOs). Recognized NGOs are those who meet the following criteria:

- represent interests not represented in already existing NGOs
- represent an interest that is directly affected by Yadkin's relicensing
- represent the interests of a group of stakeholders rather than an individual
- demonstrate a defined organizational structure
- have a designated representative who can speak for the organization

Time Line

The first objectives of the IAG process are to help Yadkin develop a scope of technical resource studies to be conducted and to review study plans. It is anticipated that IAGs will then meet as needed throughout 2003, 2004 and the first quarter of 2005 to review study results, as available, and refine/adjust studies, as needed.

Meeting Procedures

The following are suggested procedures for managing the work of the IAGs. These suggestions are open for discussion and revision within the IAG.

Meeting Schedule

- Yadkin will schedule the initial meetings. Subsequent meetings will be held on an as needed basis as determined by the IAG or Yadkin. Yadkin will try to provide notice to IAG members of all IAG meetings about 30 days prior to the meeting, if possible. Meetings may be scheduled with less than 30 days notice, if necessary. IAG members who are unable to attend the meeting in person will be given the opportunity to participate by conference call.
- It may be helpful to select a particular week of the month to convene IAGs in order to avoid conflict with other regional licensing processes.

Agenda and Information

- IAG meeting agendas will be prepared by Yadkin with input from IAG members and distributed to members at least 14 days prior to the meeting. IAG members may submit comments about the agenda in writing, by phone, e-mail or fax up to one week prior to the meeting. In addition, the agenda may be modified at the beginning of the meeting with agreement from those attending.
- Yadkin and IAG members should endeavor to make available all documents and other information necessary to prepare for the meeting at least one week prior to the meeting. As an alternative, materials may be provided at the meeting.

Meeting Summary Preparation and Distribution

- Yadkin will provide a draft meeting summary to all meeting attendees within about 15 days of the meeting. Meeting attendees should provide their comments on the meeting summary to Yadkin in writing or by phone, fax, or e-mail within about 15 days following the meeting. Yadkin will then finalize the meeting summary within about 30 days after receiving comments and will distribute a final meeting summary to all IAG members, regardless of their

(continued)

Issue Advisory Groups (continued)

participation in the meeting. If no corrections are submitted, the meeting summary will become final 30 days after the date of the meeting.

Meeting Norms

- Meetings begin and end on time
- Agenda is followed during the meeting
- Needed information resources are available during the meeting
- Tangible progress is made toward accomplishment of the tasks
- All decisions are brought to closure in a way that is clearly understood
- Agenda for next meeting discussed at close of each meeting
- Group members demonstrate effective meeting behaviors

- One speaker at a time, one subject at a time, limit war stories
- Respect for opinions of others, look for merit in ideas
- Active participation of all
- All members present at start of meeting
- All members arrive informed about previous meeting and agenda for present meeting

Resolving Study Disputes

- As the process unfolds, disagreements may surface regarding the type and scope of studies to be conducted. It is anticipated that IAGs will consider developing an appropriate dispute resolution process with the goal of

resolving any study disputes within the IAG. Under FERC's regulations, a licensee is expected to conduct all "reasonable and necessary" studies requested by resource agencies and tribes. If through its dispute resolution process an IAG is not able to resolve a dispute regarding whether or how a particular study should be conducted, then Yadkin may opt to send the dispute to FERC for formal dispute resolution.

Yadkin's Communications Enhanced Three-Stage Relicensing Process

Stage One 2002-2003	Stage Two 2003-2006	Stage Three 2006-2008
1) Inform stakeholders and public (publish ICD) 2) Receive input from stakeholders and public 3) Form Issue Advisory Groups	4) Conduct studies 5) Review studies w/ IAGs and public 6) Draft Application 7) Receive comments on draft Application 8) File Application	9) FERC Reviews Application and Comments 10) Conducts Environmental Assessment 11) Issues License

Attachment 4 – IAG Dispute Resolution Process Document

**Alcoa Power Generating Inc.—Yadkin Division (FERC No. 2197)
Communications Enhanced Three-Stage Relicensing Process**

IAG Dispute Resolution Process

As the Issue Advisory Group process unfolds, there will be situations in which the issue being discussed cannot easily be resolved within the normal IAG setting. When such disputes first present themselves, Yadkin and the IAG members will discuss the issue and attempt to resolve the dispute through discussion commensurate with the nature and importance of the dispute. Should initial discussions over the dispute cause an inordinate delay of the work of the IAG or become an obstacle to the progress of the IAG, Yadkin will implement the following process:

- (1) The issue will be delegated by Yadkin or the meeting manager to a smaller dispute resolution work group made up of Yadkin representative(s) and IAG members who have a vested interest in the issue.
- (2) The dispute resolution work group will convene outside of the regular IAG meeting to discuss the issue. Interested parties who are part of the dispute resolution work group will have responsibility for development of their position statements.¹
- (3) Yadkin will take into consideration the position statements prepared by the interested parties while making a decision on the disputed issue. Yadkin's decision on the disputed issue and the position statements of the interested parties will be reported back to the full IAG.
- (4) Both the position statements prepared by the dispute resolution work group's interested parties and Yadkin's report to the full IAG will become part of the IAG meeting summary and the final consultation record, which will be reviewed by FERC.

¹ For instance, in cases where the dispute is over a request to conduct a study or gather information, the position statements prepared by the dispute resolution work group should at a minimum include 1) a description of the study or information being requested, 2) the purpose of the study or need for the information being requested, and 3) the relationship between Project operations and effects on the resource to be studied.

Attachment 5 – IAG Dispute Resolution Process Document As Revised

**Alcoa Power Generating Inc.—Yadkin Division (FERC No. 2197)
Communications Enhanced Three-Stage Relicensing Process**

IAG Dispute Resolution Process

As the Issue Advisory Group process unfolds, there will be situations in which the issue being discussed cannot easily be resolved within the normal IAG setting. When such disputes first present themselves, Yadkin and the IAG members will discuss the issue and attempt to resolve the dispute through discussion commensurate with the nature and importance of the issue. Should initial discussions over the dispute threaten an inordinate delay of the work of the IAG or become an obstacle to the progress of the IAG, Yadkin will implement the following process:

- (1) The issue will be delegated by Yadkin or the meeting manager to a smaller dispute resolution work group made up of a Yadkin representative(s) and IAG members who have an expressed interest in the issue.
- (2) The dispute resolution work group will convene outside of the regular IAG meeting to discuss the issue and attempt to resolve it. As part of this effort, IAG members who are part of the dispute resolution work group will develop a written statement of their positions.¹ It is expected that these efforts will take place before the commencement of the next meeting of the IAG.
- (3) If the dispute resolution work group is unable to reach a timely resolution of the issue, Yadkin will take into consideration the position statements prepared by the interested parties when making a decision on the disputed issue. Yadkin's decision on the disputed issue and the position statements of the interested parties will be reported back to the full IAG.
- (4) Both the position statements prepared by the dispute resolution work group's interested parties and Yadkin's report to the full IAG will become part of the IAG meeting summary and the final consultation record, which will be reviewed by FERC.
- (5) If through this dispute resolution process an IAG is not able to resolve a dispute regarding whether or how a particular study should be conducted, then Yadkin or the resource agencies may opt to send the dispute to FERC for formal dispute resolution.

¹ For instance, in cases where the dispute is over a request to conduct a study or gather information, the position statements prepared by the dispute resolution work group should at a minimum include 1) a description of the study or information being requested, 2) the purpose of the study or need for the information being requested, and 3) the relationship between Project operations and effects on the resource to be studied.

Attachment 6 – Issues/Comments/Study Request Tables

TERRESTRIAL, WILDLIFE AND BOTANICAL

ISSUE/COMMENT	STUDY REQUEST
Effects of reservoir operations/fluctuations on wetlands and riparian habitats	Inventory wetlands and riparian habitat and evaluate potential effects of reservoir operations on these areas.
Current status of migratory bird use of Yadkin Project	Evaluate migratory bird use of Yadkin Project and identify potential habitat improvements.
Presence and impacts of terrestrial and aquatic invasive exotic plant pests (IEPPs) at the Yadkin Project	Inventory IEPPs at Yadkin Project and evaluate potential impacts to surrounding environs.
Transmission line and other facility operational impacts on vegetative cover and wildlife habitats	Inventory t-line cover-types and habitats and evaluate effects of t-line and facility operation and maintenance on these habitats.

**RARE, THREATENED AND
ENDANGERED (RTE) SPECIES**

ISSUE/COMMENT	STUDY REQUEST
Current status of RTE species at Yadkin Project that could be affected by Project operations	Inventory RTE species (aquatic and terrestrial; plants and animals) at the Yadkin Project and evaluate potential effects of Project operations on these species and their habitats. <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Bald Eagle•Bats•Redhorses•Freshwater Mussels

Attachment 7 –Wetlands, Wildlife, and Botanical Study Outlines

STUDY: Wetland and Riparian Habitat Assessment

1. Identify vegetative wetlands and important riparian habitats
 1. Delineate and map
 2. Describe habitat functions/values
2. Evaluate effects of current Project operations and water levels on wetlands
 1. Determine portion of wetlands affected by current operations
 2. Evaluate how wetland configuration and composition might change under altered Project operations
 1. High Rock
 3. Evaluate the impact of piers on aquatic vegetation (water willow)
 1. Narrows

STUDY: Transmission Line and Project Facility Habitat Assessment

1. Delineate vegetative cover types and habitat types
 1. T-lines
 2. Dam/powerhouses
2. Evaluate wildlife value and wildlife use of the habitats
3. Review Yadkin management practices for these areas
4. Qualitative assessment of Yadkin operations on vegetative cover and wildlife use
5. Identify opportunities to improve wildlife habitat

STUDY: Invasive Exotic Plant Species

1. Identify potential impact areas
 1. UNF
 2. Other?
2. Inventory for presence of IEPPs in areas with impact potential
 1. Portions of Narrows Reservoir
 2. Narrows dam/powerhouse
 3. Portions of Falls Reservoir
3. Evaluate current status of known IEPPs
 1. Brazilian elodea
 2. Other?
4. Identify appropriate management/control measures, if necessary

STUDY: Impacts of Shoreline Erosion on Important UNF Plant Communities

1. Inventory UNF shoreline for areas of shoreline erosion that might be impacting important plants/plant communities
 1. USFS data
 2. Reconnaissance level survey
2. Identify potential measures to protect or enhance threatened plant communities

STUDY: Migratory Bird Evaluation

1. Evaluate the use of the Yadkin Project by migratory birds
 1. Seasonal surveys
2. Qualitative evaluation of potential impacts to migratory bird use associated with current Project operations
3. Identify opportunities to enhance use of Project by migratory birds

STUDY: RTE Species Survey

1. Survey Project for RTE species
 1. Natural Heritage Program
 2. Literature
2. Determine RTE species of “concern” that may be affected by Project operations
3. Conduct focused field surveys for species of concern
4. Evaluate potential impacts of Project operations on species of concern
5. Identify opportunities to enhance conditions for species of concern and their habitats