1	MINUTES OF THE
2	FOREVER WILD BOARD MEETING
3	WENDELL MITCHELL CONFERENCE CENTER
4	LURLEEN B. WALLACE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
5	Greenville, Alabama
6	May 9, 2019
7	
8	
9	* * * * * * * * * *
10	
11	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
12	
13	* * * * * * * * * *
14	
15	
16	Proceedings taken before Tracye
17	Sadler Blackwell, Certified Court Reporter, ACCR
18	No. 294, and Commissioner for the State of Alabama
19	at Large, at the Wendell Mitchell Conference Center
20	at the Lurleen B. Wallace Community College, 750
21	Greenville Bypass, Greenville, Alabama, on
22	Thursday, May 9, 2019, commencing at approximately
23	10:00 a.m.

```
BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:
 1
    Commissioner Christopher M. Blankenship, Chairman
    Mr. Horace H. Horn, Jr.
 3
    Dr. Michael Woods
    Mr. David Wright
    Mr. Raymond B. Jones, Jr.
    Mr. William "Bill" Satterfield
    Mr. Russ A. Runyan
    Dr. Lori Tolley-Jordan
 6
    Dr. Douglas Watson
 7
    Dr. Salem Saloom
    Dr. John Valentine
 8
 9
10
       CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: I'd like to call the
11
              Forever Wild Board Meeting for May 2019
12
              to order. I'll do a roll call of the
13
14
              Board members. If you're present,
15
              please indicate so.
16
                   Chris Blankenship is here.
                   Charles Ball?
17
18
                     (No response.)
        CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Horace Horn?
19
2.0
       MR. HORN:
                   Here.
21
       CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Raymond Jones?
2.2
       MR. JONES:
                    Here.
       CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Russ Runyan?
23
```

```
MR. RUNYAN: Here.
 1
       CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Saloom?
       DR. SALOOM: Here.
 3
       CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Satterfield?
       MR. SATTERFIELD: Here.
 5
 6
       CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Tolley-Jordan?
       DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: Here.
       CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Valentine?
 8
9
       DR. VALENTINE: Here.
       CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Watson?
10
11
       DR. WATSON: Here.
       CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Woods?
12
13
       DR. WOODS:
                   Here.
14
       CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: And Mr. Wright?
       MR. WRIGHT:
                     Here.
15
16
       CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. John Hall, Rick
             Oates, and Dr. Sims -- I do not see them
17
             present, but we do have a quorum. We
18
             have more than nine members present. So
19
             with that we have enough members here
20
              for a meeting.
21
                  I appreciate everybody being here
2.2
23
              today and mostly appreciate Mayor
```

McLendon and the Chamber of Commerce for
their hospitality and would like to give
the Mayor a few minutes if he'd like to
say a word or two of welcome. You are
recognized, sir.

2.2

MAYOR McLENDON: Be real careful when you ask a politician to come up front; okay?

And I'll try to be extremely short.

But welcome to Greenville, Alabama.

This is, as you can see, a great
facility. It's a great place to have
things like this. We're halfway between
Birmingham and Mobile, halfway between
New Orleans and Atlanta. So we have a
great community. We think it's a great
opportunity for all of you to be here
and to see our town and to find out how
much we have to offer.

So, again, welcome. If we can do anything, we'll be more than happy to make your dream come true. How about that?

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mayor, would you mind

recognizing any of your staff that you
have here. I see some of the folks -
MAYOR McLENDON: Absolutely. I think a lot of
them are in some other places, but Tracy
has done most of the work putting all
this together. She's -- Tracy Salter is
head of our Chamber of Commerce. She
does a great job.

And then you have Justin Lovvorn.

And then you have Justin Lovvorn.

We have him out here because Horace Horn has to have a police officer around him.

That's the reason Justin is here.

So back in the back, Peige Josey that's over this campus and David Hutchinson, who I'm sure a lot of you know. So some of those are the ones that have been putting everything together.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thank you, sir.

MAYOR McLENDON: All right.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: And I do appreciate

Lurleen B. Wallace Community College and

Herbert Riedel, the President, for

2.2

Z

allowing us to use the facility here.

This is very nice. We've been trying to have a meeting here in Greenville for a year or so and couldn't work out the schedules with the facility until this meeting. So I'm very thankful for the Mayor and for the community college for hosting us here today and looking forward to a very productive meeting.

I would like to take just a moment to recognize the passing of two former Forever Wild Board members that have passed since our last meeting.

One was Mr. Tom Joiner. Mr. Joiner served on the Forever Wild Board from 2000 to 2006 from the Central District. I did not have the honor of serving with Mr. Joiner here on the Forever Wild Board, but I did work with him on the Oil and Gas Board. He was a very strong proponent of oil and gas exploration around our state. He was very instrumental in a lot of the work that's

been done, and he will be sorely missed. He had four daughters, 13 grandchildren, and 25 great-grandchildren. He was a very fine man.

And then John Woller who was a member of the Forever Wild Board from the North District from 2006 to 2012.

He was a U.S. Navy -- or Marine Corps veteran, worked in the Saturn V project, and then also, I think, was very instrumental in the Summit Tree Stand Company. And he served on the Board for six years. And he has passed and leaves his wife, Pat, four children, and 11 grandchildren.

So I did want to take just a minute to recognize those gentlemen's service on the Forever Wild Board and their service to the State that have passed.

So thank you for that moment of personal privilege to do that, and now we'll move into the public comment period.

Just a reminder that you have three

minutes to speak. The staff will set 1 the -- keep the time. I'd appreciate it if you'll keep your comments down to 3 those three minutes. That gives the staff -- or gives everybody the 5 6 opportunity to speak. And when I call your name, if you'll just come up. For the Board members, there is a 8 9 blue sheet in your folder. And yours is white. I apologize. 10 11 have to have a colored one because I'm 12 needy. 13 But it has the tab and page number. So I'll call those out for which 14 property the person wants to speak on in 15 16 case you want to find that in your book. MS. McCURDY: Yeah. And that's in your green 17 folder. 18 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All right. So the 19 first speaker on the Red Hills-Flat 20 Creek will be Steve Northcutt, Tab 3-B, 21 page 9. 3-B, page 9. 2.2

Mr. Northcutt.

MR. NORTHCUTT: Yes, sir. Could we have the 1 Mayor who's going to be speaking on the same subject -- could we have him speak 3 first? CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Sure. Certainly. 5 6 So this is Mayor Calvert Wright? MAYOR WRIGHT: Yes, sir. CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir. Very nice to 8 9 have you here today. Thank you for coming to join us. 10 MAYOR WRIGHT: Good morning, everyone. 11 like to thank Mr. Blankenship and his 12 13 Board members for allowing me to speak on the Red Hill. 14 I started my career right here in 15 16 Greenville, Alabama, in a little college over there called Lomax-Hannon Junior 17 College years and years ago. I'd like 18 to thank the Mayor for allowing me here 19 in his city. 20 I want to speak on the Red Hill, my 21 area which I live. I'd like to let the 2.2

Board members know to support our

1	underserved area of the Red Hill. We
2	have a lot of wildlife there. We have
3	people coming in from all over the
4	states and America to do a lot of
5	hunting and fishing. It's a beautiful
6	place, a beautiful part of the state.
7	And I would just like to once again
8	ask the Board members to please continue
9	to support our area. You will be much
10	appreciated if you'll do that for us.
11	Once again, may God bless you and
12	thank you very, very much.
13	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thank you, sir. He's
14	the Mayor of Brandenburg.
15	MAYOR WRIGHT: Yes, sir. Brandenburg,
16	Alabama.
17	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Brandenburg, yes, sir.
18	Thank you so much for coming over and
19	joining us today, Mayor.
20	Next will be Mr. Steve Northcutt on
21	the same Red Hills property.
22	MR. NORTHCUTT: Yeah. I might not be as
23	eloquent as the Mayor, but I'm going to

talk about very specific aspects of the Red Hills. I'm Steve Northcutt with The Nature Conservancy.

There are several properties that are fantastic potential acquisitions for the Forever Wild Board. I'm going to speak about three specific properties.

And under Tab 3, page 9 and 10, you can see maps of the Red Hills. I'm going to speak specifically about the Red Hills-Flat Creek Phase I, Red Hills-Flat Creek Addition Phase II, and the Section 2 property.

And the reason I bring those up, all three of those properties have federal grants that would help reduce the price of the properties to Forever Wild. If you go back to the original acquisitions Forever Wild did in 2010, the two properties, which is number 75 and number 81, that is the first time in, I believe, the history of the state that they were able to get HCP

land-acquisition money.

Now, Habitat Conservation Plans are for protected species. If the property is eligible and is protected under an HCP, you can get this pot of money. The State of Alabama got \$4.64 million to assist in buying those properties. That is almost unheard of. And the reason I say that is because if you look at the nation, HCP funding almost goes exclusively out west. This money that you have here now, Alabama is the only state that got HCP money except for California, Oregon, and Washington. The entire state of Washington is under an HCP. So they're very clever in the way they go after this pot that a lot of people don't know about.

So for the Phase I, the 1184 acres, you have \$2 million that you can offset your acquisition costs. A first appraisal has been done. It's been scored. The second phase, the Phase II,

1

3

5

2.2

you have \$300,000 in funding to acquire that from the same owner. And then for the Section 2 property that's 330 acres you have a grant of \$250,000. So a total of 1,697 acres that you have \$2.55 million in Fish and Wildlife grants to acquire those properties.

And the reason why I come today with a sense of urgency is if you today decide to move forward and do a second appraisal and close on those properties, then the Department can go and ask for new money for next year. They've got until the 17th of May to do that. So in their grant request they can say that these funds have been obligated to buy that. Obviously, it can't close by that time. But it really makes your score higher for the grants to show that you've obligated the money they've already provided for you.

So today I'm asking you to consider these tracts. And there's a lot of

other good tracts in the Red Hills, and 1 hopefully we can get some more funding for that. 3 I see my time is up. So if anyone has any questions, I'll be glad to 5 6 answer them. Yes, ma'am. CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Tolley-Jordan. 8 DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: Okay. So you mentioned -so the HCP, I assume, is for the Red 10 11 Hills salamanders? MR. NORTHCUTT: Right. 12 13 DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: And then you mentioned this \$2.5 million. That's already 14 allocated and available, then, or is it 15 16 something that still has to be approved? It's fully approved. You 17 MR. NORTHCUTT: No. have \$2 million for the first phase of 18 the Red Hills-Flat Creek. So \$2 million 19 standalone for that. 20 For the smaller tract, the 183 21 acres, you have \$300,000 under this --2.2

so there's actually several pots under

endangered species, HCP, section 6
recovery, and then the State was
actually able to get what they call some
reverted funds. So when states are
given these grants and if they don't
spend them and it goes back, the
landowner decided they didn't want to
sell it or whatever, then those are
reverted back to Fish and Wildlife. And
the Department, because they worked very
hard with Fish and Wildlife, were able
to get -- I believe that \$300,000 was
for reverted funds.

So the Department does a great job writing grants. The Board has done a wonderful job on leveraging money. So this is a great leverage opportunity.

- DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: And so when you speak of the Department, who are you speaking of?
- MR. NORTHCUTT: Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, specifically Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries. Ericha Nix has been -- and, of course, everybody

helps, but she's been writing these 1 grants. DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: Okay. And so these are 3 coming out of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service funds? 5 MR. NORTHCUTT: That's correct. 6 DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: That's all. DR. WOODS: What was the amount of Phase II --8 or Section 2? 9 MR. NORTHCUTT: So the Section 2 is \$250,000 10 11 grant. 12 MS. McCURDY: In Tab 5-A you can see the 13 numbers and the acreage. Tab 5-A. 14 MR. NORTHCUTT: And Doug Deaton will give you a more detailed summary, but I wanted to 15 16 bring these up today. CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Horn. 17 MR. HORN: He answered my question. I was 18 19 wondering what agency the money was coming from, so ... 20 MR. NORTHCUTT: The Fish and Wildlife have 21 been on the property with us. We've set 2.2 23 up a tour. And they're very supportive

of this area. We would like one day to 1 be able to take -- have enough protected land where the Red Hills salamander is 3 not even a listed species as the 5 ultimate goal. 6 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thank you, sir. MR. SATTERFIELD: Mr. Chairman? CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Satterfield. 8 9 MR. SATTERFIELD: While you're still there, I have a couple of questions on the 10 11 Phase II piece of property which is way down in the south. 12 13 MR. NORTHCUTT: Okay. Sure. MR. SATTERFIELD: 14 That has an inholding in it. A fairly significant portion of that 15 16 portion has an inholding. Can you tell us who owns that, how that would be 17 managed? 18 19 It may be that DCNR needs to help us address this too. If we acquired that 20 piece of property, how would we 21 coordinate with the present landowners 2.2

in the management of that property? And

since it's in the middle of that parcel, 1 would we be required to provide public access to those folks to get into their 3 property? How would we manage all that process in that section? 5 6 MR. NORTHCUTT: I'm going to let Patti answer That's kind of outside my that. expertise, but that is something --8 9 MS. McCURDY: Don't leave because I may have other questions. 10 11 We have inholdings in many tracts, 12 so they're going to be somewhat 13 tract-specific. But we obviously deal with that in many situations. There is 14 a road that goes to this inholding. 15 16 they already should have access via road for this inholding. 17 But many of the maps you see for 18 many of the properties -- you know, 19 we -- it is an effort sometimes, but we 20 do successfully manage property with 21 inholdings. 2.2

MR. SATTERFIELD: Yeah. Well, would we have

to maintain the road across Forever Wild property to allow them to get to their property?

MS. McCURDY: We would have no obligation to maintain the road other than whatever obligation we would have as owning that acreage. Obviously, legally they would have access to their property, but I wouldn't think we would have to pay to maintain the road for them to get there.

Do we know if that is currently --

- MR. SATTERFIELD: Well, the scale on the maps that we have are such that we can't even tell if there's a road in there. So I'm wondering if that's a public road, is it a private road, and what the responsibilities would be to maintain it.
- MS. McCURDY: Do we know if it's a public or private road? And then I'll follow up on the second question.
- MR. DEATON: I'm not a hundred-percent -- I'd have to --

1	MS. McCURDY: Doug is not sure. I have
2	several Wildlife folks here. Anybody
3	from Chuck's group that knows if that's
4	a public or private road?
5	MR. NIX: Private.
6	MS. McCURDY: It's a private road.
7	But as far as expense to the program
8	to maintain the road
9	MR. SATTERFIELD: Well, how do we manage that
10	in other circumstances?
11	You say we have other similar
12	circumstances. How does DCNR deal with
13	that on those other properties?
14	MS. McCURDY: We deal with it however we
15	are first of all, whatever we're
16	legally required to do we obviously do.
17	However, there are often easements.
18	You've also seen requests that have come
19	forward to the Board from different
20	owners of property that are inholdings
21	of what we acquire that ask for
22	easements. Some ask for deeded
23	easements. Some do not require that.

Some are okay with our permits to cross. 1 It really depends on the individual situation as to how they are handled. 3 If that is a concern that we want more 5 information on, obviously we can get 6 that if you -- y'all need to just let us know what you want to do. MR. SATTERFIELD: Have we been asked for an 8 9 easement in this case? MS. McCURDY: We have not. I have not been 10 approached. I will ask Wildlife. 11 12 MR. SATTERFIELD: Mr. Chairman, it would seem 13 to me that on that piece of property we 14 have several unanswered questions we need to look into, especially in terms 15 16 of the responsibility for maintaining that road to provide that access. So I 17 don't know how we want to handle that, 18 but that -- I know that that was a 19 concern of mine when I was looking at 20 the map. 21 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All right. Thank you. 2.2

MS. McCURDY: I'm sorry. I was talking with

Steve. So do we need any additional 1 direction? Okay. 3 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All right. Thank you. The next speaker is Mitch Reed on 5 6 the Richard Tract in Grand Bay, Tab 4-B, page 10. 4-B, page 10. This is also covered in a memo, 5 -- wait just a 8 9 minute, Mitch. I'm sorry. It's also covered in the memo in 10 5-G. 11 All right. Go ahead, Mr. Reed. 12 13 MR. REED: So thank you, Commissioner and the Board, for letting me speak on the 14 15 Richard property. 16 This is a piece of property that would connect into the Grand Bay 17 Savanna-Solet property down on the Gulf 18 Coast. It's an 80-acre tract that 19 provides a critical access point into 20 the Grand Bay piece. The Grand Bay 21 obviously is owned by Forever Wild, and 2.2

because public access and public lands

Thank

are so important to this program and to 1 the people of the state, this piece of property really allows for the public to 3 have that access into this Forever Wild 5 property. 6 TNC is acquiring the property through a NFWF grant. So that property will be donated. What we're asking for 8 9 is for the Board to approve the purchase and then the -- or the donation and then 10 11 the 15-percent fair market value match 12 for stewardship. 13 I'd be happy to answer any questions or call Steve Northcutt back up if they 14 get really complicated. 15 16 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Seeing none. 17 you, Mr. Reed. MR. REED: All right. Thank you. 18 19 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: The next speaker is Mr. Mark Hollis. He's going to speak on 20 the Sherwood Mountains. This is not a 21 tab in the book. This has not been

scored. I think it was a fairly new

2.2

nomination.

Mr. Hollis.

MR. HOLLIS: Hello and good morning to
everybody. I'm here to give some
information on the Sherwood Mountains
property.

The Sherwood Mountains property is a 3,928-acre tract of land. It's located about 30 miles south of Birmingham, Alabama. There is a handout that I had provided that includes the brochure on the property and *The Land Report*, which is a national publication that featured the property on the front cover. So I thought I'd go ahead and supply you with that.

I am representing the landowner along with Cypress Partners. My company is Hollis Real Estate, and I've been in the real estate business in Birmingham as a commercial broker and handled land as well for 26 years, 15 years with Hollis Real Estate. And Cypress

Partners is in the land sales business, and we have co-listed the property for sale.

I wanted to just go ahead and read a very short article that came out in the Birmingham Business Journal in September of 2018. And the article was by Brent Godwin, and the title is "Massive Shelby County Undeveloped Property Featured in National Magazine."

A large property in Shelby County was featured in a national real estate publication. The Land Report, a magazine focused on land ownership in the U.S., featured Sherwood Mountains as Alabama's leading land listing.

Sherwood Mountains is a 3,928-acre property in north Shelby County about 15 minutes from Shoal Creek, Greystone, and Mount Laurel, and 30 minutes from downtown Birmingham.

The massive land parcel is undeveloped and has been owned by the

/

is listed by local firms Cypress
Partners and Hollis Real Estate at
\$38 million. The tallest mountain in
Shelby County. Thousand-foot tall
sandstone ridgelines. Awe-inspiring
vistas for 20 miles and more clear to
Birmingham, the feature from "The Land
Report" reads.

According to the listing, the property is where seven separate mountains converge and the nearly 4,000 acres appear such as it did in the 1800s. Sherwood Mountains includes a 300-acre cove surrounded by mountains long known as "The Penitentiary" and were once deemed too wild and unsettled for even a cursory inspection in an 1895 U.S. Geological Survey.

A more recent survey and master plan have been done for the property which could include a low-density residential community placed into conservation of

./

2.2

large parts of the area. The economic potential of the property is enormous because of its location. Sherwood Mountains sits in the perfect place for Birmingham's southward growth, the listing reads.

I thought I would go ahead and just read that, which I felt that writer explained it pretty well from a marketing standpoint in the national publication that you have.

This property is one of the most unique properties in Alabama given its location. It's well suited for consideration for acquisition. I'd like to give you the information you need in order to acquire this property. The property was nominated for purchase in 2011 by the Forever Wild program and received high grades for potential state park in the Central region.

This property has been nominated again for possible purchase by Forever

Wild. I had originally nominated the 1 property in 2011, and, of course, it was scored at that time. And I'd like to 3 answer any questions that y'all might 5 have in regard to this property. 6 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thank you, sir. 7 Any questions? Dr. Tolley-Jordan. 8 DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: I notice that it's not 9 scored at this time. Is that correct? 10 11 MS. McCURDY: That's correct. Just the way 12 the cycle goes, the nomination wasn't in 13 time to be scored. We do have the 14 willing seller returned, so it is in the process for the next meeting. 15 16 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thank you, sir. 17 MR. HOLLIS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: The next speaker is 18 Beth Finch on the Cahaba-Mohon Tract. 19 Hello, Ms. Finch. Good to see you 20 again. 21 MS. FINCH: So I'm Beth Finch. I'm a 2.2 23 conservation photographer, and I work

with Cypress Partners. And Blair Mohon here is our seller. So I've got six points that I need to make.

First of all, Paul Johnson and Michael Buntin with the Alabama Aquatic Biodiversity Center in Sprott — they visited the property on Tuesday to collect mussels and snails. Paul said this is one of the better sites he has seen. It is more than double or triple the size of rich shoal habitat in the Refuge. In an hour and a half they found 11 gastropods, two of them federally listed, 16 mussels, one federally listed, and the federally threatened goldline darter. That is 30 species of concern in 90 minutes.

He said it's one of the bigger concentrations of the cylindrical lioplax and may be the best remaining sites of this very endangered snail.

And he was very surprised to find large populations of the threatened fineline

_

pocketbook mussel, which is very unusual anywhere and particularly on the Cahaba.

Paul also discovered that this is one of the original mussel collection sites of H.H. Smith, who is the famous curator of the University of Alabama Museums. He discovered and named many of the Alabama mussels a century ago. And it's a beautiful and stunning site he told me. He said he expects to find much more when they can spend more time there as long as they can continue to access this Mohon Tract.

So Randy Haddock was with me in early spring, and he wanted to keep — he didn't want to quit exploring. He just wanted to go all over this property. I took him to a very tall bluff that overlooked the river where you can see it curving in the distance, and he says, look, there's a beach down there, which would be really exciting for someone who spends a lot of time

taking people up and down this river.

And this also means it would fit very
well within the Cahaba Blueway, which is
a new program that's being developed.

Chris Oberholster, who's with
Birmingham Audubon, was especially
impressed with the forest and the
burning line. And thanks to Forever
Wild it's becoming a destination for
birding sites. And he says this
particular tract would fit very, very
well into that program.

This property is not only biologically rich, but it also has six greenfields and places to hunt that are somewhat separate from the forest and the river area. They're more up on the ridgelines where the reclaimed mining areas are.

This property fits within the acquisition boundary of the Cahaba

National Wildlife Refuge, but,

unfortunately, at this particular time I

3

5

6

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. FINCH: Oh, I forgot to tell you one

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thank you, ma'am.

don't think Fish and Wildlife is really willing to accept any more lands along the Cahaba. Things might be different in another two years, but this is where we are right now.

You've got a copy of the report that Paul has. You've also got a map in there that shows how this fits within the acquisition boundary. It has taken six different entities to protect as many different parts of the Cahaba as you see here. I mean, it's significant, and this piece fits in the heart of it. This place is also the piece that connects the two zones of the William R. Ireland Wildlife Management Area.

And we think all of this is really pretty significant. It's a hard thing to pass up. So I hope you move for acquisition and a second appraisal. Thank you.

thing. This is really important.

Blair has been very diligent about doing research on surface mining and the oil and gas leases. You can see how diligent he has been. And he found out yesterday that the well that is on his property is no longer producing and that they plan to close it.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thank you.

The next speaker is Michael Norris.

He just has some general comments. It's not a tract-specific comment.

MR. NORRIS: Good morning and thank you all for the opportunity. I'm a small landowner in north Butler County. I own land in Butler and Crenshaw County. My wife and I are certified tree farmers.

We're stewardship farmers, and we are a TREASURE Forest.

So, Salem, I know you can appreciate that and appreciate the fact that we're good stewards of what God has given us while we're here.

,

The editor of this monthly

newsletter which I am subscribed to

commented -- and when he announced that

this was going to be here, commented

that he had a list of questions that

should be asked of you as well as

ourselves. And so I thought it would be

a good idea to answer those questions in

my own opinion.

The first question is: Should the State of Alabama provide recreational property?

My answer is absolutely. The independent and private landowners cannot and should not be expected to provide recreational property for all the citizens of the state of Alabama. Acquisition and maintenance of this property should be a function of State agencies.

Number two: Does the State need more public land to compete with recreational opportunities provided by

private landowners? 1

> Well, we might reach that point at some point in the future, but at this point I don't think we're there yet. As far as it competing with private landowners, hunters that want a piece of property to lease to hunt on are not the same people that's going to go occasionally to a Wildlife Management Area and hunt one or two or three times a year or take their child there. Wildlife Management Areas do serve a very important purpose of allowing the expansion of the hunting and fishing not only for the adults but for children as well.

The third question was: Will more public land that doesn't pay taxes put pressure on private landowners to pay more taxes?

Well, I'm sorry, but that just sounds like a scare tactic to me, guys.

The next question: Will higher

2.2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

taxes promote more or less forest ownership?

I don't see how it's possible.

Forest product markets are what drives profitability and forestland ownership, not taxes.

Five: Is private forestland ownership public -- public or private better for our state?

And they both are. There's a place for both and a place where both are needed.

My final comments to you are simply this: Future acquisitions by this group should focus on environmentally sensitive and unique tracts, not just go out and buy 50,000 or 10,000 or 5,000 acres of timberland. Good examples of this are the Mobile-Tensaw Delta and the Pike Picosin in Pike County.

I spent many, many days in 1973 and '74 when I was a student at Troy in the Pocosin area. And it's thrilling to me

2.2

to know that that place has been preserved and will be there for my children to be able to go and see because it is that unique. And that uniqueness is what I'm asking you to consider in future purchases and future acquisitions.

If the Mobile-Tensaw Delta had not been purchased, I probably would never have an opportunity to go into that delta without, you know, my own private boat to see and enjoy it as it is. The Red Hills Complex may be the only way that the Red Hills salamander survives.

I ask that you be purposeful, be selective, and don't let anybody tell you you're not doing the right thing here. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thank you, sir.

The next speaker is Mr. Al Nettles on the Rails-to-Trails update in Monroe County.

MR. NETTLES: I think all of you have in your

packet a letter dated January the 27th of 2016, and it pretty well lays out what I need to talk to you about. I appreciate the opportunity to be here and to be heard.

I'm a private landowner, a general partner of a family limited liability limited partnership, and as of right now I think we've got 35 in the family. So my brother and I are the general partners, and we've finally got a great-grandchild coming along. We're TREASURE Forest certified. We've got about — well, roughly 4,000 acres in the limited liability limited partnership.

This is kind of an update to you from what the letter is about in three minutes. You know, it's like taking a sip out of a fire hose. A lot taking place. So I'm not going to have time to -- I'll be glad to answer any questions you've got. I'll hit a few

high points.

_

/

But my main message is in that first paragraph in the letter. And, that is, I don't believe that Forever Wild should be involved at all in Rails-to-Trails projects. Now, before you think I'm against hiking, I'll tell you that I'm now 83 and I've been a Boy Scout for 70 years. And I've done my share of hiking, including the Appalachian Trail and some in the Grand Canyon. I've had an opportunity to do a lot of hiking, and I'm certainly not opposed to it.

I'm not opposed to Rails-to-Trails projects in the right place, but we've got a situation where it's certainly in the wrong place -- not just because it goes through our particular property.

Of course, we don't like that for a lot of reasons that I enumerated in here.

And I haven't found a landowner yet that understands the situation that says they would like to have it in their property.

As I say, there's a list that I've got there.

The first situation that I -- and I'll try to go down the letter briefly and tell you -- kind of update you on what's happened. These are what we were fearing was going to happen, and we're just getting started in Monroe County.

I've noticed in the activity that's going on over in the peanut country over close to Dothan that there's been -- I think there's been an effort over there for eight years. I'm not a resident and don't own land over there. I'm not qualified to say what their situation is, but I suspect some people over there -- some of them have got the same problems that we feel like we have.

The main problem I see in the
Rails-to-Trails is, first of all, you
get a quitclaim deed. And, you know, I
could give y'all a good -- good
quitclaim deed to the Brooklyn Bridge,

but you wouldn't have much.

/

And as it's turned out since this
letter was written, we finally after
warning the Monroe County Commission
that we had to -- they had a problem
with the title up there with one of our
neighbors that was leasing property that
we've known for years, and it goes down
through what now is our Heritage Farm
that was certified by the State. In
other words, the land has been in the
family for over a hundred years.

And they didn't pay any attention to us. We had to file a suit to quiet title. The local judge, Weaver, down there ruled in the landowner's favor. The County decided to appeal it to the State Supreme Court. The State Supreme Court has ruled again to affirm Judge Weaver. They've got the option possibly to take it to the U.S. Supreme Court, which, you know, that tactic is just — you can imagine it's not a cheap

1 project.

2.2

And I really don't know how to express myself without resorting to profanity, which I won't do. But put yourself in that position. This land has been in your family for over a hundred years and these people that are the elected representatives in your area are basically taking your land. What you going to do about it?

Well, I spent 30 years in the military, four of it active duty Army Reserve Special Forces with the Rangers, and I'm not planning to roll over. But I would appreciate you guys taking a very close look at anything that's appealed to you about Rails-to-Trails because there are a lot of snakes in that pile. I appreciate the chance to hear me out. And I'll be glad to answer any questions anybody has got.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thank you, Mr. Nettles.

Good to see you again. Enjoyed talking

with you down in Evergreen a couple of months ago at the gopher tortoise meeting.

2.2

MR. NETTLES: That's right. Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir. Very nice to see you.

The next speaker is Mr. Chandlar Graham speaking on the Thigpen Hill property, Tab 3-B, page 12. 3-B, page 12.

MR. GRAHAM: Good morning. Thank y'all for having me here. I feel like y'all get tired of seeing me, but I'll keep this quick today.

I'm here really just -- I think everybody is familiar with the property and what we're trying to do here. I really just want to convey to y'all that our owner is more than willing to work with y'all as far as timing and kind of helping with acquisition and also to extend an invitation to any of y'all that would like to come and spend some

time on the property and get to see how 1 unique and special the place is given the proximity and the location. That 3 goes without saying, but I wanted to come today and make sure that y'all are 5 6 aware that you can reach out to us. We'll be happy to spend some time with you on the property. Thank y'all. 8 9 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thank you. Thank you, Chandlar. 10 11 Our last speaker that I have a card 12 for is Chuck Byrd on the Prairie Grove 13 Glades, Tab 4-B page, 22. 4-B, page 22. 14 Mr. Byrd. Thank you. MR. BYRD: Thank y'all. I'm going to go ahead 15 16 and apologize. I'm a dirt forester. I'm not a public speaker. So I'll give 17 it my best. 18 19 I'm the land manager for The Nature Conservancy. I manage lands all over 20 the state and work with private 21 landowners to manage and help their --2.2 23 help them manage their populations of

rare plants.

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The property you have before you, Prairie Grove Glades, has some of the rarest plants found in Alabama. It's got 11 different species that are of concern: Harper's umbrella plant, Alabama larkspur, Prairie Indian plantain, Alabama gladecress, Limestone flower, Nashville breadroot, Tennessee milkvetch, caladium quillwort, yellow sunnybells, and most importantly lyre-leaf bladderpod. As I -- correct me if I'm wrong, but there are -- that's the only population of lyre-leaf bladderpod found in the state. It's an endangered-listed species.

And what makes this property so unique is that it's a combination of cedar glade and exposed limestone. A lot of that area has been converted to either ag, row crops, or been mined. There's quarries in the area. And recently several of the adjoining

landowners have been bought out by a 1 large mining corporation. So we're hoping that with y'all's 3 help we could potentially protect this property and these rare plants in the 5 6 future. Any questions? CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Satterfield. MR. SATTERFIELD: Who owns this property now? 8 9 MR. BYRD: The Nature Conservancy does. There's a small private landowner, the 10 11 blue-shaded on your map, Mr. Wimberly, that would -- the property would be sold 12 13 together. But we own the property. 14 MR. SATTERFIELD: But you own the entire 15 tract? 16 MR. BYRD: Yes, sir. CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Except for the blue? 17 MR. BYRD: Except for the blue. 18 19 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Okay. MR. BYRD: And we've been working with the --20 Mr. Wimberly since I've been here, which 21 is going on eight years now. 2.2 23 actually has cattle that graze on the

western -- sorry -- the eastern part of 1 our property that's separated by a county road because the bladderpod 3 actually needs disturbance, and the cattle provide that disturbance. 5 MR. SATTERFIELD: So for clarification, then, 6 you're representing The Nature Conservancy which is shown in red on 8 9 this map? Correct. 10 MR. BYRD: 11 MR. SATTERFIELD: And you're in essence 12 nominating that part. 13 Patti, what about the blue? Do we have -- do we have anything from the 14 owner on that tract to say that --15 16 MS. McCURDY: Yes, sir, we do. If you'll look on Tab 4, page 22, the Owner 1 and 17 Owner 2 that you'll see in your packet 18 map, the red -- happens to also be red 19 and blue, so it corresponds. 20 And so, yes, this tract had to have 21 a willing selling letter for all owners 2.2

before we would have proceeded with

23

1	scoring and entertaining its short-list
2	position. So I think what you have is
3	just one of the owners speaking here
4	today, but we have willing seller
5	letters or we would not have processed
6	the nomination.
7	MR. SATTERFIELD: Okay. That was my
8	clarification because I wanted to be
9	sure we had a nomination from the actual
10	owner of that blue tract.
11	MS. McCURDY: We do. It's one nomination, but
12	it's two owners. And we have willing
13	sellers from all landowners involved.
14	MR. SATTERFIELD: Thank you.
15	MS. McCURDY: You're welcome.
16	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thank you, sir.
17	Any other questions?
18	MR. BYRD: I would ask if you would move with
19	a first appraisal.
20	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All right. Thank you,
21	sir.
22	That's the last card I have. Is
23	there anybody that wanted to speak that

did not sign up or have the opportunity? 1 (No response.) 3 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All right. Seeing 4 none, we'll move into the next portion 5 of the meeting where we need to recess for Executive Session. 6 7 By regulation, appraisal values are 8 confidential during periods of 9 negotiation. Accordingly, in order to 10 discuss tract appraisal values, the 11 Board will need to go into recess for an 12 Executive Session. 13 Is there a motion for the Board to now recess to attend the Executive 14 15 Session? 16 MR. JONES: So move. 17 MR. HORN: Second. 18 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Moved by Mr. Jones. 19 Seconded by Mr. Horn. 20 As I call your name, please state 21 your position on this motion to recess. 2.2. Those in favor indicate by saying "aye" 23 and those opposed by "nay."

Chris Blankenship, aye. 1 Horace Horn? MR. HORN: Aye. 3 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Raymond Jones? 4 MR. JONES: Aye. 5 6 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Russ Runyan? MR. RUNYAN: Aye. 8 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Saloom? 9 DR. SALOOM: Aye. CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Satterfield? 10 11 MR. SATTERFIELD: Aye. 12 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Tolley-Jordan? 13 DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: Aye. CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Valentine? 14 DR. VALENTINE: Aye. 15 16 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Watson? 17 DR. WATSON: Aye. CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Woods? 18 19 DR. WOODS: Aye. 20 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Wright?

will be at recess -- it is now 10:47.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All are in favor. We

MR. WRIGHT: Aye.

21

2.2

1 We'll be in recess for approximately 30 minutes, and then we will return. 3 (Recess for Executive Session was 4 taken at approximately 10:47 a.m. 5 and the meeting was called back to order at approximately 11:30 a.m.) 6 7 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All right. We'll call 8 this back to order. It is now 11:30, and the Forever Wild Board is back in 9 10 session. 11 Now we'll move on to Tab 5 -- no, 12 I'm sorry -- the financial data, 13 Tab 2-A. Ms. Powell. 14 15 MS. McCURDY: Thank you. This is the portion 16 of the meeting each time that for the 17 benefit of the Board and also the 18 benefit of the public -- and I'm Patti 19 McCurdy, Director of State Lands 20 Division. 21 I run through the status of prior 2.2. motions and motions to close to try to 23 get us to understand how much money we

3

5 6

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

23

have to work with. As I always say, it's just like your checkbook. You've got to keep up -- even the properties we haven't closed, I have made a promise to try to get them closed, so I need to know the money is there.

So the tracts that are currently in closing -- actively in closing are: The Big Canoe Creek-Epps Addition, St. Clair County. Cahaba River-Savage Creek Tract, Shelby County. Coldwater Mountain-Sarrell Addition, Calhoun County. Guntersville State Park-Smith Cemetery Addition, Marshall County. Red Hills-Parris Trust Addition, Monroe County. Skyline WMA-Crow Mountain Addition, Jackson County. Weeks Bay Reserve-Meadows Phase III Additions, Baldwin County. Also working on the Beaver Dam Swamp Tract, Limestone County, and Freedom Hills WMA-Robbins Addition, Colbert County.

When I take all of the acquisition

costs, including the 15-percent stewardship fund transfer, that leaves us with about \$10.2 million that we are currently working on. We then have in the account just over \$30 million. That leaves us about \$16.8 million of unencumbered cash in the acquisition account.

However, as I always have to talk through, there are also certain State budgetary procedures that will limit how much spending authority — how much authority you have to spend that money to get to the bottom line. As we are today, you've got just over \$9.5 million in spending authority of the cash that I just referenced. So you have \$9.5 million available for actions and commitments at the meeting today.

I also wanted to run through -- I've included -- I won't go through the entire list of closings. We try to keep up with the offers that have been

accepted and therefore closed and then what has been declined. That's in your Tab 2-A, the second page.

For this fiscal year, which runs
October 1st -- which began October 1st
of 2018, the following tracts that you
have asked us to pursue have been closed
or declined as follows: The Barbour
WMA-Leak Creek Addition has closed.
Caldwell Swamp was declined. And that
was, again, declined by the landowner.
Coldwater Mountain-Rice Addition has
closed. The Freedom Hills WMA-Buzzard
Roost Creek Addition -- and that one was
a mouthful -- that was declined.

Grand Bay Savanna-Little River

Addition, that was one of the

100-percent donations. That has closed.

Slaughter Swap has closed. And the

Tannehill-Ayers Addition has closed.

So that's where we are currently from the direction we've been given by the Board in prior meetings.

Any questions on that?

(No response.)

MS. McCURDY: All right. We will now move -at each meeting we also give an update
on our expenditures from the stewardship
fund to let you know kind of where we
stand.

We have budgeted authority up to \$1.5 million in the stewardship fund.

To date we have expended -- or at least when we ran it April 30th, we have expended about \$676,000. So we still have ample balance for additional actions, although, you know, you will see we are heavily engaged in some activities, so we are still actively spending from the fund. But we do look fine for this fiscal year.

The current value as of

April 30th -- and, again, these are the dates that we are able to run balances and amounts for the Board from the accounting procedures -- is just over

\$33.5 million in the fund itself.

2.2

Are there any questions on that?

(No response.)

MS. McCURDY: I then, also, at this time each meeting run through the tracts that we have received appraisals on. These are the tracts that you motioned for a first appraisal and that we have received appraisals back from. These would be the properties available to the Board for motions for second appraisals and to proceed to purchase.

What we have available is the
Blackwater River South Tract, Baldwin
County. Cahaba River-Mohon Tract, Bibb
County. Coldwater Mountain-Martin
Addition, Calhoun. D'Olive Bay,
Baldwin. Red Hills-Brown Schutt Trust
Additions, Monroe County. Red
Hills-Flat Creek Phase I, also Monroe.
Red Hills-Flat Creek Phase II, Monroe.
Red Hills-Section 2. And Thigpen Hill
in Butler County.

Doug will give you more detail, but 1 I am pleased to announce we have just this morning heard that the grant 3 application we had in for the D'Olive Bay Tract has been awarded. That's hot 5 6 off the press from a phone call this morning. So I didn't want to steal Doug's thunder, but --8 9 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: But you did anyway. MS. McCURDY: But I did it anyway. I couldn't 10 11 resist. I'm up here with the 12 microphone. 13 So all in all, the total of those tracts that have been appraised is just 14 over \$28 million and so -- of the 15 appraisals and what the stewardship 16 funds would require. So as you can 17 see -- which is not unusual. We've got 18 a lot more in appraised value than we do 19 in spending authority, but -- any 20 questions on that? 21 (No response.) 2.2 23 MS. McCURDY: Well, now that I've stolen his

thunder, I will still let Doug come up
with grant status. And, actually, Doug
is going to provide some information and
Chuck Sykes will also be providing some
information during the grant status

portion.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: As Doug is coming up, I would like to take a moment to recognize Charlanna Skaggs. Charlanna is the new General Counsel for the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. I was remiss in not introducing her at the very beginning of the meeting.

When you work with somebody now for,
I guess, all of six weeks or however
long, I feel like everybody else ought
to know her the way that we know her.
And I did not realize that this was her
first Board meeting because it seems
like she's been there longer than she
has. And so I would like for you to
take an opportunity while you're here,
if you have not met Charlanna, to

introduce yourself to her. And thank you very much for being here today.

Mr. Deaton.

MR. DEATON: Thank you, Commissioner.

Next I'll cover the grant status.

If you'll look in your packet at

Tab 5-A. And as everybody is turning to
that, I'd just like to mention for the

Board and those attending the meeting
today that DCNR staff of Wildlife and

Freshwater Fisheries routinely try to
find land-acquisition grant
opportunities that fit some of the
nominations that we receive to help
further the Forever Wild dollar. In
each meeting we give a report to update
the Board and the public about the
different opportunities that we have.

The first grant opportunity that

I'll offer are the U.S. Fish and

Wildlife Section 6 funds. That's the

RLA and HCP funds that was mentioned

earlier by Steve Northcutt, but I'll go

back through those for you.

The Red Hills-Flat Creek Phase I, we received \$2 million to be applied towards the purchase. The breakdown of that, the acreage purchased with the \$2 million would be deeded to Wildlife and the remainder would be to Forever Wild.

The Red Hills-Flat Creek Phase II

Tract, we have \$300,000 available to be applied towards purchase. Acreage purchased with the \$300,000 would be deeded to Wildlife and the remainder to Forever Wild.

The next is the Red Hills-Section 2. We have \$250,000 available to be applied towards purchase, and all of that acreage would be deeded to Forever Wild.

These three tracts have first appraisals and are available today for the Board's consideration for acquisition during the general discussion. And to take advantage of

2

3

<u>-</u> 5

6

/

9

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

1718

19

20

21

22

23

any of these grants that I just mentioned, the acquisition would have to take place prior to the end of 2021.

In addition to the grant awards I just mentioned, we are currently working with Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries on a proposal to U.S. Fish and Wildlife for grant funds that could be applied to the Red Hills-Brown Schutt Trust Addition. The potential amount of funding for this grant is currently unknown, but we're working to apply for that application. The Brown Schutt Trust Tract does have a first appraisal available for the Board for consideration, and the Board could take any action during general discussion that could include a motion to acquire as is with no grant funds, a motion to acquire contingent upon award of grant funds, or wait until any -- wait on any motions until grant funds are received. So those are your options today.

These four tracts if acquired would become part of the existing Red Hills Complex and would bring the total acreage to approximately 8200 acres.

At the last meeting there were questions as to potential management support by Wildlife. Wildlife has clarified for us if all four tracts are acquired that they would be willing to roll the Red Hills Complex into their Wildlife Management Area system and provide management support. And that's contingent upon all the tracts being acquired.

Are there any questions about the Red Hills?

DR. SALOOM: I have a question about appraisals just off the side.

How long normally -- and I know it depends on the size of the tract -- would a second appraisal take place?

How long will it take to do a second appraisal?

2.2

MR. DEATON: From the time we order it to the 1 time we get it back about 60 days. Any other questions? 3 (No response.) The next opportunity we have is 5 MR. DEATON: 6 the National Coastal Wetlands Conservation Grant which Patti mentioned earlier. We received word this morning 8 9 that we had been awarded that grant. And that grant can be applied to the 10 11 D'Olive Bay Tract. This grant is for acquisition and restoration of wetlands 12 13 in coastal counties. If the Board wishes to take action 14 on this tract, it's a grant opportunity 15 that would make this property no cost to 16 If you would like 17 the program. to take action on that, you would take 18 19 advantage of that during general discussion. 20 Are there any questions about that? 21 (No response.) 2.2 Seeing none -- and that's all the 23 MR. DEATON:

updates I have for grants. Next would be Director Chuck Sykes.

DIRECTOR SYKES: Thanks, Doug. This is right below that last grant opportunity that Doug talked about. It's still in Tab 5.

It's the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration grants.

We've partnered with the Board on quite a few projects over the past four years that significantly added to our mission as Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries as well as Forever Wild's mission of providing quality public hunting land. We wanted to let the Board know that we do have funding for the acquisition of the Cedar Creek Addition and we'd be willing to go 75/25 with the Board if y'all choose to pursue that option.

And I'll answer any questions if y'all have any.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Commissioner. Could I ask a question?

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir, Mr. Wright. 1 MR. WRIGHT: Chuck, I noticed in here you had like 3600 entries last year for these 3 SOA hunts. 5 DIRECTOR SYKES: Yes, sir. 6 MR. WRIGHT: But you can register multiple times. Do you know about how many people this was? 8 DIRECTOR SYKES: That's people. Yes, sir, 9 that's people. Some of them -- not to 10 11 call anyone out, but I know a couple of 12 the TNC employees applied for every hunt 13 that we had. So some people apply for all of them. Some just apply for one 14 specific hunt on one SOA. 15 16 MR. WRIGHT: So you got a lot of applicants. DIRECTOR SYKES: Absolutely. 17 MR. WRIGHT: You got 3600 different people 18 that put applications in? 19 DIRECTOR SYKES: Yes. And, you know, you 20 don't really hear from the happy people. 21 You usually just hear from the unhappy 2.2 23 people. But I actually have a list that I can send y'all of emails that we've gotten thanking us for the opportunity to hunt on the SOAs if that would be something that y'all would be interested in looking at.

MR. WRIGHT: I would be interested, yes.

DIRECTOR SYKES: And, also, we did a little comparison this year for one of our WMAs, Hollins up in Coosa County. They have a similar system where it's — instead of having a biologist at a check station, they have a self-reporting kiosk where on certain hunts — you have four-day hunts and three-day hunts.

People come in, take a permit, fill it out when they leave.

So I had my staff compare that, and acre by acre -- that was 28 to 29,000 acres. Just looking at Uchee, Cedar Creek, and Portland was about 15,000 acres, so roughly half. We had approximately 25-percent participation on the SOA versus the WMA. So even

though anybody could go whenever they
wanted to, if you look at it on acre by
acre, the SOAs have almost as many
people hunting them as Hollins did on

2.2

their normal come one, come all.

So I've got all of that that I can provide the Board as well. It was pretty eye-opening for us. And we're also finishing up a WMA usage study with Auburn that shows the distances that people are willing to travel to go to these areas, how much money they're spending on a typical trip. Hopefully I'll have all of that for you by the next meeting.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All right. Thank you.

Next up is Jo to go over the

short-list nominations in Tab 4.

MS. LEWIS: Good morning. I'm Jo Lewis with the State Lands Division, and I'm going to run through the short list in Tab 4.

Doing our usual thing, there is a slide show going on behind the Board members

/

if they prefer to look over their shoulders. Then I am going to run through the short list which is the maps arranged in Tab 4-B. It's the same sequence and same information as on the slide show.

The short list is comprised of the top highest-scoring tract nominations in each category of use in each district in the state. So that's four categories of use in three districts in the state. Hypothetically we could have 36 nominations on the list. Due to tracts short-listing in more than one category of use and some categories of use not having nominations in all of their districts, we tend to condense it down.

We have 16 tracts or nominations on the short list. They are from 14 different counties from Elmore County to Lawrence County. They vary in size from 47 acres to over 11,000 acres. So I'm going to run through Tab 4-B.

23

We've got Cedar Creek SOA Addition, Dallas County. Coldwater Mountain-Oxanna Addition, Calhoun County. Coldwater Mountain-Young Addition, Calhoun County. GBS or Grand Bay Savanna-Richard Addition, Mobile County. Hollins WMA Addition, Clay County. Lowndes WMA-Johnson Hill Addition, Lowndes County. Magnolia South Tract, Baldwin County. Monte Sano State Park-McCombs Addition in Madison County. MTD, Mobile-Tensaw Delta-Three Lakes Tract, Clarke County. Prairie Grove Glades Tract in Lawrence County. Saginaw Swamp in Shelby County. Shelby Crossroads in Shelby County. Sipsey River Swamp-Mill Creek Addition in Tuscaloosa County. Skyline WMA-Bishop's Cove, Jackson County. Tannehill-South Addition, Bibb and Shelby County. And Yates-Porter Addition in Elmore County. Additionally, Tab 4-C is all of our

currently active nominations listed by

1	district and county in their various
2	states of active short list or in the
3	process of being evaluated. I'll be
4	happy to take any questions on any of
5	the nominations.
6	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Any questions for Jo?
7	(No response.)
8	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thank you, Jo.
9	MS. LEWIS: Thank you.
10	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Now we'll move to
11	the next item is general discussion from
12	the Board members. Give me just a
13	second to get set up here.
14	All right. Are there any motions or
15	any discussion from the Board?
16	DR. WOODS: Commissioner?
17	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir, Dr. Woods.
18	DR. WOODS: I have three separate motions I
19	would like to make.
20	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Okay. Go ahead with
21	your first motion.
22	DR. WOODS: The first motion is for the Red
23	Hills-Flat Creek Phase I. I move for a

1	second appraisal and move to purchase.
2	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All right. Motion. Is
3	there a second?
4	MR. HORN: Second.
5	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Seconded by Mr. Horn.
6	It is for the Red Hills-Flat Creek
7	Phase I for a second appraisal and move
8	to purchase.
9	Any discussion?
LO	(No response.)
L1	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All those in favor say
L2	"aye."
L3	(All Board members present respond
L 4	"aye.")
L5	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Any opposed?
L6	(No response.)
L 7	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: None opposed. Motion
L8	carries.
L9	Yes, sir. Go ahead with your second
20	motion.
21	DR. WOODS: This is Red Hills-Flat Creek
22	Phase II, a move for second appraisal
23	and purchase.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Is there a second? 1 DR. SALOOM: Second. MR. HORN: Second. 3 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Seconded by Dr. Saloom. It is for the Red Hills-Phase II, a 5 6 motion for a second appraisal and move to purchase. Any discussion? 8 MR. SATTERFIELD: Mr. Chairman? 9 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir, 10 11 Mr. Satterfield. MR. SATTERFIELD: That's the one that I raised 12 13 the questions about earlier in the meeting about the inholding and the 14 access road and what responsibilities we 15 16 would be taking on if we actually moved to purchase, and I think that those 17 questions are still sort of outstanding. 18 So I think if we move forward on 19 this it needs to be a contingency motion 20 that we have that problem resolved 21 before we could move -- I don't mind 2.2 23 having the appraisal, but I'd like to

have that -- some kind of contingency before we purchase, if that's possible. And I don't know how the staff might want to respond to that.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: I don't know if y'all

woulthat
we n
very

would like to respond, but I would say that there are several properties that we manage that have inholdings and are very similar circumstances. I think our staff is very adept at managing those and doing the right thing for the program. And if it was something that would be detrimental to the program, I feel that the staff would come back with a question about that at the next meeting.

Would that be accurate?

MS. McCURDY: Yes. If we uncover anything
that concerns us as to proceeding with a
motion to purchase, something either
that wasn't known or presents a
burden -- if I understood your concern,
Mr. Satterfield, is if we would have

responsibility to maintain a road for 1 the owner of the inholding, maintain -the expense of maintaining the road. 3 That was your concern; correct? MR. SATTERFIELD. 5 Yes. 6 MS. McCURDY: Okay. MR. SATTERFIELD: Who would have that responsibility for maintaining the 8 9 access road? I understand -- I understand we have 10 11 to provide access because it's 12 landlocked, but my question then was 13 what responsibility we would have --MS. McCURDY: To maintain it -- to expend 14 funds to maintain a road for other than 15 16 our own use -- like if we use the road, too, but if it was the use of the 17 inholding party -- if we are having to 18 pay to maintain a road that they just 19 use themselves to get in and out would 20 be of concern; correct? 21 MR. SATTERFIELD: My question is who would 2.2

have to maintain -- would Forever Wild

have to maintain the road?

MS. Mccurdy: Okay. So if Forever Wild has to maintain the road for a benefit to someone other than the programmatic use of that tract by Forever Wild — if we expend money to maintain a road that we use, that's not a problem because that's a road that we use. If we are having any obligation to maintain the road for the use of the private party and it's a road that we would not otherwise maintain for ourselves, then that's an expense to the program that would be a concern to you and that's at the heart of the question?

MR. SATTERFIELD: Yes.

MS. McCURDY: Okay. So if I determine that, I will report back to the Board. However, if you would like to add anything to the motion, contingent upon satisfactory resolution of that concern, that is also fine. That is up to this Board.

MR. HORN: Let's take the motion as stated

2.2

with the confidence that the Board --1 the staff will bring back any concerns to the Board. 3 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: If there's not a substitute motion, Mr. Horn in the 5 6 discussion has said that we move forward and trust the staff under those -- under the stated concern or question that if 8 9 that is the case that you would bring that back to the Board -- that the staff 10 11 would bring that back to the Board. 12 Is there any other discussion or any 13 other -- any substitute motion or anything? 14 (No response.) 15 16 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Hearing none, all those in favor of moving forward to a second 17 appraisal and move to purchase on the 18 Red Hills-Phase II indicate by saying 19 "ave." 20 (All Board members respond "aye" 21 except for Mr. Satterfield and 2.2 23 Mr. Wright who abstain.)

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Any opposed? 1 MR. SATTERFIELD: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to be registered as abstaining from that vote. 3 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All right. There was one abstention, Mr. Satterfield. 5 6 MS. McCURDY: So let's be sure that we do have 7 nine. So, Commissioner, if you want to 8 9 just do a roll call on that one. CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All right. We'll have 10 11 a roll-call vote. If you'll just state "yea" or "nay" as I call your name for 12 13 the motion to move forward with a second 14 appraisal and move to purchase on the Red Hills-Phase II. 15 16 Chris Blankenship, aye. Horace Horn? 17 MR. HORN: Yes. 18 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Raymond Jones? 19 MR. JONES: 20 Aye. CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Russ Runyan? 21 MR. RUNYAN: Yes. 2.2 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Saloom? 23

DR. SALOOM: Aye. 1 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Satterfield? MR. SATTERFIELD: Abstain. 3 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Tolley-Jordan? DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: Aye. 5 6 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Valentine? DR. VALENTINE: Aye. CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Watson? 8 DR. WATSON: Aye. 9 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Woods? 10 11 DR. WOODS: Aye. 12 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Wright? MR. WRIGHT: I'll abstain. 13 MS. McCURDY: So I have nine. 14 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Nine "yeas," two 1.5 abstentions. Motion carries. 16 MS. McCURDY: Thank you. 17 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Go ahead with your 18 third motion, Dr. Woods. 19 20 DR. WOODS: Third motion would be Red Hills-Section 2. I make a motion for a 21 second appraisal and move to purchase.

DR. SALOOM: Second.

2.2

1	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Seconded again
2	motion made by Dr. Woods, seconded by
3	Dr. Saloom.
4	The motion is on the Red
5	Hills-Section 2 for a second appraisal
6	and move to purchase.
7	Is there any discussion?
8	(No response.)
9	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Seeing none, all those
LO	in favor say "aye."
L1	(All Board members present respond
L2	"aye.")
L3	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Any opposed?
L 4	(No response.)
L5	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: None opposed. Motion
L6	carries.
L 7	DR. VALENTINE: Commissioner, I'd like to make
L8	a motion.
L9	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Valentine.
20	DR. VALENTINE: Yes. I would like to make a
21	motion for a second appraisal and to
22	proceed with purchase of the Blackwater
23	River South Tract contingent upon staff

obtaining other leveraging source money
in the amount necessary so that the
remaining Forever Wild Land Trust
portion of the land acquisition cost
does not exceed \$2.5 million plus the
applicable required stewardship fund
transfer amount.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All right. Is there a

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All right. Is there a second?

MR. HORN: Second.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Seconded by Mr. Horn.

The motion is to move for a second appraisal and to proceed with purchase of the Blackwater River South Tract contingent upon staff obtaining other leveraging source funding in the amount necessary so that the remaining Forever Wild Land Trust portion of the land acquisition cost does not exceed \$2.5 million plus the applicable required stewardship fund transfer amount.

Is there any discussion or questions?

DR. WATSON: What's the advantage of the 1 motion with the contingency as opposed to just waiting? 3 The money allocation. MR. RUNYAN: MS. McCURDY: Yeah. I think I have two 6 questions. One would be the advantage of moving with a contingency. I'll 7 allow the Board to discuss that. 8 9 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Moving with the contingency now I think will be 10 11 beneficial in signaling the Board's intention to help facilitate that 12 13 additional funding to allow the staff to obtain the additional grant funding 14 during this grant cycle that we are 15 16 engaged in currently. MS. McCURDY: And staff has a general 17 direction from the Board to pursue any 18 opportunities that we think that we can, 19 so we're always doing that. 20 Now, I think Mr. Runyan -- did you 21 have -- the impact of a contingent 2.2

motion would be, in this situation, the

\$2.5 million would be -- plus the 1 stewardship, 15 percent of the appraised value, would be the obligation of this 3 So I would move it to the table Board. 5 where I keep up with the checks I might 6 have to write if everything goes well. But that's all. That's all that would 8 happen. 9 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Satterfield. MR. SATTERFIELD: So if I understand what 10 11 we're doing, if we approve this motion, 12 we're in essence obligating \$2.5 13 million -- up to \$2.5 million in this 14 fiscal year which ends on September 30 which would take that money sort of off 15 16 the table for any other purchases that we want to make between now and the end 17 of the fiscal year. Is that correct? 18 19 MR. RUNYAN: Plus the stewardship money. MS. McCURDY: Correct. That is correct. 20 MR. SATTERFIELD: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I don't 21 have a problem with this purchase at the 2.2 23 right time, but I think it's premature

because of that problem and the limited 1 funds that we have now between now and the end of September. I think it's 3 premature to obligate those funds at this point in time when we still have 5 6 another meeting between now and the end of the fiscal year when we can wait until after we see what federal funds 8 9 are available. I just have a -- just have a problem with it being premature 10 11 at this time. That's my concern. 12 MR. HORN: But I think, Bill, that also, if I 13 understand what the staff is saying, 14 going ahead and making this obligation would possibly hopefully enhance the 15 16 ability to obtain the grant. DR. SALOOM: How much would it enhance? 17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

MS. McCURDY: And sometimes in seeking outside sources of funding to leverage our acquisition opportunities -- sometimes the sources that we go to and the funds that become available do like to see that there is a commitment for that. So

with any tract that probably is -- would
be applicable to any leveraging
opportunity. I think there's some -some feel that -- is there any time
sensitivity to this one that the Board
wants to discuss?
CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: And to answer that, I
think that there is a time sensitivity
between now and the next meeting for us

2.2

think that there is a time sensitivity between now and the next meeting for us to work together to show that the Board is interested in pursuing this as a project before the — and the opportunity to obtain some additional grant funding will be before the next meeting. The decision will be made before the next meeting on moving forward. So I think it's important for the Board to signal an interest if that is the interest of the Board on this property.

MS. McCURDY: I think you had a question,
Dr. Saloom.

DR. SALOOM: No. I'm just learning about how

much weight that would carry. And so, 1 in other words, the comments from this Board right now, the fact that it's a 3 possibility that this land will be purchased in the future, is that weight 5 6 enough now to ingather some funds for leverage in the near future or would it be better to pass for the second 8 9 appraisal now? That's where I'm coming from. 10 11 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: And to answer your question, I don't -- I don't know if 12 13 that's enough of a commitment from the Board or not. I think that's ... 14 DR. VALENTINE: So if I could ask a question 15 pragmatically. A decision will be made 16 in all likelihood by the potential 17 source of the matching money before we 18 19 met again. Is that correct? MS. McCURDY: I think Commissioner ... 20 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: 21 DR. VALENTINE: So technically we're not 2.2 23 really taking this money off the table

because it could become reavailable at the next meeting for use at another purchase?

MS. McCURDY: If we know that the contingency either -- cannot be met, yes, it could -- it could -- it would come back. It just ties it up between now and the next meeting. But I just want you to understand any contingent motion -- the financial impact of that I have to put on the sheet.

So if it comes through, obviously, and there's enough funding to make the acquisition to where the expense is -- I believe the \$2.5 million was the cap mentioned -- then we proceed on to purchase. So it could either be it comes back available or it could be it is in fact utilized and we proceed to purchase.

DR. VALENTINE: And we can make no decisions between now and the next meeting in any event. So encumbering this for the

interval between these two meetings
wouldn't affect future decisions?

- MS. McCURDY: If we had an answer before the next meeting to where we knew this was not going to go forward, then it would be removed if that would be what would pull it back off.
- MR. SATTERFIELD: Well, it seems to me that that might be worse. If we get to the next meeting and we still don't have a decision on the federal funds and then we get to that meeting and we have to reverse a decision to approve going forward today and take it off the table in order to unallocate those funds, it seems to me that would send a worse signal that we now have disapproved something that that would be seen as a negative by the Board.
- MS. McCURDY: Well, I think the decision would be --
- MR. SATTERFIELD: I'm just confused by the process. I want to state again I'm not

against this project. I'm in favor of this purchase. I'm only concerned about how the funds are getting allocated in a year when we've had some extraordinary expenditures, and I'm not sure if we're going to have enough to do what we need to do before the end of the fiscal year. That's my concern. It's a fiscal concern.

2.2

MS. McCURDY: Absolutely. And so what would happen if the motion passed, as I said, it would go on that sheet. The 2.5 would be a subtraction. If we know something before the next meeting and it's a no-go, it would come off. If we don't know anything, it would stay on unless you had another vote that because you haven't heard you want to take it off.

So there's nothing requiring you at the next meeting -- it would be a decision of your interest in continuing to pursue the tract and the funding.

But those are the -- that is what would happen. It would come off.

Now, if we know between now and the next meeting we're not getting the funding, it would be removed by staff because we cannot fulfill the contingency. If we haven't heard anything, it would still show up. Ιf for some reason we don't know something, you would have to -- it would either then stay there -- it would stay there until you took a vote to take it back off. If you wanted to wait another meeting to hear, it would just stay. So that -- again, all with your purview. That's the bottom line.

MR. SATTERFIELD: Well, then, I think we would need to amend the motion to say that it would come off if we don't have the federal funding approved by the time we meet next time. Otherwise, I don't think staff could just unilaterally take that off themselves without having that

2.2

clear statement that the Board has said that it would come off. Do we need an amendment to that effect?

2.2

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: I mean, I think that
that happens all the time when property
gets declined -- you know, that you make
a motion for and it's declined or for
whatever reason it just doesn't proceed
to purchase. It just comes --

MS. McCURDY: If we know by the next meeting that no funding is forthcoming, as staff I would absolutely pull it off because I cannot fulfill my obligation to you to close it. So it would come off.

The way it stays on is if for some reason -- the way timing works out, sometimes information is delayed, whatever -- we haven't had anything declined by the next -- if we're still at the next meeting not knowing that we do have the funding but also not knowing that we don't, you would see it on your list at the next meeting. And if you

wanted to do something at that point, if you didn't want to wait any longer, you could make a motion then or it would wait until we heard.

So the only time staff would pull something off is if between now and the next meeting I know that that funding has been denied and will not be forthcoming. We can't close it because you conditioned your motion -- you capped your motion at 2.5. We can't do it for that.

So, again, totally up to the Board.

I could work within whatever the will of the Board is on this.

MR. HORN: I think --

2.2

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir, Mr. Horn.

MR. HORN: I mean, I think this is an opportunity for us, and I think we should make every effort to move in good faith on obtaining this grant money. I mean, I don't see it really being detrimental to the program in tying up

the money for, you know, the time 1 between -- if it turns out that we do not have a commitment by the next 3 meeting, I'm not too concerned about 5 that being a problem having that money 6 tied up even until the next meeting. So I certainly support moving forward with this, and I don't really 8 9 consider it a leap of faith. I consider it good faith on our part, on the part 10 11 of the Board, to move forward and leave it up to the staff to make every effort 12 13 to obtain the grant money that we are 14 making contingent to purchase this. So I certainly recommend that we move 15 forward with the motion. 16 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Any other discussion? 17 (No response.) 18 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Let's go ahead and 19 All those in favor say "aye." 20 vote. (Mr. Satterfield abstains and all 21 other Board members present 2.2

respond "aye.")

```
CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Any opposed?
 1
                     (No response.)
       CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: None opposed. Motion
 3
             carries.
       MS. McCURDY: And I want to be sure on this
 5
             one that everybody did vote and did
 6
 7
             respond.
       MR. SATTERFIELD: I did not respond.
 8
       MS. McCURDY: Okay. Well, let's do a roll
9
              call because I couldn't tell if
10
11
              everybody responded.
       CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Roll call.
12
13
                  Chris Blankenship, aye.
                  Mr. Horn?
14
       MR. HORN: Aye.
15
16
       CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Jones?
       MR. JONES: Aye.
17
       CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Runyan?
18
19
       MR. RUNYAN: Aye.
20
       CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Saloom?
21
       DR. SALOOM: Aye.
       CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Satterfield?
2.2
23
       MR. SATTERFIELD: Abstain.
```

1	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Tolley-Jordan?
2	DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: Aye.
3	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Valentine?
4	DR. VALENTINE: Aye.
5	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Watson?
6	DR. WATSON: Aye.
7	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Woods?
8	DR. WOODS: Aye.
9	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Wright?
10	MR. WRIGHT: Aye.
11	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Motion carries.
12	Any other motions or discussion?
13	MR. RUNYAN: Mr. Chairman, I may get the
14	pronunciation incorrect. But D'Olive
15	Bay, Baldwin County, 212 acres, I
16	understand if we proceed with this that
17	we can acquire it for just the
18	stewardship funding.
19	MS. McCURDY: That would be the end result.
20	We will have to expend some funds to
21	then be reimbursed that will end up
22	being the stewardship fund being the
23	cost.

1	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: So the motion is made
2	by Mr. Runyan to move forward with a
3	second appraisal and purchase of D'Olive
4	Bay.
5	MR. RUNYAN: Contingent upon the money
6	allocated present and then the refund
7	when it comes in, I make a motion that
8	we proceed with a second appraisal and
9	proceed to purchase.
LO	MS. McCURDY: So that the net cost after
L1	reimbursement to the program would just
L2	be the stewardship fund transfer.
L3	MR. RUNYAN: Yes, ma'am.
L 4	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: So is there a second?
15	MR. JONES: Second.
16	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: A second by Mr. Jones.
L 7	The motion is to move forward for a
L8	second appraisal and move to purchase on
L9	D'Olive Bay contingent upon the grant
20	funding providing the cost and that the
21	only cost in the end to the program
2	would be the stewardship fund

Is that clear what the motion is?

1	Any discussion on that?
2	DR. SALOOM: Second.
3	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: We already have it
4	seconded by Mr. Jones.
5	Any other discussion?
6	(No response.)
7	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All those in favor say
8	"aye."
9	(All Board members present respond
LO	"aye.")
L1	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Any opposed?
L2	(No response.)
L3	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: None opposed.
L 4	And, Mr. Runyan, I will tell you
L5	that if you're from Dauphin Island that
L6	is D'Olive, but if you're from Daphne
L 7	it's D'Olive. So it just kind of
L8	depends on
L9	MR. RUNYAN: I'm from neither one of those
20	places.
21	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: So any other motions,
22	discussion?
23	MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman?

1	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir, Mr. Wright.
2	MR. WRIGHT: I would like to nominate for
3	second appraisal the Coldwater
4	Mountain-Martin Addition because it is
5	an inholding within the Coldwater
6	Complex.
7	MS. TOLLEY-JORDAN: Second.
8	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All right. The motion
9	was made by Mr. Wright on the Coldwater
10	Mountain-Martin Addition for a second
11	appraisal and to proceed to purchase and
12	was seconded by Dr. Tolley-Jordan.
13	Any questions or comments about that
14	property?
15	(No response.)
16	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All those in favor say
17	"aye."
18	(All Board members present respond
19	"aye.")
20	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Any opposed?
21	(No response.)
22	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: None opposed. Motion
23	carries.

DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: Mr. Chairman? 1 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, ma'am, Dr. Tolley-Jordan. 3 DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: I would like to -- let's see if I can say this correctly --5 6 make ... MS. McCURDY: Tell us what you want to try to do, and we'll try to get you there. 8 9 DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: Okay. I have a question first of all. 10 If we could make a motion for second 11 12 appraisal --13 MS. McCURDY: And purchase. 14 DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: -- and purchase contingent on splitting the tract -- so there is --15 16 MS. McCURDY: And which tract are you referring to? 17 DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: The Mohon Tract. I'm 18 sorry. The Cahaba River-Mohon Tract. 19 So there is concern about the 20 mineral rights. And at the well site 21 there is the road that leads to the 2.2 23 tract and then to the south of that is

going to be the shoals sort of south of where Black Branch comes in, and those are the area of concern -- of conservation concern.

So if splitting the tract is possible, it would be something I would like to propose as a motion for second appraisal and move to purchase.

MS. McCURDY: Okay. So I want to be sure with the Board -- well, first of all, we would not be able to move immediately to a second appraisal due to the nature of this tract -- you know, some tracts we have if you want to portion off or section off something I am able to utilize a per-acre value and we can adjust an -- we get verification from the appraiser, but I know how to move forward on that and could tell you a value -- an impacted value.

We need to talk a bit more about what the geography of that would look like. But it would require getting an

updated -- basically a new updated appraisal specific to whatever that looked like because I don't believe this is a tract that we would be able to pull a per-acre value on. So I think I would have to go back to the appraiser.

So that may be the easier part of what I just said. I want to be sure, first, that we understand, I think, the area of ecological conservation concern that you would be most interested in and then be able to define that well enough to engage in discussions with the owner as to a willingness.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: So really I guess there are multiple -- multiple issues with this property that we've discussed -- or that were mentioned in your motion. One is the surface -- surface mining rights. One is the location of the well or the operationality of the well.

So I guess there are a couple of paths here as the Board that we could

direct the staff. We could ask -- I mean, we could have that tract split and get appraisals for the different portions or try and find some resolution or -- I mean, I'm kind of asking your opinion.

MS. McCURDY: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: It seems like there are a couple of issues that are leading to ask to have the tract appraised or split.

Is there a possibility that we could — that the landowner could provide either an update on the operation of the well or maybe some removal of the concerns of certain restrictions on the property that would negate the need to split the tract, or would it be better to move forward with another appraisal with the tract split?

I kind of -- I wanted to hear your -- I wanted the Board to hear your opinion on that. I hate to put you on

the spot, but here you go.

MS. McCURDY: No. And let me divide that up a little bit.

You've got certain rights associated with the well site, which if you don't mind me calling it the "dot" as you see coming in on the deeded access. And Mr. Mohon has informed us -- now, I don't have anything from the company officially, but he did email saying he was authorized to report that the entity that is producing on that well -- that the well has quit producing and they will be capping and abandoning the well in the next year. And he said he was authorized to say that. We don't have anything from the company, but, you know, he did put that in writing in an email that I provided to the Board.

So there are still -- even when the well site is capped and abandoned, what you see on the map -- Tab 3, page 4 -- in sort of the shaded -- which in the

1

3

5

6

legend -- it's kind of gray. In the
legend it's surface use agreement
acreage.

There is a surface use agreement and a mineral -- there's a mineral deed that is perpetual. It's a deed -- mineral deed RGGS holds, and there is an agreement that came with the property of a surface use agreement that gives some certain rights to the mineral owner or maybe their lessee to perform certain mining or certain mineral extraction.

We have also been told by

Mr. Mohon — there are two things that

we know. The surface mining rights

expire in 2024. Mr. Mohon has informed

us that the current permit will expire

in 2020. They do have an opportunity to

renew. We did talk with the Surface

Mining Commission. Generally the

considerations that might lead to that

not being renewed are more related to

public health and safety, probably not

_

necessarily conservation concerns. But, regardless, that would end in 2024.

What we have in addition to the mineral deed perpetually is a surface use agreement that by its term will expire in 2103 --

So I can't do math on the fly, but 2103, whatever -- however many years that is.

or possibly whoever — the mineral owner still has rights to try to extract minerals by other means other than strip mining after 2024. I don't know what additional methods might be viable on the site or 20 years from now what other methods might be used on the site. They also have certain rights to utilize sand, clay, rock, different resources on the property if they need to for their operation or to build roads.

So those are -- it's very complicated, but bottom line, that

/

a

2.2

agreement goes into 2103. So if they really -- Mr. Mohon has also said on repeated occasion that he does not believe that there is a desire to really continue mineral extraction there or the equipment to do so.

So I say all that to say we could ask the mineral rights owner if there would be any renegotiation of the surface use agreement or termination of those rights. That would be a little unusual. The mineral deed will still be there.

We could go forward with -- we could determine the cost of putting in a road and a trailhead and ask them if they're okay with that and report to the Board the cost and report whether we could get some up-front permission. It's just very difficult to promise the Board the outcome on that.

Splitting the property -- I think, Dr. Tolley-Jordan, looking at the map,

2.2

what you're trying to do -- and I don't want to put words in your mouth -- but would be to kind of look at the area where there's only the one southernmost triangle, so to speak, of the surface use agreement. Is that --

DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: Yes.

MS. McCURDY: -- oversimplified?

We'd have to get more specific with that. But we could present to the owner -- ask if there would be some reconfiguration that the owner would be willing -- that's lesser than the whole but would at least protect the most ecologically sensitive area.

If the Board is interested, we could then also try to figure out if we have permissions or costs on access roads to -- an access point. But that's -- the first question would be -- oh, I'm sorry. It's like I had a vision and there he is. Come up to the microphone.

So, anyway, in case they have

questions, let me say that's just a 1 myriad of options. But let me show you what I think --3 MR. MOHON: Oh, I understand. CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Mohon -- this is 6 for the court reporter. MS. McCURDY: We know him, so I forget. MR. MOHON: I'm Blair Mohon, and I'm the 8 9 property owner. CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir. Go ahead. 10 11 MR. MOHON: What you're talking about is the equivalent of about 20 acres which is 12 13 the existing strip pit on the 350-acre 14 property. It is essentially at the 15 entrance to the property. 16 The gas well site is right on the front edge of the property, and they 17 have said they're shutting it down --18 well, it's been shut down for months 19 There are three decision-makers 20 now. that have to reach uniformity to shut 21 down that well. One of those three has 2.2

said we've agreed that this year we're

/

2.2

going to shut it down and cap it, end of discussion. But they have not done that formally. So I asked him may I represent in fairness that pending some unexpected change that you do expect to cap and permanently seal that well in this calendar year, and the answer was absolutely.

And so they have discussed it. They have agreed. But they have not memorialized it. They have to go to the mineral rights owner, RGGS, to get their agreement also on that. And so it's just the administrative aspect of it that remains.

Regarding the coal mine, there is 16 to 20 acres involved. There are three different mineral rights owners on that miserable little 16 acres. RGGS, which is the company I've been dealing with, has about 4 acres. Kimberly Clark has the other 16 acres. And an unrelated piece of 40 acres, Kimberly Clark and

3

5

7

6

9

10

8

1112

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

John Hancock own it. There's no activity on it and never has been, but those mineral rights exist on 40 acres.

On this strip mine there are two coal seams, the Alice and Jones coal seams, both of which are very narrow. The modern high-wall mining equipment requires a thicker coal seam to mine. So it goes back to a more primitive auger system that is required to mine these two narrow seams. The company that holds the permit, which is named Jesse Creek Mining out of Alabaster, does not own that equipment. They have no intentions -- they have told me -their engineer has told me it's not in our current plans and it's not in our long-term plans, but hypothetically it could happen. I think that's what Patti said, that we don't know what might happen at some point in time.

So that exists on that acreage.

However, the permit expires in June of

2.2

next year. So it's got 13 months until the permit expires. The surface mining portion of the mineral rights owner's surface rights agreement expires — it's 2023, not 2024, the 20-year permit — or I'm mistaken. I apologize.

MS. McCURDY: I'll give you a year. I don't know.

MR. MOHON: But basically four years from now that surface mining agreement expires.

And they still would have the legal right to mine that property. However, it would require a new surface use agreement with the property owner is how they have represented it to me.

Given the unlikely prospect that not owning the equipment, likely to lose the permit, nothing in the planning on the property, I've raised the question with them hypothetically if for some reason it was mined, what are the results.

They have given me an appraisal of what the surface rights owner royalties would

be.

The royalties off of that 20 acres to the surface owner would be approximately \$350,000 plus the total reclamation of the 20 acres. So if the property were acquired, those rights would go with it — those royalties would go with the property in the unlikely event that it was mined.

I don't think that there are any road issues there. There is road access from two different directions as well as a potential third direction that is undeveloped. It's an old logging road.

There is a road that comes in at the north. I have property here. And there is a trailhead that comes in right here and crosses a creek on that. And then this existing road comes in.

So I have asked the mineral rights owner, RGGS, would they sell those mineral rights, and they have said, yes, we will because we agree with you; it's

not going to ever be mined and it makes
sense for us as a company to sell it.

However, they only own roughly 30 to 40

percent of that strip pit.

And so I have not pursued it with Kimberly Clark to try to get a price on that because it just seemed to me to be an overkill on that when I already had the estimate of what it would produce. I have not asked RGGS for a price as to what it would cost to buy them out. I don't know if they would sell based on the acreage involved, meaning the 4 or 5 acres that they're holding the mineral rights to, or if it would involve the entire 120 or 140 acres that they hold mineral rights access to.

That's probably much more than enough, and I apologize for going on.

But I think that's what the status is.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Okay. Thank you, sir.

All right. I would like to -- after that discussion -- do you have anything

you want to add, Ms. McCurdy? 1 MS. McCURDY: No. But in all seriousness, I think that gives -- and I appreciate, 3 Mr. Mohon, you stepping up and doing that. 5 6 I guess the thing that it didn't address if you want to pursue it -- and I'm not suggesting this, but the 8 9 question is on the table with any different configuration. So I kind of 10 11 look back to the Board. DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: I think --12 13 MR. HORN: Do we have a second? Where are we? 14 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: No, we don't --DR. WOODS: We don't have a motion. 15 16 MR. HORN: Can we have any discussion or --CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: We can have -- we can 17 go ahead -- we can have general 18 discussion. It's not necessarily on a 19 motion. We can just have general 20 discussion of the Board. 21 MS. McCURDY: And I think we were trying to --2.2 23 and that was maybe my fault, but I

3

5

6

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

23

wanted Dr. Tolley-Jordan -- if there was a motion offered -- you know, if you wanted to try to make something, I would try to help you get there.

DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: No. I just -- no. made a motion, I would like to withdraw I'm not sure -- I'm just very still it. quite confused, and some of the descriptions that you made or that Mr. Mohon or the wording that you've just used, it would be great to have that in writing. So I got lost somewhat on listening. And then the acreage that's available or that you mentioned, I can't just visually verify or tell exactly what you're talking about just from listening. So if we could get some clarification on some of these details where I could read them, that would be helpful.

MS. McCURDY: I'm happy to pursue anything for the Board. This is by nature a complex scenario, and so -- but if you have a

vision of what you would like to see or like to know could be done somewhere, we can certainly possibly confirm --

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Horn.

2.2

MR. HORN: Yeah. Mr. Mohon, I think this is exactly the kind of property that

Forever Wild should be buying. I'm totally in favor of this purchase.

MR. MOHON: I agree with you, sir.

MR. HORN: But there are some contingencies
here I think that are just left
open-ended. And my advice as a Board
member to you and to the staff would be
for us to -- well, we don't have a
motion -- but for us to carry this over.
And I think you raised all the points
that I have questions about, and I don't
think you have all the answers. But I
think we need to go back -- and you're
working with the staff -- and answer
these questions, these points that you
brought up -- are the other mineral
rights owners willing to negotiate, can

we get a price on buying them out or would they give us a letter of termination -- or some real definitive answers to these questions. And with that, I would be totally in support of buying the property. But I think we have to get some answers.

DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: Yeah, absolutely.

MR. MOHON: I can give you a political response or I can tell you the truth.

And the truth is that ain't going to happen. They're not going to sell out their mineral rights.

This piece of property has some strip-mine coal remaining on it.

Somebody else owns it. Somebody else is always going to own it. And there is always going to be some theoretical possibility that that owner is going to come get it. And if and when that happens, in the unlikely event that it happens, the owner of the property is going to get the equivalent of \$350,000

plus the property improved by a total reclamation. That's cutting it down.

Now, I've provided all of this. I provided the equivalent of a five-inch binder worth of information to Doug. I have provided numerous phone calls and emails with all of the information that I've just stated. And it has been, you know, a steady stream of contact for six months. We're not going to raise any new issues or any new answers by continuing it. And so, you know, the expression is "fish or cut bait" kind of thing.

And I don't mean that in any way to be a challenge. I'm just saying I've exhausted my ability to analyze the property, and I think the staff has too. So it really just comes down to are you willing to buy a piece of property that everybody wants but that does have a strip mine on it that theoretically could have some activity on it at some

2

3

5

6

7

10

9

12

11

1314

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

point in time even though the mineral rights owner and the mining company with the permit say it's not going to happen.

MR. SATTERFIELD: Let me kind of go in a little bit of a different direction.

Do you think those owners of the mineral rights would be willing to donate those -- rather than -- just to get rid of them? They could get rid of their obligation, donate those -whatever value that is. Maybe they can get a tax deduction. So solve it from that way and thereby just turn over whatever ownership they have to the State through the Forever Wild program which we could purchase. And that might be a different way to go and solve everybody's problem, and that way you don't have to worry about money exchanging hands down the road for royalties.

MR. MOHON: I've explored that but only with RGGS. RGGS has said that they have

/

never found their corporate

decision-makers preferring tax

deductions to cash and that they agree

it needs to be sold and it could be sold

at a reasonable price that I have not

pursued. But, again, that's only

40 percent.

Kimberly Clark owns the rest of the strip-mining area of mineral rights.

They have no mining activity going on.

They have no gas well activity. And you can hardly find their mineral rights management organization. I've struggled for weeks trying to find anyone who could talk on the subject. So absent a Balch-Bingham attorney who happens to represent Kimberly Clark or something like that, I don't really know how to get into their organization to find out anything.

The mining company with the permit didn't even know that Kimberly Clark owned the mineral rights. They had not

gotten far enough along with that. And they had assumed that I owned the mineral rights, and they had me as a fee owner. So it has not been a highly sophisticated process going on back there.

MR. SATTERFIELD: Well, the reason I raise the issue is in my representation of a lot of corporations in these kind of things a lot of times they -- particularly where there's tremendous environmental benefit -- and I agree with Horace that this is a good property that needs to be -- needs to be acquired by Forever Wild. But sometimes in working with these corporations they see a benefit in being a good environmental steward themselves.

And, Beth, that might be something that from your standpoint, from the environmental groups that you work with -- could approach these companies and there would be positive benefit from

2.2

MR. MOHON: And I agree with you completely, and that's why I've explored it with them. And the outcome to my evaluation was they are much more likely to want to have a press release with Forever Wild on contributing the mineral rights to the land than they are contributing it to Blair Mohon so that he can sell his property to Forever Wild.

MR. SATTERFIELD: That's my point.

- MR. MOHON: So I think that the negotiating for that would have to come through Forever Wild and not through me.
- MR. SATTERFIELD: What I might suggest is a better negotiator might be that lady sitting next to you. I've dealt with

her before, and she's a really good 1 negotiator. MR. MOHON: She is, but she's not the 3 decision-maker and you are. MR. SATTERFIELD: No. But she could bring an 5 6 offer to the table that then we could 7 perhaps deal with. MS. FINCH: How did you get --8 9 MS. McCURDY: Come to the microphone or stand 10 up. 11 MR. FINCH: I just wanted to ask a question. MS. McCURDY: Yes, ma'am. I've got a court 12 13 reporter struggling. MS. FINCH: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm Beth Finch. 14 So how are you able to get through 15 16 the mining issues on the other Cahaba tracts? I mean, they've got to be 17 similar. 18 19 MS. McCURDY: There are some other tracts with -- some of them next door, the 20 recreational leases. And those were 21 leases, not fee acquisitions by the 2.2

Department.

And, too, I will tell you we can get through any issues that this Board wants to get through. I mean, I don't know what you mean by get through. Are they acceptable or --

- MS. FINCH: Like the mining issues, say, with like the Savage Creek Tract. I mean, they would have mineral rights ownerships. Something should have been similar.
- MS. McCURDY: With each individual tract we're going to have differing surface use agreements. Also, as they come up, whether each Board member wants to take on the implications of the tract-specific nature where those rights occur in conjunction with access and other opportunities is a little tract specific and the use of that tract and the purpose of acquiring that tract and what we intend to do on that tract and whether or not it's a concern of whether it's active mining or not, whether it

is -- what is the activity -- there's no 1 hard-and-fast what we can and cannot do, if you know what I mean, other than 3 what -- so I'm not ... MS. FINCH: Well, were there mining rights 5 6 issues on that Savage Creek Tract? MS. McCURDY: I don't remember. I just don't remember. I do recall some as to the 8 9 lease tracts, the recreational leases. CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All right. Let's move 10 11 along on this particular issue. I think we've had a lot of discussion. Is it 12 13 the pleasure of the Board to ask the 14 staff for anything or to make any motions related to this? 15 16 Yes, sir. DR. SALOOM: I have one question and not to 17 belabor the situation. But in the 18 future if Forever Wild held this land, 19 the surface minerals of the 300-X 20 dollars that we're talking about, would 21 that money go into the general fund of 2.2

the State or would it come back to the

stewardship for the Forever Wild? 1 MS. McCURDY: Into the general fund. DR. SALOOM: General fund. 3 MS. McCURDY: Yes, sir. As you know, the 5 revenues generated off the properties 6 generally would go into the general fund. Now, you know, that is still a benefit to the State, so it's to be 8 9 recognized as such. But the way that the law was drafted for this program, it 10 11 was not to be revenue driven --12 DR. SALOOM: Does the reclamation money --13 it's separate from that that goes back into reclaiming the strip-mining and to 14 reforest that or regrass or do whatever 15 you need to do to get it reclaimed? 16 17 MS. McCURDY: The reclamation expense -- I want to double-check with legal. 18 The reclamation work would have to 19 be done by -- hang on. Normally it 20 would be the mining company. I want to 21 be sure there's nothing in these 2.2

agreements. I know there were certain

provisions where if the area might not be able to be reclaimed, the reclamation activities were not successful -- it contemplated a few places where that might be -- that then the mineral owner would have to purchase that land back that could not be reclaimed. The only issue there would be you might have an inholding. But other than base reclamation, any other work that we would do on the tract, you know, would be a stewardship expense.

But, Mr. Mohon, while you're here, I want to be sure I'm correct that there were certain areas identified that if they could not be reclaimed, the shafts and -- I'm not an expert on this -- but then the mineral owner would retain -- would have to purchase those portions and retain them -- would then retain them.

MR. MOHON: I think that is in there, and I do think that was referring to underground

mining as opposed to surface mining, 1 strip mining. On a portion of the property and leased property that I 3 lease, the same company did mine two areas there and reclaimed it about eight 5 6 years ago. And part of that was total reclamation. The owner gets to choose what vegetation to put on it; if you 8 9 want to put longleaf pine or whatever, that the owner gets to do that. And all 10 11 of that is done as a part of the miner's responsibility in addition to the 12 13 royalties to be paid. 14 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thank you. I think --MS. McCURDY: Yeah. There are several 15 16 questions that are just -- anymore questions for ... 17 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All right. I think 18 we've had a lot of discussion on this. 19 Is there any motion on this property or 20 any other discussion or general 21 discussion or business? 2.2

MR. SATTERFIELD: We have some other

nominations if that's --1 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir. MR. SATTERFIELD: From the short list. 3 MS. McCURDY: Mr. Satterfield, the court reporter can't hear you. 5 6 MR. SATTERFIELD: I'm sorry? MS. McCURDY: The court reporter can't hear 8 you. 9 MR. SATTERFIELD: Okay. CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: If you do from the 10 11 short list -- if you have any nominations, now would be the time to 12 13 make those, yes, sir. MR. SATTERFIELD: Okay. Mr. Chairman, from 14 the short list I would like to nominate 15 the Hollins WMA Addition for a first 16 appraisal. 17 MR. WRIGHT: I second it. 18 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: I'm sorry. I'm just 19 catching up with you, sir. 20 So the motion is for a first 21 appraisal for the Hollins WMA Addition, 2.2 23 1161 acres in Clay County.

1	MR. SATTERFIELD: Right.
2	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: A motion made by
3	Mr. Satterfield, seconded by Mr. Wright.
4	Is there any discussion on that?
5	(No response.)
6	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Seeing no discussion,
7	all those in favor say "aye."
8	(All Board members present respond
9	"aye.")
10	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Any opposed?
11	(No response.)
12	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: None opposed. Motion
13	carries.
14	MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman?
15	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Jones.
16	MR. JONES: I would like to make actually two
17	motions for first appraisal, and I guess
18	we could handle those separately.
19	But the first for the Cedar Creek
20	SOA Addition of 1853 acres in Dallas
21	County.
22	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All right. Thank you,
23	Mr. Jones.

1	Is there a second?
2	DR. WATSON: Second.
3	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Watson. Seconded
4	by Dr. Watson.
5	So it's a motion for a first
6	appraisal on the Cedar Creek SOA
7	Addition, 1,853 acres in Dallas County.
8	Any questions or discussion on that?
9	(No response.)
10	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All those in favor say
11	"aye."
12	(All Board members present respond
13	"aye.")
14	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Any opposed?
15	(No response.)
16	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: None opposed. Motion
17	carries.
18	MS. McCURDY: I'm not sure we had responses
19	from everyone.
20	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Let's vote again.
21	MS. McCURDY: We need "yeas" or "nays" or
22	abstentions, please.
23	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Cedar Creek, first

1	appraisal. If you're in favor, say
2	"aye."
3	(All Board members present respond
4	"aye.")
5	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Any opposed?
6	(No response.)
7	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: None opposed. Motion
8	carries.
9	MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, my second motion
10	would be for the Monte Sano SP-McCombs
11	Addition, 120 acres in Madison County,
12	Alabama.
13	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All right. Thank you,
14	Mr. Jones.
15	Is there a second?
16	MR. HORN: Second.
17	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Seconded by Mr. Horn.
18	This is for the Monte Sano State
19	Park-McCombs Addition, 121 acres in
20	Madison County, motion for a first
21	appraisal.
22	Any questions, comments?
23	(No response.)

1	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Seeing none, we'll
2	vote.
3	All those in favor say "aye."
4	(All Board members present respond
5	"aye.")
6	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Any opposed?
7	(No response.)
8	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: None opposed. Motion
9	carries.
10	DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like
11	to nominate for first appraisal the
12	Prairie Grove Glades Tract in Lawrence
13	County.
14	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thank you.
15	Dr. Tolley-Jordan makes a motion.
16	Is there a second?
17	DR. WOODS: Second.
18	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Seconded by Dr. Woods.
19	A motion for a first appraisal on
20	the Prairie Grove Glades Tract, 216
21	acres in Lawrence County.
22	Any discussion?
23	MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to

3

5

6

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

23

make sure. I mean, we don't own any other land around this. This would be -- that is a small tract, 216 acres, that we don't have any real -- I'm just thinking from a management standpoint that's a concern for me in that regard.

Is there --

MR. SATTERFIELD: I had a similar question about that, about how the Department would manage that, whether there's any funds, how it would be set up.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Okay.

Right now it's rated as a nature preserve, but whose responsibility would that fall under and does that department have the funds and/or the resources to manage that small isolated tract?

MS. McCURDY: Being a nature preserve, the State Lands Division on behalf of the Forever Wild program would manage that It would be managed, as with tract. other tracts, with stewardship funds as necessary. It's no more difficult. Ιt is a remote -- more remote tract.

There's not ownership nearby. So, yes, 1 there is a greater management burden for such a tract, but the question is for 3 the program and for the nature preserve 5 value, an ecological value makes it 6 worth pursuing. There's a comment that we had MR. RUNYAN: cows grazing on there as a benefit. 8 9 Where does the Board stand on grazing cattle? 10 11 MS. McCURDY: Well, that's a question for --12 where does the Board stand on grazing --13 MR. RUNYAN: The Department. MS. McCURDY: For us what it would mean? 14 What we would need to do is if you 15 16 are having that type of activity, we would need to lease that out, offer that 17 for lease for that activity. I don't 18 19 know that we could just have somebody's cows on there, but I'm sure there's a 20 way by agreement to have that. 21 MR. RUNYAN: How would that co-exist to have a 2.2 23 nature park and cattle grazing together?

MS. McCURDY: From what we heard earlier,

there was assumed to be a benefit to

having the grazing cattle by turning the

dirt, I believe, or disturbance of the

dirt. How would we manage that?

Again, we would have to deal with whose cows on there and an arrangement as to that. There would have to be some agreement in place dealing with that.

Is it doable? Can we do it? Yes. If it's existing okay, then I would imagine it would continue to co-exist okay. But we would have to -- we could not have what would be basically private usage on that without reaching some agreement or leasing it out or some type of agreement dealing with the presence of cows.

MR. HORN: In your opinion this -- well, would this breach our, I guess, agreement not to purchase any land -- any agricultural land or any land in agricultural production? Would you consider this to be agricultural land?

MS. McCURDY: I would consider it -- and let me say, as described -- we may need more details on exactly the cows and if anything else is going on.

As described, although very different from what we've heard before as a positive in the disturbance of the land, you know, is it the same as we've discussed before, just bush-hogging to maintain — not have your land overgrown, I don't know. You know, that is up to the Board as to whether they consider it ag or not. If we kept it there, it would not be taking it out as far as the cows, but I don't know what else is there. And without knowing the owner of the cows, there's some more discussion to be had.

So I would say, you know, on this one, Dr. Jordan, if you don't mind, I would, you know, maybe find out a little additional on the cow presence. I'm not sure we fully understood the cows or the

cows -- and let me -- and not at all 1 being funny. I'm serious. If they are part of what maintains the -- are 3 important ecologically to what is there, then we do need to figure out how to 5 6 deal with it and keep the cows. So this is a new one for me. I'm just going to be honest. But do I 8 9 consider it ag? I would put it back on the Board. There are certain ... 10 11 DR. SALOOM: So we don't know whether there's just -- there's trees involved here and 12 13 some forest, but do we know if these are 14 native prairie grasses in this area, or do we know that? 15 16 MS. McCURDY: I do not know. I know some of them are native. 17 Mr. Byrd, if you want to come back 18 up, but I'm asking my staff --19 MS. LEWIS: As I understand it -- I haven't 20 been there myself, but I believe Wayne 21 has been. 2.2

I haven't been on the tract, but I

heard discussions from other experts. I believe Dr. Barger has been to the tract a few years ago. It's a very rich tract of unique plant diversity that appears like grasses but, I mean, it's open glades. It's short vegetation of diversity. So it might look like a pasture, but it's a lot better than that.

MR. BYRD: The main body of the preserve is of native grass and shrub component. And the small portion that is actually being grazed, we're trading grazing rights, well, for management of the fences in the areas — the small areas that the cattle are in. They're not in the majority — the larger portion of the property which is open to the public that's got a trail and all that sort of thing.

So it's just native grasses. It's unimproved glades with, you know, native grasses. It's not pasture.

Yes, ma'am. 1 DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: Could you fire-manage it if you don't use cattle? 3 DR. SALOOM: What's the question? 5 DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: I'm sorry. Can you use 6 fire, you know, controlled-burn management if you don't use cattle? MR. BYRD: We've looked at that. The shallow 8 nature of the soils and the fact that 9 they tend to get inundated quickly, fire 10 is difficult for that situation. 11 12 There's potential. 13 I know that the majority landowner who we've been working with in the past 14 has used bush-hogging or mechanical 15 16 treatments as a surrogate in the areas that are specifically located -- that 17 have the bladderpods specifically 18 located, which is the only plant that 19 needs the disturbance. 20 DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: 21 Okay.

DR. SALOOM: So are you saying that this is

not a fire-prone area that needs to be

2.2

burned to maintain? 1 MR. BYRD: We don't do prescribed burning. It's a glade -- cedar glade. So as you 3 know, cedars either burn really well or don't burn at all. And primarily the 5 6 forest type on the preserve is cedar glade. DR. SALOOM: There's a lot of cedar on the 8 9 property? MR. BYRD: Yes, sir. 10 11 DR. SALOOM: Is that an invasive on that 12 property --13 MR. BYRD: No, sir. DR. SALOOM: -- like normal prairie invasives? 14 MR. BYRD: It's a natural part of the system, 15 16 and the cedars are controlled primarily by drought. The photo in the map -- you 17 can see the red. That was taken 18 after -- those are all dead cedars. 19 That was taken after the extreme drought 20 we had several years ago, and that's 21

sort of Mother Nature's way of shaving

the dog.

2.2

DR. SALOOM: What are some of the -- what are the grasses that are predominantly there?

2.2

- MR. BYRD: I can't tell you exactly, sir. I'm sorry. The grass species escapes me.

 (Multiple speakers.)
- MS. McCURDY: Y'all, please -- hold on. Hold on. I'm sorry. Wayne -- if somebody has a question, Tracye is struggling.
- DR. BARGER: Well, I mean, I'm not sure that I could give you a list of grass species.

 If you're just talking about that eastern side that's been nominated where the cattle are on the property, you have a lot of exotic grasses that are there as well that are impeding the bladderpod, which is the plant species that is of conservation interest there.

 The cattle are going in there and grazing the grass down, keeping it in a successional stage so that that minute little plant can thrive there.

Did that answer your question?

1 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir. Mr. Satterfield. MR. SATTERFIELD: Earlier you said The Nature 3 Conservancy owned a portion of this property that's shown in red. That's 5 6 correct? MR. BYRD: Yes, sir. MR. SATTERFIELD: Like many other properties 8 9 Forever Wild has acquired, is The Nature Conservancy willing to donate this 10 11 property to Forever Wild? MR. BYRD: I'm not sure. That potentially 12 13 could be explored, but that's kind of above my pay grade. 14 MR. SATTERFIELD: Well, I think that's 15 16 certainly a worthy question to explore because we've got a number of properties 17 that we've worked in conjunction --18 19 partnership with The Nature Conservancy where they have given us 100-percent 20 donation on properties like this. So I 21

would suggest that's maybe something we

need to also take up with The Nature

2.2

Conservancy, if maybe you could open 1 that line of conversation for us. MR. BYRD: Yes, sir. 3 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Any other discussion? So we have a motion and a second. 5 6 MR. WRIGHT: I have one question. CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir, Mr. Wright. MR. WRIGHT: Since there's cattle involved and 8 9 we're not in the farming business, don't we need to research this just a little 10 11 bit further? 12 MS. McCURDY: What I was saying before was, is 13 that the presence of someone's cows -they would obviously be someone else's 14 cows -- on the property would have to be 15 16 the subject of some sort of agreement of some type. Whether it would have to be 17 a lease or something, I don't know. 18 So, yes, we would -- if acquired, we 19 are going to have to figure out by -- it 20 would not be our cows nor would we would 21 be in charge of cows. So, yes, we're 2.2

going to have to --

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: So is there -- you 1 know, as we've had discussion, is there concern from the Board to have some more 3 information on a couple of these issues before --5 6 MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, it is for me. mean, we only have so much money, and I would hate to see us waste money on an 8 9 appraisal if we're going to do that. So with respect to Ms. Jordan, if you could 10 11 maybe move to withdraw your motion --12 DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: Sure. 13 MR. JONES: -- or do that and let's get some more answers and revisit this down the 14 15 road. 16 DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: Sure. So I will withdraw 17 my motion. CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Is that okay with you, 18 Mr. Seconder, Dr. Woods? 19 DR. WOODS: Yes, that's fine. 20 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All right. So with 21 that, the motion is withdrawn. 2.2

Thank you, Dr. Tolley-Jordan.

we'll find -- staff can work with the 1 landowners to provide that information for the next meeting. 3 DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: Sure. MR. SATTERFIELD: Mr. Chairman? 5 6 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir, Mr. Satterfield. MR. SATTERFIELD: I would like to make a 8 9 motion that we go to first appraisal on the GBS-Richard Addition, which is one 10 11 of those examples of 100-percent donation from The Nature Conservancy. 12 13 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: So I want to make sure I clear this with the staff before I 14 take a second for your motion. 15 16 Is there a memo on that later in the --17 It's 5-G. MS. McCURDY: 18 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: In 5-G. 19 MS. McCURDY: And that property has had all 20 the due diligence performed and cleared 21 now and we are where the Board can go 2.2 23 ahead and simply accept the donation.

If you'll turn to 5-G in your packet. 1 MR. SATTERFIELD: Okay. MS. McCURDY: We don't need a first 3 appraisal --MR. SATTERFIELD: So we can just -- we can go 5 to make that motion from the packet. 6 MS. McCURDY: Yes, sir. Go ahead and we won't have to discuss it later. 8 9 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: So if you are interested in that particular property 10 11 on 5-G, I think there's a sample motion there. 12 13 MR. SATTERFIELD: I apologize for not following the discussion close enough, 14 and I would make the motion that's in 15 the packet. Do you want me to read it? 16 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir. If you don't 17 mind reading that, that would be great. 18 MR. SATTERFIELD: The motion is as follows: 19 The Board approves acceptance of the 20 Grand Bay Savanna-Richard Addition Tract 21 donation and approves staff proceeding 2.2 23 with closing the acquisition with the

1	understanding that, as required,
2	15 percent of the appraised value will
3	be transferred to the stewardship fund.
4	In addition, this motion is
5	conditioned on payment through
6	third-party funds of all costs and/or
7	fees associated with appraisals,
8	environmental reports, title insurance,
9	closing, and recording fees.
LO	This motion is further conditioned
L1	upon review, approval, and acceptance of
L2	all due diligence by the State Lands
L3	Division.
L 4	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: So you've heard the
L5	motion. Is there a second?
L6	MR. HORN: Second.
L7	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Seconded by Mr. Horn.
L8	Any discussion on that?
L9	(No response.)
20	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All those in favor say
21	"aye."
22	(All Board members present respond
23	"aye.")

1	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Any opposed?
2	(No response.)
3	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: None opposed. Motion
4	carries.
5	Thank you, Mr. Satterfield.
6	Anybody else? Any other discussion?
7	MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Commissioner, I'd like to
8	make a motion for first appraisal on the
9	Coldwater-Young Addition because it will
LO	give access to the Martin Addition that
L1	we just moved on and to other holdings
L2	that Forever Wild holds there.
L3	MS. TOLLEY-JORDAN: Second.
L 4	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All right. So the
L5	motion is for first appraisal on the
L6	Coldwater-Young Addition. Motion made
L7	by Mr. Wright, seconded by
L8	Dr. Tolley-Jordan.
L9	Any discussion?
20	(No response.)
21	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All those in favor say
22	"aye."
23	(All Board members present respond

1	"aye.")
2	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Any opposed?
3	(No response.)
4	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: None opposed. Motion
5	carries.
6	Any other discussion?
7	(No response.)
8	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thank you all for a
9	spirited discussion on certain items,
0	and now we'll move on to item number 7,
1	the miscellaneous reports, Tab 5.
L2	MS. McCURDY: We'll let Doug come up since
L3	I've belabored everything.
L 4	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: We have covered many
L5	things in this tab over the course of
L6	the meeting. I think we are on Tab 5-C.
L 7	MR. DEATON: Thank you, Commissioner. I'll be
8	very brief.
_9	The next item is found in Tab 5-C.
20	In previous meetings staff presented a
21	request from the Historic Blakeley State
22	Park asking the Board to consider a land
23	swap. The requested land swap would

help resolve the current encroachment issue with the park and allow expansion of the park's master plan and provide increased revenue for the park.

authorized staff to proceed with the necessary appraisal and survey work to determine the value of each property with the condition that Blakeley would be responsible for the expenses.

Appraisals have been performed and reviewed to confirm a value-for-value swap of the acreage. The attached map represents the final boundaries of the proposed swap.

So pursuant to the swap, 38.85 acres of the Blakeley property will be received in exchange of 42 acres of Forever Wild holdings. Since this is a value-for-value swap, there will be no exchange of funds for the transaction.

Assuming the Board would like to proceed, we would need a motion, and

1	we've provided the information in your
2	package.
3	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: That's on 5-C.
4	Any questions for Doug, or is there
5	anybody that would like to make that
6	motion on 5-C?
7	MR. HORN: I'll make the motion that the Board
8	approve the State Lands Division to
9	proceed with the closing of the proposed
LO	Blakeley Land Swap as a value-for-value
L1	swap as outlined in the memo dated
L2	May 9, 2019.
L3	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All right. Is there a
L 4	second?
L5	DR. SALOOM: Second.
L6	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Seconded by Dr. Saloom.
L7	Any questions about that, Blakeley,
L8	the land swap?
L9	(No response.)
20	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All those in favor say
21	"aye."
22	(All Board members present respond
23	"aye.")

1	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Any opposed?
2	(No response.)
3	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: None opposed.
4	MR. DEATON: All right. The next is
5	management plans. It's found in
6	Tab 5-D.
7	As required by the Amendment 543,
8	management plans must be developed
9	within one year of acquisition of a
10	tract. And so today we have four tracts
11	that need approval to be added to
12	existing management plans and one new
13	management plan that needs the Board's
14	approval.
15	The first two tracts are the Freedom
16	Hills WMA-Randolph Hollow Addition and
17	the Lauderdale WMA-Newman Addition.
18	We're asking approval to fold these into
19	the existing Freedom Hills, Lauderdale,
20	Riverton WMA Forever Wild Complex
21	Management Plan.
22	The next tract is the Perdido River

WMA-Freise Addition in Baldwin County.

We are seeking approval to fold this tract into the existing Perdido River Wildlife Management Area Complex Management Plan.

And the other tract that we're looking to do is the Red Hills-Zieback Addition in Monroe County. We're seeking approval to fold this tract into the existing Red Hills Forever Wild Complex Management Plan.

In addition to adding those tracts, we have one new management plan that we need approval and that is the Big Canoe Creek Tract located in St. Clair County.

Each management plan was provided in your packet. If there are no questions, we would need a motion to approve the plans as provided.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Saloom.

DR. SALOOM: Yeah. The Board approves the

State Lands Division proceeding with the inclusion of the tracts into existing management plans and the adoption of the

1	new tract management plan as set forth
2	in the memorandum dated May 9, 2019,
3	attached to this memorandum.
4	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: The motion was made by
5	Dr. Saloom. Is there a second?
6	DR. WOODS: Second.
7	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Seconded by Dr. Woods.
8	Any questions?
9	(No response.)
LO	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All those in favor say
L1	"aye."
L2	(All Board members present respond
L3	"aye.")
L 4	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Any opposed?
L5	(No response.)
L6	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: None opposed. Motion
L7	carries.
L8	Next.
L9	MR. DEATON: The next item is just an update.
20	It's Tab 5-E.
21	At the February meeting staff
22	provided information in the meeting
23	packet notifying the Board that a

portion of the tract previously owned by CSX Transportation had some deed language that restricted recreational use and contained a hold harmless agreement that was unacceptable.

And just for the record, this is the Shelby Crossroads Addition. I'm sorry.

After further discussions with the landowner, they have decided to reduce the footprint of the nomination to only the acreage to the east of the old CSX acreage. This reduces the nomination to approximately 684 acres. The acreage reduction does not significantly reduce the original evaluation scoring as the new configuration still provides adequate access and recreational use.

This is just to update the Board of the changes in that revised nomination that you'll see in your packet. There's no action needed by the Board today.

Any questions?

(No response.)

2.2

MR. DEATON: All right. If you'll turn to

Tab 5-F, this is just an update on the

Old Cahawba Prairie Tract. At the last

meeting Mr. Will Roberts came to the

Board addressing some concerns that he

had about trespass and potential firing

across his line.

2.2

Staff along with Board Member David Wright and Mr. Will Roberts met on site, talked about his issues, and what we came to was a solution of taking the area adjacent to his property and making it bow hunting only for this season and see if that resolves the issues. If it doesn't, we'll re-evaluate at the end of this season and take further steps as needed.

- DR. SALOOM: Just a comment. I thought that was very innovative for y'all to work with him about that. That was good.
- MR. JONES: Question: How will that be denoted? Will it be marked?
- MR. DEATON: It'll be on the map. So when we

have areas in our WMAs and on our permit maps, there's an area that says "bow hunting only." And we used a natural barrier, a road, that delineates it, and it's bordered by our boundary line on the north side of it also.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thank you, Doug.

Ms. McCurdy, I think you have the next two items, 5-I and J.

MS. McCURDY: Yes. The May meeting has become the time when we begin talking with the Board about two things.

One you'll see in Tab 5-I relates to the transfer of funds to the State Lands Division to support our administrative work on behalf of the program. We do it in May, and we use the previous fiscal year as a basis for our request for this fiscal year.

And so we are keeping our request at \$750,000. While that does not cover the State Lands expenses and we're going to need to probably look to upping that

some in the future, we are going to stay at the level request for this year.

And we've attached some information to the Board about how we reach the determination of those expenses and the staff time and expenses that the program incurs. If there are any questions on that — it's not really different from last year, so I don't want to spend too much time on it unless there are questions.

To approve that transfer of administrative support, we would need a motion from the Board.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Jones.

MR. JONES: The Board approves the State Lands

Division staff to proceed with requested

administrative transfer in the amount of

\$750,000 for the fiscal year 2019

administrative support provided by the

State Lands Division.

MR. HORN: Second.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Seconded by Mr. Horn.

1	Any discussion?
2	(No response.)
3	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All those in favor say
4	"aye."
5	(All Board members present respond
6	"aye.")
7	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Any opposed?
8	(No response.)
9	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: None opposed. Motion
LO	carries.
L1	MS. McCURDY: All right. The next item and
L2	I think our last item if that sounds
L3	good is 5-J. That memo details
L 4	something a little different.
L5	We just talked about approval for
L6	transfer for the current fiscal year.
L 7	When it comes to stewardship fund and
L8	expenditures from the stewardship fund,
L9	we have to look a fiscal year ahead. So
20	it is time to begin the discussion for
21	authorization related to approval of
22	stewardship fund expenditures for the
23	fiscal year that will begin October 1.

/

We do this in advance of the fiscal year -- which I realize it sounds -- it's tough to always know what you're going to need, and it's certainly tough in advance to know. And we've had years where we've had storm damage. We've had a threat of timber bugs. We've had several things over the years. So it is -- it is a little difficult to project.

But you will see in your memo we have classified anticipated needs from the stewardship fund as routine work on tracts and then tract-specific work.

And we have included a breakdown in Exhibit A for a manner in which we estimate the cost for tract-specific work, which this fiscal year really, I think, is just going to be reforestation unless something unexpected hits.

Otherwise, it's our regular routine tract needs.

And we consider routine needs to be

such things as road repairs and maintenance, boundary line maintenance. We have recreational projects that we do have enough funds to contribute to.

Obviously, we have invasive species work that varies from tract to tract.

So those are the routine. We are expecting -- or calculating the routine land expenditures to be approximately \$1,035,000.00, a little over that, with tract-specific just over \$110,000, for a total anticipated, the best we can forecast, \$1,146,000.00.

Now, we have last year -- and staff suggestion and Commissioner's suggestion also would be to go ahead and ask for a motion authorizing up to \$1.5 million in the event that at October 1, that fiscal year, that we do have something unexpected that we do not know of. It doesn't mean we will spend that, but if we do not get that approval in this fiscal year, we cannot go back and add

more next fiscal year. And so that's why we're asking for it now.

The additional reason that puts us in this position is under Amendment 543, if we expect to expend anything more from the stewardship fund than interest income, then we need to do that motion now. And although we also can't completely forecast that, we know we're not going to have \$1.5 million.

And so the Commissioner, you will also see with your memo, has made his determination under Amendment 543 that -- what we term "insufficiency finding," in other words, saying that he believes that we will not have sufficient interest income to not have to spend from the corpus. Obviously, the money is there to spend, but we try to spend it judiciously. So you will see for procedural purposes this "insufficiency determination" also attached to the memo.

So I'll entertain any questions 1 about our anticipated expenditures, how we reached our estimates, routine versus 3 tract-specific, or any other questions the Board has. We would have to make 5 6 a -- have this motion either this meeting or the August meeting to be, obviously, in this fiscal year. So I 8 9 open it up for questions. Commissioner, if you ... 10 11 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: No. I just wanted to 12 see if there were any questions or 13 anybody that was willing to make the motion. 14 DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: I'll make it. 15 16 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Okay. Dr. Tolley-Jordan. 17 DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: So the Board authorizes 18 19 ADCNR, after exhausting available interest income from the stewardship 20 account, to expend funds from the corpus 21 of the stewardship account up to an 2.2

amount that when added to the available

interest income does not exceed 1 \$1.5 million. MR. SATTERFIELD: Second. 3 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Seconded by Mr. Satterfield. 5 6 Any discussion? MR. SATTERFIELD: Mr. Chairman, I do have a comment. 8 9 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir. MR. SATTERFIELD: We've touched on this before 10 11 briefly in a couple of previous meetings. And, that is, I would request 12 13 that once we deal with this motion, if you could -- if you could provide us the 14 follow-up report of how much interest 15 16 income the stewardship fund earned in FY18 and what the estimated interest 17 income you expect the stewardship fund 18 to earn in FY19, which goes to the heart 19 of some of this money that we're having 20 to supplement. 21 And that's not part of the motion. 2.2

It's just a request so we can keep track

1	of the interest earnings that we're
2	getting from the stewardship fund.
3	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Let's dispense with
4	this motion, and I'll provide some
5	commentary on that if that suits you,
6	sir.
7	MR. SATTERFIELD: Yeah, that's fine.
8	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Any other discussion?
9	(No response.)
10	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All those in favor of
11	the motion please say "aye."
12	(All Board members present respond
13	"aye.")
14	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Any opposed?
15	(No response.)
16	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: No opposed. Motion
17	carries.
18	Yes, sir, Mr. Satterfield. As
19	you'll recall, at the urging of some
20	questioning from the Board and working
21	with our former State Treasurer,
22	Mr. Young Boozer, we have changed the
23	investment strategy of the stewardship

2

3

5

6

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

fund from where it was in an interest-bearing account to where now we have a diversified portfolio in conjunction with the Alabama Trust Fund that's managed by the State Treasurer.

So the language that is in the act about the difference between interest and operational costs is going to be a little bit different than how we -- I can still show you that information on interest income, but the interest income now is a very small portion of the total return on investment of our portfolio. I don't know that it's going to be valuable to you. I can give you that information. But what we're showing now in the information we provide is the change in value of the overall stewardship fund portfolio between meetings to try and provide that information.

Is that -- so what would you like to see, I guess, is what I'm asking.

MR. SATTERFIELD: Well, I guess what I'm after is return on investment, earnings, whatever -- however you want to call it, so that we know what's happening to that 33, 34 million dollars that we have in the stewardship fund -- which, you know, if I had that much money I could invest somewhere else, I would know exactly how much it's earning. And I think it's important for us to know what's happening with that fund as part of our fiduciary duty of the Board.

2.2

And whatever information you have that you can share with us in that regard, I think, is helpful. And then, secondarily, if we're not dealing with something we can isolate as interest income, I wonder if this motion was properly worded.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Sure, we can isolate

the interest income. The motion is

proper. We can isolate the interest

income, but it is a small portion of the

3

5 6

8 9

10

11

13

12

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2.2

23

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: And I think we can

overall return on the change in value of the portfolio. And so we've tried to provide in Tab 2 the change in value of the portfolio from October 1 through April the 30th. And so if that's not sufficient the way that that's provided, we'll try and find some other way that is more acceptable to the Board.

I don't know -- it's just a difference --

MR. SATTERFIELD: I realize I'm dealing with government, okay, which does their -handles their statements different than -- and more like -- probably more like foundations or other things that I'm used to dealing with, and I look at those and I can't make heads or tails out of that either. But I'm just trying to figure out how much income we have that is produced from a 33 or 34 million dollar account that's invested out there somewhere.

provide you that change in value between meetings.

2.2

DR. SALOOM: How much of that is in the purview of the Board in terms of -- in terms of the recommendations about who's investing it and how it's invested?

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: I think that the -
MS. McCURDY: The Board could make recommendations. They would be just that, recommendations. It is managed by

the Alabama Trust Fund.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: By the State Treasurer in a diversified portfolio that fairly mirrors the Alabama Trust Fund is what we have where we've gone from a -- just to give you -- since you're fairly new on the Board, before the money was all in interest -- just in an interest-bearing account making less than half a percent. And so we have changed the investments to provide a growth in the stewardship fund over time just like if you had your own personal

investments.

_

./

DR. SALOOM:

That's good.

And so we can -- you know, it's not as simple as it used to be to tell you what interest we made, which was very little. Now we have -- some of it is in cash in an interest -- does have interest while we -- you know, money that's easily accessible in a money market fund. But a lot of the other investments are in equities and bonds and in a diversified portfolio through the Alabama Trust Fund.

So what we're trying to provide -what I have attempted -- or the staff
has attempted to provide here is what
the value of the portfolio was at the
beginning of the fiscal year and then
provide what the value of the portfolio
is in the stewardship fund before each
meeting. And then if that is -- if you
want something different, we can try and
provide that.

MS. McCURDY: And to clarify one thing, there are at certain times certain elections as to the strategy of where -- which type of fund the money is put in, but the underlying investment decisions are made by the State Treasurer.

DR. SALOOM: I got you.

2.2

MS. McCURDY: So we have to make some

decisions of what money we have to have

access to for purposes versus money we

know is going to be there long-term.

But there are some decisions there that

would be in the purview of the Board,

but the specific investments would be

with the State Treasurer.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: So we'll try and -we'll work with staff. We've had a lot
of discussion about this before this
meeting to try and provide something
that we thought would be most beneficial
to the Board. If what we provided is
not beneficial, we'll see if we can find
something that is a different level of

detail. 1 And appreciate the approval of the stewardship fund expenditure request. 3 And the next item is the approval of the minutes from the November 6th meeting. 5 6 I think that was provided to the Board in advance of the meeting. Are there any corrections or changes to the 8 minutes? 9 I move we approve as presented. 10 MR. HORN: 11 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Motion by Mr. Horn, 12 seconded by Dr. Saloom. 13 Any other discussion, changes, corrections to the minutes? 14 (No response.) 15 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All those in favor of 16 approving the November 8th, 2018, 17 minutes please say "aye." 18 (All Board members present respond 19 "aye.") 20 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Any opposed? 21 (No response.) 2.2 23 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: None opposed. Motion

carries.

The next meeting will be August 8, 2019. Mr. Horn has offered and our staff has gone to the Five Star Preserve in Kellyton, Alabama, in Coosa County, and that's where the next meeting will be held. They've gone to make sure that would meet our needs as a board. And so our next meeting will be held there on August the 8th.

Is there any other business, or do I have a motion to adjourn?

Mr. Horn.

MR. HORN: Back to one piece of property very briefly. Beth and Mr. Mohon stepped outside. I really want to see us buy this piece of property. I heard Mr. Mohon loud and clear. It's time to fish or cut bait and don't blame him for that if he has to move on.

But if we could have the time between this meeting and the next meeting, I would certainly like to work

with the staff. 1 And, Beth, you bring up some good points about how we manage mineral 3 rights and mining on some other properties. I don't think the Board is 5 6 aware of that. But I would personally do what I could do to resolve these issues on 8 behalf of the Board between now and the 9 next meeting if the property remains 10 11 nominated for the Board to take action 12 on. 13 MS. McCURDY: That would be very helpful. 14 Thank you, Mr. Horn. CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Saloom. 15 16 DR. SALOOM: Did we talk about the Grand Bay Savanna? 17 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir. 18 DR. SALOOM: Oh, we already spoke about that? 19 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir. 20 DR. SALOOM: I'm sorry. I apologize. 21

MS. McCURDY: We've had a lot going on.

motion carried to accept the donation.

2.2

- DR. SALOOM: All right. One question about this:

 How much cogongrass is on that savanna?

 DR. BARGER: I can't give you a good answer on
 - DR. BARGER: I can't give you a good answer on that.
 - MS. McCURDY: I will say some of the -- there will be some additional funds I think we'll be able to take advantage of through NFWF for some activity -- conservation activity probably, but I do not know the exact amount. That is an issue in that area as an entirety, and so ...
 - DR. SALOOM: Would it be -- would we be providing the monies to spray that from the stewardship fund?
 - MS. McCURDY: To the extent that we don't have additional funds for conservation efforts through NFWF, we will be assisting.
 - MR. DEATON: That's correct.

2.2

MS. McCURDY: I mean, there are some funds we will be getting from NFWF that are -through NFWF that will help us on that

1	property. But, yes, in the end that
2	would be part of what I would put under
3	the routine tract expense and land
4	management expense.
5	DR. SALOOM: Sorry. I've been out in left
6	field.
7	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: And any other words of
8	wisdom you need to give us before we
9	adjourn?
LO	MS. McCURDY: I wish I had words of wisdom. I
L1	don't think I do. Thank y'all very much
L2	for your patience.
L3	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Is there a motion to
L4	adjourn?
L5	MR. HORN: Move to adjourn.
L6	MR. RUNYAN: Second.
L7	CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All those in favor say
L8	"aye."
L9	(All members present respond
20	"aye.")
21	
22	(Meeting adjourned at approximately
23	1:24 p.m.)

1	* * * * * * * *
2	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
3	* * * * * * * *
4	STATE OF ALABAMA:
5	MONTGOMERY COUNTY:
6	I, Tracye Sadler Blackwell, Certified
7	Court Reporter and Commissioner for the State of
8	Alabama at Large, do hereby certify that I reported
9	the foregoing proceedings of the Forever Wild Board
10	Meeting on May 9, 2019.
11	The foregoing 176 computer-printed pages
12	contain a true and correct transcript of the
13	proceedings held.
14	I further certify that I am neither of
15	kin nor of counsel to the parties to said cause nor
16	in any manner interested in the results thereof.
17	This 2nd day of July 2019.
18	
19	
20	Tracye Sadler Blackwell
21	ACCR No. 294 Expiration date: 9-30-2019
22	Certified Court Reporter and Commissioner for the State
23	of Alabama at Large