MINUTES OF THE 1 FOREVER WILD BOARD MEETING 2 Agriculture and Industries Auditorium 3 Richard Beard Building 4 1445 Federal Drive 5 Montgomery, Alabama 6 7 August 5, 2021 10:00 a.m. 8 9 10 Transcript of Proceedings 11 12 13 PROCEEDINGS, taken before Stacey 14 L. Johnson, Certified Court Reporter and 1.5 Commissioner for the State of Alabama at 16 Large, at the Agriculture and Industries 17 18 Auditorium, Richard Beard Building, 1445 Federal Drive, Montgomery, Alabama, on the 19 5th day of August, 2021, commencing at 20 10:01 a.m. 2.1 22 23

1	BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:
2	Mr. Raymond B. Jones, Jr. Mr. James "Mickey" Childers
3	Mr. Jack Darnall Mr. Reginald N. Holloway
4	Dr. James B. McClintock Dr. Sean P. Powers
5	Dr. Sean F. Fowers Dr. Salem Saloom Mr. William "Bill" Satterfield
6	Dr. Patricia Sims
7	Dr. Lori Tolley-Jordan Dr. John Valentine
8	Mr. David Wright * * * * * * * * * *
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

MR. JONES: Let's go ahead and try to 1 call this meeting to order. The time is 2 3 10:01. First thing we need to do is do 4 roll call, so when I say your name, please 5 6 state that you're here. 7 Mickey Childers? MR. CHILDERS: 8 Here. MR. JONES: Jack Darnall? 9 MR. DARNALL: Here. 10 MR. JONES: Reginald Holloway? 11 MR. HOLLOWAY: Here. 12 MR. JONES: Raymond Jones, here. 13 Dr. James McClintock? 14 DR. MCCLINTOCK: Here. 1.5 MR. JONES: Dr. Sean Powers? 16 DR. POWERS: Here. 17 MR. JONES: Dr. Salem Saloom? 18 DR. SALOOM: Here. 19 MR. JONES: William Satterfield? 20 MR. SATTERFIELD: 21 Here. MR. JONES: Patricia Sims? 22 DR. SIMS: 23 Here.

MR. JONES: Dr. Lori Tolley-Jordan? 1 TOLLEY-JORDAN: DR. Here. 2 3 MR. JONES: Dr. John Valentine? DR. VALENTINE: Here. 4 MR. JONES: David Wright? 5 6 MR. WRIGHT: Here. 7 MR. JONES: Chris Blankenship's not 8 attending and Dr. Jay Neumann and Rick Oates are not attending. We do have a 9 quorum. 10 First of all, I'd like to make a 11 couple of opening remarks. I am not Chris 12 13 Blankenship. I am Raymond Jones. Chris was unable to attend the meeting 14 today and asked me to Chair. But before 1.5 we go any further, I would like to ask any 16 of the Board Members is everybody okay 17 with that. 18 (All Board members 19 20 indicated yes.) 21 MR. JONES: Thank you. Appreciate that. 22 What if we weren't? DR. SALOOM: 23

MR. JONES: Well, I don't know. We'd have to turn it over to Patti, then.

MS. MCCURDY: I just want to remind everybody, though, do be sure your microphones are on and be sure to speak into them. You can turn them off if you're not speaking, but just be conscious of that and -- anyway, I just wanted to remind everybody -- I'm sorry. Mr. Jones, your name -- not only are you not Chris Blankenship, you're not anybody at the moment. I'll fix that.

MR. JONES: Okay. We'd like to give our express appreciation to Rick Pate, Commissioner of Ag and Industries, for allowing us to use this facility today. And, Mr. Pate, I think you would like to say something to us?

COMMISSIONER PATE: Yeah. I just wanted to welcome y'all here. We're excited to have you. Obviously, it's not my building. This is a State building, and lots of other State Agencies use this

building, the state troopers, the

Department of Education. And so we're

certainly glad to have y'all here. Of

course, I guess you know, the restrooms

are right there. If we can help you in

any way, just let us know.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I did pass out these -- I do feel like I need to take a minute at least and tell y'all a little bit about what we do. But if you look at these eight things along the wall here, the six, the three in the back, these are our six divisions, and hardly anybody knows what we do. Everybody's seen the sticker on the gas pump, but we actually sponsor everything that's weighed and measured that goes into We've got all the EPA commerce. responsibilities for pest management, food safety. We do that for FDA in the state And I'm proud to say even of Alabama. during COVID, I would contend that your food was probably safer than it's ever been, and we've got the safest food supply in the history of mankind.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But anyway, we're thrilled to have y'all here. I would say Ag & Industries -- people are excited when we get a new car plant -- Toyota Mazda in Limestone County -- but our poultry industry and the timber industry in the state of Alabama is huge. I mean, you're talking about 85-, 90,000 jobs. Yeah, so we have the responsibility -- I tell people COVID would have never gotten out of Wuhan if it had been in a chicken, because the way we would have kept it in Wuhan is we would have depopulated every chicken that had it. And I know as humans, that's probably not an acceptable It would have never left control method. Wuhan if we had been on it and we'd have found those chickens right off the bat.

But anyway, we're thrilled to have you here. That information is in here.

Actually, this is a pretty valuable -it's got the emails and phone numbers of

all our key executive staff, and then if you get on back in there, it's got all our division directors, their phone numbers and emails. And a lot of people don't realize we run seven labs, and those lab directors and what they do is on the back. And actually, right here, your food and drug lab, that's actually a DEA-certified lab.

Y'all remember the China seeds
that were being sent out about a year ago?
We were the first state -- USDA was home
at the time, and we were the only state
that for a week or so -- Georgia ended up
coming in behind us -- but we were
collecting those seeds. We split them up.
If you go down to that end of the building
is our seed lab. We took half the sample,
germinated them to see what they were,
sent the other half over here to food and
drug lab, and then checked them for
toxicity to see if anything had been put
on it. But really, we were on the phone

with the FBI every day, because there was nobody else doing it but us. And then it was probably a month before USDA even went back to work. And maybe y'all all work for USDA, so I won't --

But anyway, we're thrilled to have you here. Raymond, if he gets to going a little long, it will give you something to read. And they'll pass those out. We'll try not to be disruptive. We're going to pass those out.

Thank y'all, Jack. Appreciate you, David.

MR. JONES: Thank you, Commissioner Pate.

Also, I'd like to recognize

Representative Tracy Estes here. I think
you're going to speak to us here in a few
minutes. But I want to thank you for your
service to our state.

We will now enter into the public comment phase. I'll remind the speakers that you have about three minutes, and one

of the staff members will be keeping time on that. I will try -- me or the staff will try to let the other Board members know what tab and page we are talking about so we can go from there. So with that, we'll begin the public comment period. And Representative Estes is here to talk about the Natural Bridge Park. That's Tab 4-B, page 19.

Mr. Estes, if you will, give us a minute to turn to that section.

Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE ESTES: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. Appreciate the time, Board

members, for allowing me to speak today.

This is a project -- Raymond and I were talking before the meeting shortly -- but most of you are already well aware, it's in Winston County, which that part of Winston County is in my district. It is the largest natural bridge east of the Rocky Mountains, a 147-acre plot that I would implore of this Board to consider if

we could get our hands on that. I'm

certainly not opposed to it retaining -
or being retained by private ownership.

It's been in a family for a few

generations now. But we do have a natural

wonder right here in Alabama.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

As I noted, it's the largest natural bridge east of the Rocky Mountain And we have numerous, numerous chain. school children that visit that site on an annual basis. It's a wonderful thing to And I'm biased, yes, of course, because it's in my district. I just don't want -- if the Lord should tarry, I just don't want to look back in 15, 20, 30 years and people look back at me as the representative of note at that time had not done what I needed to do to meet with this Board and see if there were a way we could secure that for future generations because I honestly believe it would definitely be a loss should we not do something. So all I'm here to do today is

to keep the conversation going, ask you to continue to study the numbers, and to reach out to me at any time. My cellphone number is (205)468-0643. That's (205)468-0643.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I did have a chance to meet the Commissioner beforehand. Is Rick still in Well, good, I can say whatever I If you should not be interested, I want. think Rick's going to let me have some money out of Ag and -- I'm just kidding. I wish he would. I wish he'd let me have some money out of Ag & Industries to buy the property. But I do think it's something -- and I know you hear this from every group that comes before you, that whatever they're trying to get this group to work with them on is important. do have a natural treasure. And it's -it may work well if it shifts hands into another private owner, but we've seen things happen in our state and across the country in the past that we look back

after the fact and wish we had taken action so I would just encourage the Board to continue to study this property. If you have any questions, feel free to reach out to me. I would love to partner with you as a member of the State Legislature to see what we might could do to make this happen.

Any questions from anyone?

DR. SALOOM: I have one question.

Would you please talk a little bit about
the access to this property and whether
it's restricted now or not.

REPRESENTATIVE ESTES: No, sir, not to my knowledge. Now, I'll admit I'm not an expert on the property. It is located just — it's in a little community that's named after the bridge. It sits west of Double Springs, which is the county seat of Winston. It sits right on U.S. Highway 278, so access is — from a highway transportation standpoint is very easily accessible.

As far as access in and out of the park, you can still purchase tickets.

School groups can come in, you know, and tour that. I know people personally that have gone up numerous times and maybe take their grandkids and have a picnic lunch and do some things like that. It's not a facility, to my knowledge, that is greatly overrun.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

As far as daily attendance, if I'm being completely honest, I don't know what those numbers are. But at the same time, I think it is something as we draw more attention to that -- there's some -there's marketing ideas that we're throwing out there. And now with the completion of Interstate 22 -- as most of you know, we have the newest interstate in America running right through the heart of my district that links Birmingham to Memphis. And so there's now signage up on the interstate that's going to help, that the State Department of Transportation has

partnered with us. I want to commend them for working with us to do that. So I really believe the potential is there to see this grow exponentially. We've just got to make sure it's in the right hands to make sure that accessibility continues.

Yes, sir?

DR. POWERS: So I'm very familiar with it. My daughters love it. Even though we live in Mobile, I've brought them up numerous times when they were still young, and you're right, it's never that crowded.

REPRESENTATIVE ESTES: Yes, sir.

DR. POWERS: This question is more probably for Patti to chime in. I noticed it was right under the preserve, not the state park. When would Forever Wild in this process -- I'm still learning -- decide on the management plan? Would we reach out to State Parks and see if they could manage it? You know, just some background on what we would do next if it's the County that would manage it.

For every property that MS. MCCURDY: we have acquired, we look for a multiple use of -- the management, that's the philosophy, is what all can we appropriately do without negatively impacting a tract. So I think the difference here would be -- and certainly we would consult -- can consult further with State Parks, but what it would indicate is that the management would be Forever Wild's norm, which is not a staffed location there. It would be like many of our other publicly accessible locations that are not manned.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Now, the -- currently, if you go, as you know, they will have a skeletal staff there, have a gift shop, have some other things there. They have a little community center. We would really not be able to staff that and run that. You know, could there be partnership opportunities with the local government entity? Absolutely. But the short list

designation itself does not limit, once acquired, the type of activities or the divisions that could assist with those activities, but I don't want any confusion. I don't know at this time think that it would be a state park addition in the sense of a manned park,

DR. POWERS: That does. I was just wondering if, you know, State Parks was interested in it and it was -- I mean, since it didn't -- I'm assuming they are not --

staffed park, if that -- does that help?

MS. MCCURDY: Right, right. The property could be managed as are other tracts, again, open access to the public, but it would require the active management of other staff and it -- it just wouldn't operate like a state park.

DR. MCCLINTOCK: Is the building that you see in pictures of it on that property that would be acquired so there's a structure that would have to be managed

too?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. MCCURDY: There are actually two structures. There's one structure that I'm -- operates primarily as the intake and gift shop. They do have certain vendors that place items there that they sell. That's an average structure, one we normally, frankly, might not retain.

The other structure, though, is sort of a civic community area that has an apartment on the upper floor that had once been utilized by the current owners at times, you know, to have someone on the property, like a caretaker type of That structure is a nicer concept. structure that I'm not sure we would want to demolish, but at the same time, Forever Wild would not really be operating. So the continued use of that would require a partnership of some type with someone, the local government, the county, if they would be willing to, is one potential example. And we would have

to address, though, if that was not the case the expense of demolition of the structure or if we retained it what we would do with it. That one structure, the, what I call, community center structure, would require some more Board discussion as to what to do. It would not be an expense you would want to bear to tear down, but it's also an expense to run. So we would have to talk some more along that.

1.5

DR. MCCLINTOCK: Okay. Thank you.

DR. SALOOM: One other question, not to belabor all of this, but it's 149 plus or minus acres. The surrounding acreage is that hardwood, pine, or is it merchantable timber, or what's -- kind of management has been going on there?

REPRESENTATIVE ESTES: Yes. My understanding is is that's also under private ownership but it's a different -- all the acreage around the 149 acres in question is owned by other individual

private property owners, but I can't sit there and tell you I can break it down into four owners or five owners or anything like that.

And I do want to go back, if you'll allow me, to this gentleman's question here. I do have relationships with private contractors that should we be able to reach an agreement on something like this that I believe would help us. There's various ways they could do that to really lower the cost of any demolition involved, which might make it more feasible for this Board to consider such a purchase.

DR. MCCLINTOCK: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE ESTES: We'd be willing to help facilitate that process.

MS. MCCURDY: And, Dr. Saloom, in follow-up, I just want to -- I don't -- other than understanding there is private ownership around, I don't -- and the acreage listed is the acreage offered -- I

don't know the specific identity of the surrounding ownership, but this is all the acreage that would be included with that acquisition.

1.5

2.1

DR. SALOOM: So what about the 149 acres itself that the bridge is sitting on that we are -- you're proposing, is that merchantable timber? Is it being managed or what?

REPRESENTATIVE ESTES: Most of that property is timber. I cannot say if it's being managed. It is all owned by one private owner being the family, so there's not a process involved of having to facilitate and pull together five or six different property owners to make this happen. It would just be a discussion between this body and the one owner.

MR. JONES: Mr. Satterfield I think has a question.

MR. SATTERFIELD: Is this property still being commercially advertised for sale?

REPRESENTATIVE ESTES: Yes, sir. The Realtor from Haleyville, a lady by the name of Reba Hicks, she has been at meetings before. I had told her earlier when I have found out about today's meeting, I wanted to come and just continue to facilitate the conversation. And she let me know that she had had a family emergency and was not going to be able to come today, and I told her that I was still going to come.

1.5

But, yes, Ms. Reba Hicks out of
Haleyville -- I'll have to get the name of
her firm that is -- yes, they are still
commercially promoting the property. But
she has the same dream that I have, that
we would much rather go this route if it
were something feasible that the Board
could consider doing, because then we have
a much better idea of what the long-term
application for that property would be.

MR. JONES: Mr. Childers?

MR. CHILDERS: This acreage lies north

of 278?

REPRESENTATIVE ESTES: Yes, sir, it has frontage all along 278.

MR. CHILDERS: Where is the bridge physically located on this property?

REPRESENTATIVE ESTES: As you go in the main entrance, it would be back kind of -- I guess it would be northwest slightly of the main entrance.

MR. CHILDERS: So there's a road access to the bridge?

REPRESENTATIVE ESTES: Well, there's road access into the park, yes, and then it's just trails and things of that nature once you get in. Of course, that's part of the beauty of it as you -- it's not something you just want to drive up to and snap a picture and leave. The whole point is to --

MR. CHILDERS: It's got trails and all already in place?

REPRESENTATIVE ESTES: (Nods head.)

MR. CHILDERS: Thank you.

MR. JONES: Any other questions?
Yes?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

MR. HOLLOWAY: Representative Estes, do we know whether or not the County is -- wants to be a partner?

REPRESENTATIVE ESTES: I can have those discussions with the County Commission.

And you have two municipalities on either side, the cities of Haleyville and Double Springs. Natural Bridge is a really, really small community, operates on a very limited municipal budget. sure they would be willing to partner with us, but at the same time, it would -- if you could create a four-way partnership between the three municipal governments and the local county government, none would be asked to expend a large amount of money. And I'm assuming based on these conversations should you want to go that route, should we acquire the property, you're not looking at a major expense to

have it -- to have someone on property X number of hours per week. So it would -- you could do that, I would imagine, for a few thousand dollars per government entity to pool that money, but that's something as representative of that area, of course, I would be more than willing to partner with you to facilitate those discussions.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Thank you.

1.5

2.1

REPRESENTATIVE ESTES: Yes, sir.

DR. SALOOM: So since one of our objectives is multiple use and you alluded to something about a trail system, can you say anything about that trail system? Is it a hiking system? Is it maintained and who would we think -- we would -- I suppose DCNR would maintain that if we purchased that. And how far off Interstate 22 -- how far off of that interstate is it?

REPRESENTATIVE ESTES: I have never clocked that, but I want to sit here and quesstimate it's probably six or

seven miles. In other words, it's a feasible distance. It's not like you're asking folks to get off a major federal interstate and then hike it 78 miles to get there. No, sir. And, like I said, it sits directly on Highway 278, which, as you know, goes from Gadsden to Cullman, westward into Hamilton, and over into Mississippi.

MR. JONES: Patti?

1.5

2.1

MS. MCCURDY: As to the question on the trails, I think the current trail now -- and I have not -- I've been there, but I've not personally been through all of the trail. But staff that has been there, I know we have discussed the possibility of adding trail. I think the trail right now is primarily to get you a little more than this, but basically to and from the bridge feature. I mean, it's a little more than that. I don't mean it's that limited.

But, you know, we have had some

discussion as to whether we could add I do not remember now the distance or amount of trail we decided we thought And, yes, I based on terrain we could do. mean, it would be, you know, a decision this Board has to -- you know, the funding we would expend or not as to add trail or whether it would be a condition of acquisition that local -- another local entity agreed to maintain the trail. Ι mean, that's -- you know, that's the type of discretion you have in connection with the terms of an acquisition that you would be willing to make, but there would -- we would normally want to add some trail distance within this -- the property currently.

MR. JONES: Mr. Powers?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

DR. POWERS: So what is the kind of in between? I mean, I know we're not ready for motions and things like that until later on in the meeting, but is there something we could do short of going to an

appraisal where we have staff that work with the County to investigate those possibilities? Because my fear is if we acquire the property and being on the property and everything, if we just acquire it and let people have free reign, there'll be vandalism, there'll be a bunch of things that I think, in my opinion, we would be -- do a disservice by acquiring the property because it is fairly fragile, the bridge structure. But I could -- is there something in between we can do as a first step to have staff investigate with the Counties, ask the State Parks again if they're interested, things like that?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. MCCURDY: Sure, I would say a couple of things. I mean, obviously, staff within the Department across the divisions could have some additional discussion, you know, if the Board's interest is discussed today, then I think Representative Estes, you know, we can continue talking with him and he will -- I

think you can volunteer as far as a go-between or help us facilitate potential discussions with the local governments and test their interest. I mean, I do think right now we're talking about several -- several unknowns as to what -- a final proposal of how it would work and operate afterwards and how management would be. I think if the Board has expressed an interest, it's like any other property, staff can, you know, increase the interaction, continue follow-up and discussion. Representative Estes, I mean, that's -- he'd be willing to work --

1.3

1.5

REPRESENTATIVE ESTES: Anything I could do to facilitate it.

MR. JONES: Mr. Darnall?

MR. DARNALL: Yes. So thank you for all the comments. I think this Board has to look at it as a 149-acre tract by itself, and it's not our job to explore potential possibilities for commercial use, et cetera. I think if the

communities feel strongly that this land ought to stay on -- be owned by something like Forever Wild, I think it's kind of incumbent upon them to bring a proposal to I mean, Patti, unless you us to consider. tell me the staff has nothing to do, I mean, I assume exploring potential uses of a meeting facility or a gift shop is really not in the purview of what we're supposed to do. So I mean, I think all these ideas are good, but I think it's just incumbent upon the communities to bring forward a plan and a partnership as opposed to us speculating what may can be or may not can be, you know, and then obviously we could consider it at that time.

Thanks.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

DR. SALOOM: Yeah, I'd like to comment that if we owned the property, then we would have responsibility to protect the property, and I'm specifically thinking of that natural bridge structure, and I don't

know what the impact would be if we had people going out there taking souvenirs, rock climbing, doing some type of other things that might be destructive to that bridge for the long term. So I think it's important that we look at Dr. Powers' suggestions about that possibility for the future if we can consider that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. MCCURDY: And I would say I would not personally propose a continued operation, you know, of overly commercial of the gift shop. I mean, I do think that gets complex. It gets into revenue generated off the property, which goes to the general fund, not to the program or to whoever would be running it. Although, we could maybe look into that more, but I think I just need some, I guess, direction from the Board. I think it is -- and maybe it is that -- Representative Estes, if you discover there's interest from the local -- I keep saying local governments. I don't know what else to say -- but the

local governments in potentially partnering in some way, you maybe bring that to the Board, but I don't want to cut off -- again, we can always -- staff can always continue discussions, but I do want to understand the direction of the Board and if that's -- whether it's staff to investigate or whether, you know, Representative Estes, the Board would be asking if you would let us know if you could discern where there is any local government interest.

1.5

2.1

REPRESENTATIVE ESTES: I would.

MS. MCCURDY: And then we'll still have the considerations as to the protection of the structure and the concern of going from a manned attraction, so to speak, to what would be potentially an unmanned attraction if Forever Wild was to acquire it without a very defined agreement with the local governments. But I don't want to put words in any Board member's mouth, so I am looking to y'all.

MR. JONES: Dr. Powers?

DR. POWERS: So I agree with your comment, the onus should be on the local governments, the local groups, to not only can we look at this land but also have them propose a plan. And I know we've had several groups do this before, so I mean, I guess I'll take it back a little bit that I don't want the responsibility to be on the staff. I mean, clearly, if they — I mean, y'all can interact, but the onus should be on those communities to approach us with the plan.

DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: I'm sorry. I just had one more question, and that had to do with are there any other measures of protection for this bridge currently. It has no sort of federal or state protection?

MS. MCCURDY: And I'm not saying that there couldn't be eligibility for some type of additional -- I wouldn't begin to say I know of every state or federal

program, but I'm not currently aware of any, nor have we -- you know, we do, on behalf of the Board, try to pursue various grant or leveraging opportunities. We've not seen any grant opportunities, but I will say this is a little out of our norm for the grants we would normally pursue. So don't take that as there's not one.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Representative, I don't know if you're aware.

REPRESENTATIVE ESTES: I have no let me follow up, and I'll have a seat. Ι know there's other people here today that need to speak about issues of their own personal concern. I will facilitate a meeting. Like I said, I've got the county government, I've got four -- I think I said three. There's actually four municipalities immediately around the property, and I will reach out to my county commissioners and my mayors and we'll have a luncheon one day and gauge their interest in that. I think it will

be there because they know what we have.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Doctor, you made a very valid point about vandalism and things happening to the bridge, which would be totally counterproductive to what we're trying to achieve by doing this, so that's a very good point. That's something we have to be mindful of. So I just appreciate the Board's time. I will go home -- and I feel like I've got my homework assignment -- and I'll go get to work on that over the next several weeks, and I'll come back to you at some appropriate time and we'll discuss further, if that's okay with the Board.

MR. JONES: Absolutely. Thank you, Mr. Estes.

REPRESENTATIVE ESTES: Thank you for your time.

MR. JONES: Thank you.

Our next speaker will be Drew Nix.

This will be on the Hart Addition and the

Autauga WMA. That is Tab 4-B, page 3.

And, Mr. Nix, if you'll give everybody just a minute to find their place.

MR. NIX: Thank you. Drew Nix.

First off, I want to tell y'all that I appreciate everything that y'all do. I'm a lifetime member Wildlife

Management Area user, grew up hunting public land and still do the majority of my turkey hunting on public land here in Alabama and other states in the Southeast.

MR. SATTERFIELD: Sir, could you speak up. We can't hear you over here.

MR. NIX: Is that better?

MR. SATTERFIELD: That's better.

MR. NIX: Sorry about that,

Mr. Satterfield.

2.1

I'm here to talk today about the Hart-Autauga WMA Addition. It's there in the Central District. It's on the north end of what's commonly called the Joffre Tract in Autauga WMA. It's -- 81.63 acres roughly is the tax acreages on it. But it's been nominated and scored, and I

would appreciate y'all considering it for 1 2 a first appraisal. 3 MR. JONES: Anyone have any questions for Mr. Nix? 4 MR. NIX: Could I speak about one more 5 6 thing, sir? 7 MR. JONES: Absolutely. I also wanted to talk 8 MR. NIX: Yes. about the Hollins WMA Addition that y'all 9 10 have, that I think y'all could make a motion for a second appraisal and move to 11 close. That's another great tract. 12 would be Hollins Wildlife Management Area 1.3 in Clay County. 14 MS. MCCURDY: And that's Tab 3-B, 1.5 page 5. 16 Thank you, Patti. 17 MR. JONES: Any questions? 18 19 (No response.) MR. JONES: 20 Thank you, sir. 2.1 MR. NIX: Thank you. 22 MR. JONES: Our third and final speaker today will be Mitch Reid. This 23

will be on the Belcher Tract. And Mitch is with the Nature Conservancy. This will be in Tab 3 --

MS. MCCURDY: Page 6.

1.5

MR. JONES: -- page 6. Thank you.

MR. REID: Let me start -- well, I'm Mitch Reid. I'm the state director for the Nature Conservancy in Alabama. I know most all of you on this Board, and I want to say, first of all, thank you for everything y'all do for the state. I'm speaking officially, I guess, on the Belcher Tract, but I wanted to give a little bit of background to how I come into this conversation.

The Nature Conservancy is a worldwide organization. We work in 72 countries around the world, and our vision is a place where people and nature thrive together. And in my opinion, there's no more important place for the Nature Conservancy to work than in the state of Alabama because of our

biodiversity, because of our forests,
because of what we do, and really because
of what this Board does. So our forests,
freshwater coasts, I mean, it's all world
class and it's worth protecting.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The Nature Conservancy works at landscape scales, so we're working from the Mobile Bay all the way up in the Appalachian Mountains. We work in freshwater, we work in forests, and then obviously work the coasts. And my vision for the state is really a connected landscape of well-maintained land, well-managed lands that extends up that corridor, so you can come up the Alabama River, get up into the Piedmont, into the long leaf pines, then go all the way up into the Appalachian Mountains. And most of the work that we do is with private landowners, so this is not just, you know, what's the State doing for us or what is the federal government doing. Most of it is private landowners maintaining their

land.

1.5

2.1

Obviously one of the biggest challenges in building that kind of corridor is our urban space, right. And once you start building highways and subdivisions having a well-maintained long leaf pine forest is pretty darn tough. That's why I think Oak Mountain is a jewel in our system because that is an urban park in the middle of one of the most highly developed and fastest developing areas in the state, and it's well loved. I mean, so well loved by the people of Alabama.

Dr. McClintock I know, because he biked right through the middle of a prescribed fire we were doing last year to see -- you know, that was joint use going on at the time. And the Belcher Tract is, in my opinion, a once-in-a-lifetime legacy opportunity for maintaining a piece of that corridor from the Cahaba River over into the start of the Appalachian

Mountains that doesn't come around often, if ever, again. And I think it can be a legacy for this Board and can be a legacy for this state. I would just encourage you and applaud you for your interest in it. My encouragement is for a second appraisal and a move to close.

Thank you for your time.

MR. JONES: Anybody have any questions for Mitch?

DR. MCCLINTOCK: I would like to add that I have the good fortune of having Mitch take me out to show me the Belcher Tract and tour through it, and it is absolutely stunning. I mean, it really is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for us, I believe. So I'd just like to second what you're saying.

MR. REID: Thank you.

DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: I did have a question about additional funds. I felt like we had a discussion at some point that maybe there was going to be some

partnerships looked into or grants, and if there's any other information on that at this time.

1.5

MR. REID: I would turn that to staff.

MR. JONES: Patti, can you help?

MS. MCCURDY: And I apologize. I was reading something. So you're asking about the grant situation?

DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: Uh-huh.

MS. MCCURDY: We have -- and there is a -- in Tab 5-A of our grant status update, we did -- no, no. No problem. I just wanted the Board to -- if they had -- if they wanted to look, they could look.

I appreciate the question. We have now heard back that the forest legacy application at the Alabama Forestry

Commission, Board Member Rick Oates, had helped us with is not going to be funded.

The U.S. Forest Service has not -- I'm not sure they've listed -- announced what will be funded, but we have learned that we will not be funded. And so if the Board

were to proceed, it would be at the 1 Board's cost of the full acquisition 2 amount. And so that's -- you know, 3 sometimes -- sometimes we win; sometimes 4 5 we lose. But, now, it was a very good 6 tract. I think all were disappointed it did not receive funding, but there were 7 8 some other very good tracts in the southern -- the southeastern area of the 9 United States that did not receive funding 10 and so we were not -- we were not alone in 11 that. 12 Dr. Sims? MR. JONES: 13 SIMS: My question is, Patti --14 1.5

MS. MCCURDY: Speak into your microphone, if you will.

DR. SIMS: I see the statement that the State Parks Division was offering to partner with the organization for 33 acres. Can you speak to that?

MS. MCCURDY: Yes. The original --

DR. SALOOM: What was the question?

MS. MCCURDY: There was a question

23

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

about the offer from the State Parks

Division to acquire some of the original nomination acreage. And this nomination has been around for some time now, but the original nomination included -- if you'll look in -- at the map associated with -- in Tab 3-B, I believe, page 7, 6 or 7.

MR. JONES: 6.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

MS. MCCURDY: 6. If you'll look at that map, the acreage -- there's some northern and some southern acreage that State Parks Division offered to use its own funding to inquire to assist in reducing the overall burden of the acquisition, and they are still standing by that, that offer of partnership. there are any questions on that acreage, I'll let Greg Lien, who is the director of State Parks Division, answer that. bottom line, we would be able with State Parks funds and Forever Wild funds if you were to choose to purchase it with -encompass everything shown on the map.

MR. SATTERFIELD: I have a couple of follow-ups to that question. I'm wondering is that 33 acres that the State Parks Division says they want to inquire, is that included in the 1644 acres that's being offered to Forever Wild and/or does that affect the appraisal price that we have in front of us.

1.5

2.1

MS. MCCURDY: No. We did the appraisal for the Forever Wild acreage completely separate. And, in fact, it had to be handled through a very detailed federal process required by the Forest Service, and so a separate appraisal was obtained for the acreage to be acquired by State Parks.

MR. SATTERFIELD: So State Parks is not in the 1644 we're looking at?

MS. MCCURDY: The total acreage that is shown as a Forever Wild acquisition amount would not include the acres being acquired by State Parks.

MR. SATTERFIELD: It's a separate

transaction. 1 It would close at the 2 MS. MCCURDY: 3 same time, so it would be seamless for the landowner. But State Parks paid for their 4 appraisal and will be paying for their 5 6 acreage that's represented in the map. 7 MR. SATTERFIELD: And I intended to 8 hold this -- these questions until later, and I can do that if you'd rather. 9 10 MR. JONES: Yeah, let's do that for general discussions. 11 Any other questions? 12 (No response.) 13 JONES: Thank you, Mitch. 14 MR. REID: I sure appreciate it. 15 Thank you. 16 MR. JONES: Since we only had three 17 speakers today, is there anyone else in 18 the audience that wishes to speak on any 19 particular tract? 20 2.1 (No response.) 22 MR. JONES: Seeing none, we will begin to go -- move towards -- and recess 23

towards executive session.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

By regulation, appraisal values are confidential during periods of negotiation. Accordingly, in order to discuss tract appraisal values, the Board will need to go into recess for an executive session.

Is there a motion for the Board to recess to attend the executive session?

MR. DARNALL: So moved.

MR. JONES: Mr. Darnall.

Is there a second?

MR. HOLLOWAY: Second.

MR. JONES: As I call your name, answer either yea or nay to move to executive session.

Mickey Childers?

MR. CHILDERS: Yea

MR. JONES: Jack Darnall?

MR. DARNALL: Yea.

MR. JONES: Reginald Holloway?

MR. HOLLOWAY: Yea.

MR. JONES: Raymond Jones, yea.

1	Dr. James McClintock?
2	DR. MCCLINTOCK: Yea.
3	MR. JONES: Dr. Sean Powers?
4	DR. POWERS: Yea.
5	MR. JONES: Salem Saloom?
6	DR. SALOOM: Yea.
7	MR. JONES: William Satterfield?
8	MR. SATTERFIELD: Yes.
9	MR. JONES: Patricia Sims?
10	DR. SIMS: Yes.
11	MR. JONES: Dr. Tolley-Jordan?
12	DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: Yes.
13	MR. JONES: Dr. John Valentine?
14	DR. VALENTINE: Aye.
15	MR. JONES: David Wright?
16	MR. WRIGHT: Yea.
17	MR. JONES: All right. Well, then, we
18	will adjourn to for about 20 minutes to
19	executive session, and we'll be back in
20	here in about approximately 20 minutes.
21	MS. MCCURDY: The Board members,
22	please bring your packet and green folder.
23	MR. JONES: The time is 10:41.

(Recess from 10:41 a.m. to 11:03 a.m.)

MR. JONES: Okay. We will call the meeting back to order. The time is 11:03.

Now, for the Board members, we will go on to the program status reports. The financial data that we'll look over is -- Tab 2-A, B, and C of your green folder will be first.

Patti?

MS. MCCURDY: All right. One second.

Oh, just a note, we have a new court reporter with us today who is hanging in there beautifully, and she's done our Conservation Advisory Board meeting, so she's more than capable of handling — but I would just say everybody remember to introduce yourselves, even if you are staff, if you end up having to come to the microphone to answer a question if you would. If we get into back and forth questions, that may mean a prior speaker comes up. I would just ask the public

speakers to do the same. And I've told her she is in charge. And I'm a lawyer so I know that the court reporter is in charge, so she's going to speak up if we get to going — talking over each other or going too fast or whatever, because we sometimes forget.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

All right. For the benefit of the public, this is the portion of the meeting where -- and I'm sorry. I'm Patti McCurdy. After I told everybody -- I'm Patti McCurdy. I'm State Lands Director for the Department of Conservation. this is the portion of the meeting where I generally update both the Board and the public as to some financial information related to the program. And I would ask the Board to, you know, speak up if you have any questions. And then we'll also provide the public some information as to the status of some of the tracts that have been previously motioned by the Board, either for -- to proceed with purchase or

for first appraisal. So it serves as a general update, both financially and of tract status.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

So I'm going to start with running through the tracts that are currently in some stage of closing that the Board has instructed the staff to work toward to close, and those are as follows: Hill Option A Phase II, Butler County; Cedar Creek SOA Addition, Dallas County; Coldwater Mountain-Carroll Addition, Calhoun County; Coldwater Mountain-McVey Addition, Calhoun; and the Red Hills-Parris Trust Addition, Monroe County. Of those that I've mentioned is approximately a little over -- almost 2.3 million dollars worth of acquisitions that the staff is actively working on that you have asked us to close. I like to always mention that to remind you that that is money that's going to be deducted from the current balance that the fund is showing, which is just

over 27 million.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The unencumbered available -- I'm sorry. One moment. I think I may have an error. Y'all give me one second.

Okay. I'm sorry. Let me say -so the total of the properties that are in the -- some form of closing process is going to be approaching 7.5 million The total unencumbered available dollars. balance that you have to act on that's within your spending authority is about 19,790,000. And that, again, is the unencumbered balance when we have subtracted the properties that we're currently trying to close that would -are deducted from the approximately 27.2 almost -- 27.2 million balance showing for the account.

So I would like to give you one note. I have left the Parris Hills -- excuse me -- the Red Hills-Parris Trust Addition on your sheet and is part of what I figure in to get to your unencumbered

However, as we were approaching balance. closing, as the Board may recall, we ran into some questions as to the authority of the signatory on behalf of the landowner while we were working that out. been fully resolved. However, we discovered recently that the landowner has cut timber in the interim. Therefore, we're going to go back and do two things, obviously assess the condition of the tract and also we'll have to have the appraisal updated to reflect the timber harvest. So we are somewhat on hold on that tract while we do both of those We will return to the Board things. before proceeding to closing because of the substantial change in that nomination. But for purposes of cash management, I did leave it reflected here, again, just to try to help you evaluate your available spending amount.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So any questions from the Board as to any of those tracts that are in the

closing process?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

(No response.)

MS. MCCURDY: All right. I also -generally at this time, if you'll look at -- for the Board look at page 2 of Tab 2-A, I'd like to also just review on a fiscal year basis the tracts that have closed so far, so let me do that now. will also update as to tracts that will not be closing because we've had a declined offer. So the closed and declined are as follows: Cedar Creek SOA-Elm Bluff Addition has closed; Coldwater Mountain-Young Addition was declined; D'Olive Bay has closed; Joe Wheeler Park -- Joe Wheeler State Park-Page Branch Addition was declined; Little River State Forest Addition, closed; Mill Creek, declined; MTD-The Cutoff Tract, closed; Perdido WMA-McNeill Addition, closed; Thigpen Hill Option A Phase I, closed. So that's what we had actually closed or declined.

Any questions as to those tracts? Yes, Mr. Satterfield?

MR. SATTERFIELD: Patti, since we're closing in on the end of the fiscal year here on September 30th, we've got 1, 2, 3, 4 -- 5 properties that are in some stage of closing. Do you think you're going to achieve closure on all those so that those will be finished by the end of the fiscal year, or what is your projection on those?

1.3

MS. MCCURDY: I will double check with Jennifer. I don't know -- I don't know for sure that those all will close.

Again, I would totally discount -- I don't see Red Hills happening by then. Let me check with Jennifer as to the status of the others.

(A discussion was held off the Record.)

MS. MCCURDY: Obviously, nothing for sure. We don't have set closing dates.

Although, frankly, we normally do not set the closing dates until we're literally

requesting -- have everything we need and are requesting our check, so don't take that as any indication. The Thigpen Hill Option A Phase II and the Coldwater Mountain-McVey Addition are the two that are closest and possibly -- I mean, there's a chance, but I don't know that they will by September 30th.

We also, to further explain, run into another somewhat of a glitch as we get to the end of the fiscal year as the state accounting cutoff deadlines start coming into play and there will be a couple of months at the end of September where sometimes we are literally just not able to move the money. So it really shortens it to earlier in September to hit the fiscal year.

MR. SATTERFIELD: I realize that it's just a projection, but I was just curious as to where you saw us coming by the end of --

MS. MCCURDY: Those are the two closer

1.5

to close.

1.3

1.5

2.1

MR. SATTERFIELD: Thank you.

MS. MCCURDY: Additional questions?

(No response.)

MS. MCCURDY: All right. If you would now look at Tab 2-B. This is where we discussed the Stewardship Fund for the benefit of the public.

For every acquisition made by the Board, 15 percent of the acquisition value -- and even if it's a donation, 15 percent of the appraisal value -- excuse me if I said acquisition -- 15 percent of the appraisal value must be transferred into the Stewardship Fund. That fund is designed to provide for the long-term management -- land management needs of the -- all the Forever Wild holdings.

So the Board has authorized us for this fiscal year to expend up to 1.5 million as needed for those management activities. Through July 31st, we have

spent approximately \$750,000, so there's still ample obviously left of the fiscal year; although, there will be a lot of additional spending, both due to the time of year and both to -- in advance of the cutoffs for the fiscal year. So we're in good shape, but that value will decrease by our next meeting when we have our fiscal year numbers.

1.5

Looking at Tab 2-B and then also

2C as to the current market value of
proceeds of the Stewardship Fund that are
currently invested, market value as of
September 30th was just over 42 million.

Market value as of the end of June 30 as
of information provided by our State
Treasurer's office is about 48.2 million.

Our State Treasurer's office has been
working with the Commissioner to continue
providing us those quarterly updates. The
figures do lag a little bit behind our
meeting dates, but I wanted to present
that -- present those values to the Board.

Any questions as to the Stewardship Fund?

1.3

(No response.)

MS. MCCURDY: Okay. Mr. Chairman,
I'll move on into Tab 3 if there aren't
any questions.

MR. JONES: Absolutely.

MS. MCCURDY: So if the Board will look at Tab 3-A. Each meeting, similar to the status of tracts that are in closing, I like to update the Board and remind the public as to the status of various tracts that have been motioned by the Board for first appraisal or we have had appraisals provided for potential Board use, should the Board choose to adopt them, of appraisal. So we cover those during this section of the meeting.

So the current tracts which we have appraisals in hand for, D'Olive Bay Addition, Baldwin County. We did receive an appraisal for D'Olive Bay-Barn Hill Addition, also in Baldwin County, but

we're having to do some additional work with the appraiser on that one so it's not actually final. We do have in the appraisal for the Hollins WMA Addition 2020 -- that's Clay County -- and the Oak Mountain State Park-Belcher Lake Addition, Shelby County. We have -- the Board have -- we have received and the staff has reviewed appraisals acquired by DCNR for the Styx River Wetlands Tract. The appraisals that the Board has motioned on but we have not yet received are for the Bon Secour River Wetlands Addition, Baldwin County, and the Perdido WMA-Snowden Branch Addition, Baldwin County. No issues with those really. They just were not completed in time for this meeting. For example, we have a timber cruise that needs to be completed that always takes a little longer. We should have both of those by the November meeting. So those are the appraisals that we have available.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

The rough value of all those appraisals exceed, as always, your available unencumbered balance. But that's good. It's always good to have a great selection of tracts available to the Board. So that's a good problem, not a bad problem, but, you know, just thought I'd remind you of that.

So those are the usual status reports that we give as far as both financial condition and the appraised nominations.

The next report I would usually move into is grant status, but I want to pause to see if there's anything -- any questions.

Yes, sir, Mr. Holloway?

MR. HOLLOWAY: Mr. Chairman?

MR. JONES: Yes?

MR. HOLLOWAY: Reginald Holloway.

Reference the Oak Mountain State

Park-Belcher Lake Addition, are there any opportunities for grants and/or

partnership?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

MS. MCCURDY: And that's a great question, and we'll roll on into the grant status, if that's okay, Mr. Chairman.

MR. JONES: Yes.

MS. MCCURDY: So the Board would turn to the -- there will be some information in your Tab 5-A. And also for the benefit of the public, the Board in prior years instructs the staff to continue to keep an eye out and to try to pursue grant activities for any nominations that we I mean, the Board really -have. obviously would prefer to leverage their They've had an excellent track dollar. record in doing so. Sometimes it's through grant funds; sometimes it's just through various partnership offers that we receive in order to encourage the Board to pursue and complete an acquisition. what I want to -- I'll run through those, but let me start with Oak Mountain since we have had the question on that one.

The staff, we really have been unable to locate or identify what we consider to be a likely source of grant funding upon the loss of the -- and even before the application for the Forest Legacy funding, we looked at various grant opportunities, and we could not find one. We thought that the Forest Legacy Program provided the greatest opportunity, really considered the property to be the best fit for that grant program. So just being quite honest, we really don't have another idea of where to go for grant funds at this time. And I don't -- we've looked, so I don't think we're going to see another one on the horizon. So I do think that doesn't mean the Board has to move on this nomination by any means, but I really can't give you any encouragement that we're going to be able to come back with another idea that lessens the expense to the program.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. HOLLOWAY: Thank you.

MS. MCCURDY: So I'll run through just the various tracts and give an update. As you'll recall, the Cedar Creek SOA Addition is a tract that's in closing and is being closed with Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Funding that our Wildlife & Freshwater Fisheries Division, Chuck Sykes, their director, offered to partner with Forever Wild on that one. The MTD Cutoff Tract, which closed, we were able to close it between when you received your packet and this meeting, and it was supported by National Coastal Wetlands Conservation grant funding.

The D'Olive Bay Addition is another tract that is supported by funding -- to give you some -- again, the National Coastal Wetlands Conservation Grant Funding. That program for both the D'Olive Bay Addition and if we're able to get the appraisal tied down on the D'Olive Bay Barn Hill Addition, that grant would provide approximately 15 -- 52 percent of

tract funding. And that grant deadline is September 30th of 2020. We have --

MR. SATTERFIELD: 2022.

1.5

MS. MCCURDY: I've been moving -- just to tell y'all the truth, I've been moving my house. I am about brain dead, so I apologize.

Yes, September 30, 2022. Have no fear, we're not going backwards. We are trying to go forward. So for those -- and let me ask staff one more question. Hold on.

(A discussion was held off the Record.)

MS. MCCURDY: I wanted to double check myself on a date. But the next property, the Bon Secour River Wetlands Addition, that's -- all of these are, again, the National Coastal Wetlands Conservation Grant Program. We do not have the appraisal back on that property. It was motioned at the May meeting, but that's one of the ones I mentioned we do not have

back. We also do not have a grant announcement for that property yet. We're expecting the grant award announcements to be made hopefully in January.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The Styx River Wetlands Tract is the same grant program, and that is the property that DCNR has obtained and provided, if the Board chooses to use it for that tract. The Styx River Wetlands, the owner has also offered a \$100,000 value donation, meaning that they would not require to be paid for \$100,000 of the appraised value, basically a deduction off the appraised value on that one. That tract, the owners have also offered -- and I'll mention this again when we go through the short list nominations, but there's also an offer for the landowner of that tract to proceed under two different acreage configurations. So we'll talk about that when we get to the short list.

So those are the tracts that we currently either have an award on if the

Board would like to utilize it or that we are applying for funding -- hopefully funding for.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

One additional opportunity that I became aware of after mailing the packet -- and you'll see a tab. In Tab 5, I did include a memo for the Board on this, and it is Tab 5-J. But it relates to the Cahaba WMA-Falling Rock Addition, and we'll discuss this nomination. It's a short list nomination, so we'll discuss this as we roll into the short list. Chuck Sykes has offered to utilize Pittman-Robertson funding. That is a 75/25. It would require at least a 25 percent contribution by the Board. You're familiar with those -- those -- use of those funds for other tracts in the past, but Chuck mentioned that to me this week so that's another opportunity but it's not in your 5-A memo. But we'll talk more about Falling Rock when we get to the short list.

Any question on grant status?
Yes, sir, Dr. Powers?

DR. POWERS: So the D'Olive Bay
Addition, when it says the grant deadline
is September 30, 2022, does that mean that
we have to move for second appraisal
before that? Does that mean that you
actually submit the grant so you don't
know if they're going to give you the
money until that date, or that's the
deadline we have --

MS. MCCURDY: That is the --

DR. POWERS: -- to spend that money?

MS. MCCURDY: That would be the deadline to spend the money. So we would have to successfully be closed on that tract. So, for example, a motion to proceed with second appraisal and closing would need to be made in advance -- enough advance, you know, to provide time to acquire the appraisal and get it closed.

DR. POWERS: And ballpark, how much advance? Is that six months?

Nine months?

1.5

MS. MCCURDY: Let me think because I have to think in meeting occurrences.

So --

DR. POWERS: And that's what I'm trying to get at. I mean, do we have to do it this meeting? Can it wait until the next meeting or the following meeting?

MS. MCCURDY: I would say if we have a September 30th deadline to complete the closing, that a motion at the November meeting would be helpful if the Board -- not that you can't motion today, but I think November would be -- February might also. I think we could still get it done in February. It's just if we hit a glitch -- so, yeah, that would be -- I would say November would be still comfortable, February is doable, even later, but that would be if we don't hit a glitch.

Hold on one second.

(A discussion was held off

the Record.)

MS. MCCURDY: All right. I'm sorry.

I'd rather talk now than mess up later.

But that's -- any other questions on

grants or grant status?

1.5

2.1

(No response.)

MS. MCCURDY: Okay. Well, if you'll turn to Tab 4, what I'd like to do now is run through the tracts that have made it -- were nominated in time to be scored for this meeting, have made it through that evaluation process, and have made the Board's short list or the priority list as it's referred to in the constitutional amendment that formed the program.

So we evaluate tracts. Each tract that's nominated, if we get the willing seller letter returned, is evaluated in four categories. That's nature preserve, recreation, additions to or new or Wildlife Management Areas for SOAs, and state parks additions or could be a new state park. So you have those four

categories. So each nomination is scored in those four categories. The nominations compete with other nominations in the three districts, north, central, and southern districts. And so the properties have to hit a top three score in at least one category of those four in their district where they're competing to make the short list. Now, there are some properties that may score in all four categories. It just depends. But a tract must score in the top three of at least one of the four categories to make the short list.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

So what I wanted to run through now for the Board, if you'll look at Tab -- Tab 4-A is just a simple listing of the short list. Tab 4-B provides some maps and a brief description of each of those, and so that's what I'd like to walk through now. In effort to not make the meetings longer than usual, I tend to roll through them fairly quickly, but -- so if

you have a question or want me to stop and discuss anything, please just speak up.

Just let me know. I won't see you as I'm rolling through it.

1.5

The following tracts are currently on the short list and would be available to the Board potentially for a motion for first appraisal in its process: So we have the August WMA-Hart Addition, 80 acres in Autauga County; the Cahaba WMA-Falling Rock Addition. That's in Bibb and Shelby Counties. That's approximately 2,387 acres in those two counties. This nomination, we will --

Chuck is going to talk about -- I mentioned during the grant phase that

Chuck is offering PR assistance with this tract. When we finish the short list,

Chuck is going to talk a bit more with the Board regarding this tract because this tract has been presented by the landowner. The landowner-proposed nomination involves, not a fee simple acquisition,

but a recreational lease transaction for a ten-year period. And so this is something the Board -- this Board has not considered before. It is -- so it will be a little different. I realized it will involve some discussion, but I want to also have an opportunity for Chuck to speak, so we're going to shift that until we're done with the short list. But we are going to circle back to a full discussion on Falling Rock.

We have the Coldwater

Mountain-Robertson Addition, approximately
43 acres, Calhoun County; we have the

Cypress Creek Tract, approximately
74 acres in Lauderdale County; Freedom

Hills WMA-Boddie Addition, approximately
149 acres in Colbert County.

I will stop for just a second here. Those who were at the last Board meeting, you will recall we had a -Mr. Boddie was asking for an easement or a deeded access to his property in

connection with -- he was selling his property and had -- the mortgage company for the purchaser was requiring that.

That transaction fell through, but he has -- he, following the meeting, did nominate the property involved to

Forever Wild, so it is -- if it does sound familiar and look familiar, yes, you have seen it, but you've seen it in a different context. It's now been nominated, scored, and is available on the short list.

We have Lowndes WMA-Fuzzell
Addition, approximately 471 acres in
Lowndes County; Martin Slough Tract,
approximately 429 acres, Hale County;
Minamac Wildflower Bog, approximately
19 acres, Baldwin County; Natural Bridge
Park, approximately 149 acres in
Winston County; Oak Mountain State
Park-Odess Addition, approximately
81 acres in Shelby County.

I also will note on this one that -- and Director Lien obviously is

with us today -- but State Parks is currently working on an appraisal of that tract themselves, and we have been working some with State Parks on an assessment of the tract and some of the structures on the tract. But I think that it may -- I don't know if --

Greg, do you want to say anything further on that, or that's -- is that the status, the appraisal's underway?

MR. LIEN: If there's any questions from the Board, I'd be happy to answer.

MS. MCCURDY: So Greg was saying if there's any questions, he'd be happy to answer, but that's the current status. I just wanted to mention that's a little —that's a little unique but that appraisal work and — is going on at the same time as the nomination. But just wanted to let you know.

The Perdido Headwaters-Brushy
Creek, approximately 408 acres in
Baldwin County; Saginaw Swamp,

approximately 160 acres, Shelby County;
Sedgefield Tract, approximately
6,000 acres in Dallas County; Sipsey River
Swamp-Brownville Addition, approximately
5,348 acres in both Tuscaloosa and Fayette
Counties.

1.5

2.1

I will note on that one for the Board as you would notice from the map, the nomination has several separated portions, several separated tracts. My staff and Chuck's staff are currently working on valuating those tracts and would have some additional information for the Board probably at the next meeting on the opportunities on the individual tracts or all of them. We realize that's a unique shape to that nomination, but we are looking into that one. But it did score well because of the waterfowl opportunities that it provides.

We have the Styx River Wetlands, and this, again, is in Baldwin County.

And this one, as I mentioned, the

landowner has offered two different configurations, one that would be approximately 157 acres and includes a north section and then two southern portions that are -- or southern portions separated by some acreage of -- in the middle or just the acreage, the northern most acreage. The landowner is presenting either two configurations to the Board. We have looked and scored -- looked at the proposed amended nomination that's been It did continue to score and offered. remains on the short list. We also believe that the remaining wetlands on the acreage would still qualify for the grant award we received; however, we would need to confirm that with the granting authority to know for sure. But I would tell the Board that both nominations, you know, are short list as scoring and -- but the landowner's open to either possibility.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

The Walls of Jericho-Woodall

Addition, approximately 91 acres in
Jackson County. And the abbreviation WBR,
that stands for Weeks Bay Reserve. So
WBR-Marney Addition, 14 acres in
Baldwin County. And the Weeks Bay
Reserve, as it's referenced there, refers
to the Weeks Bay National Estuarine
Research Reserve, and that is a facility
that is run by my State Lands Division in
a partnership with NOAA. It is a program
that is supported by NOAA but matched by
State funding.

All right. Those are the short list nominations. And Chuck is going to come up in just a second, but before we go to the Falling Rock Addition nomination, questions on others?

(No response.)

MS. MCCURDY: Okay. Well, then, I'm going to let Chuck come up, and he will be talking about two things sort of at the same time. I mean, I'm sure he will reiterate his offer of assistance on

Falling Rock, but I think he also wanted to give some context and background to the Board as to why, you know, that -- a lease type of nomination like that did score highly in a WMA category and is something being supported by that division.

So, Chuck, I'll let you come up.

MR. SYKES: Most of you know, but for the court reporter, I am Chuck Sykes, Director of Wildlife & Freshwater Fisheries. And Patti covered most of this pretty in depthly.

I know in your packet there was a memo sent that referenced a resolution back in 2011 that placed leases as low priority. I don't disagree with that.

When I started in 2012, leases
were a low priority. But we can't look
away from the fact that in the past decade
we've lost over 95,000 acres in these
industrial leases. The way Wildlife &
Freshwater Fisheries had conducted these
leases in the past was with private

landowners, with families that wanted their property utilized by the public. So we would use in-kind services. No money changed hands. We would have stuff there and we would maintain the property. Well, a lot of these properties have exchanged hands. They're in RETs and TMOs now who have a fiduciary responsibility to their shareholders, and we understand that. So our mindset has changed a little bit.

Cahaba is a very well-used WMA.

We lose property just about every year,
little pieces here and there. When the
landowner came to us with this
opportunity, it was for ten years where
nothing would be lost. If they sell the
property, the lease goes with it. So it's
not in perpetuity, but at least we know we
would have a ten-year span where we would
be able to maintain that hunting. And we
would be willing to partner with a 75/25
just like on the fee simple acquisitions.

MR. JONES: Any questions for

Mr. Sykes? 1 Mr. Satterfield? 2 3 MR. SATTERFIELD: Chuck, there's indication this is a corporate landowner, 4 right, and they own and are currently 5 6 managing all these properties, or is your department managing these as a WMA? 7 8 MR. SYKES: Hancock Timber Company is the one that manages this tract. 9 We have different RETs and different WMAs all over 10 Hancock just happens to be the 11 the state. one that came to us. They're managing the 12 property. We just manage the hunting. 13 Wе have the hunting rights on it. 14 manage the timber. They do everything. 15 MR. SATTERFIELD: But they don't own 16 it? 17 SYKES: Yes, yes. 18 MR. 19 MR. SATTERFIELD: They own it? MR. SYKES: Yes. 20 21 MR. SATTERFIELD: They're owning and

MR. SYKES: Yes.

managing?

22

1 2

MR. SATTERFIELD: Is there some -- is there some threat that they've come to you with this lease right now -- opportunity right now? What's the triggering event for them coming to you with this offer?

MR. SYKES: Each one of these TMOs and RETs have different properties that they manage, that they control, that basically mature and it starts rolling over. So in order to keep us from losing property by degrees each year, they wanted to lock in this specific footprint for a ten-year period. That — that's it. So to answer your question, yeah, I could see us losing it in the next couple years if this piece of property matures and rolls off of their books.

MR. SATTERFIELD: And, Patti, I think you said this would be a new precedent for Forever Wild to do a lease as opposed to a purchase. Did I hear you correctly say that?

MS. MCCURDY: When I say precedent, we

currently have -- in Tab 5-J in your packet -- I apologize to the Board, but the information you're provided -- we currently have two recreational -- longterm recreational leases. The lease -- it says, the long-term recreational lease associated with Cahaba was closed in 2009. I believe it was a 94-year term. Board has done -- back in that time frame did two long-term recreational leases, this one in 2009 and this one for -- I say this one, the past example I'm talking about was 94 years. The Board has not since then done another long-term recreational lease or a lease of any type. And no one on this Board, I don't believe, would have been on the Board in '09. We've had some repeat Board members, but I don't believe anybody here would have seen We have not done anything other than those two long-term recreational leases, so the precedent would be new for this Board and it's a shorter term

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

ten-year lease. So those would be the new characteristics for this. We would also with the PR funds have to work through the splitting of the acreage and what that would look like. We would have the same 75/25. There would be two leases, one with Forever Wild and one with Wildlife and the landowner. So -- but when I say precedent, this Board has done less than a fee acquisition in the past two times.

1.5

MR. SATTERFIELD: So how would you go about appraising something like that, develop an appraisal price for a ten-year lease? Would it -- would the appraisal be based on the fact that it's -- would be used -- value assessed as a WMA, or value assessed as timber harvest or value assessed X, Y, Z? How do you go about developing price for a long-term lease?

MS. MCCURDY: So no appraiser -- let me say I never tell the appraisers how to appraise the property. But we would -- they would have a copy of the lease that

would be proposed, and it would be for 1 recreational opportunities on the property 2 so it would be the value of a recreational 3 The appraisers appraise those for 4 other parties similar to appraisals for a 5 6 hunting lease. You know, we do appraisals for hunting leases in my revenue 7 8 generating side of the world, not Forever Wild. So they're used to doing 9 those appraisals. 10 MR. SATTERFIELD: One last question. 11 Would it also require a deposit into the 12 Stewardship Fund? 13 MS. MCCURDY: I believe any 14 acquisition would require something. 1.5 Ι mean --16 MR. SATTERFIELD: That's the 17 difference between an acquisition and a 18 That's why I'm asking the 19 lease. question. 20 2.1 MS. MCCURDY: There is, and I don't --MR. SATTERFIELD: We may have to get a 22

I don't --

legal opinion on that.

23

MS. MCCURDY: And we absolutely --

MR. SATTERFIELD: I don't expect an opinion today.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

And we absolutely would. MS. MCCURDY: We're just pretty far ahead. I mean, that's on down the road. But absolutely, we would have to dig back into -- if the Board wants to proceed, there are a couple of things that we would have to do dig further into in pretty significant detail. Due to the passage of time -- although we have done it before -- it will require us to do a pretty deep dive back into the Amendment 543 to be sure that we're doing, not just stewardship, but that we're doing everything correctly. I've seen no impediment to doing this in the amendment, but that's different than getting it across the finish line in the precise manner we get it across the finish line. That's one.

Second, although appraisers do this all the time, it has been -- and they

do it for -- do hunting lease appraisals for us in the State Lands Division side of the house -- it's going to involve us being sure we're getting our appraisers the correct information. We're also going to have to go the extra step of how would we split the two leases. And, for example --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I'm not going to lie. I mean, obviously, it's easier to do when I've got, you know, a tract that's like this sheet of paper and I can squiggle my line along a road or along something and it's all together. But it may be that there's certain of these segments that are grouped together. It may not be exactly a 75/25 You know, I don't know. This is -- but these are some things we can I think that Chuck wanted to work on. present to the Board his view of the need to consider this type of a transaction as a new -- as I would say, a new tool in the toolbox through his concern as to loss of

acreage from the WMA system.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

Again, to be clear, for the Board members who may not be as familiar, you know, Wildlife manages certain acreage that is -- the ground is owned by, you know, private -- whether it's individual landowners or private corporate entities, just as Chuck was speaking of here. they allow -- almost like an in-kind services arrangement allow our Wildlife Division to manage their properties for hunting and allow them to be opened to the public while they still retain the dirt ownership. So this owner -- and, Chuck, step in if I say something wrong. current owner, though, is -- due to business considerations, there is certainly the possibility that they're going to have to remove acreage you see nominated -- right?

MS. MCCURDY: Yes.

MS. MCCURDY: -- from that program that Wildlife runs. So they have, though,

come to Chuck offering the opportunity for it to be leased by Forever Wild so that it could retain -- be retained for public usage. So that's -- that's a situation we have.

Dr. Tolley-Jordan?

DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: I just had a question about will there be a break in services at some point. So if they know that you're pursuing this opportunity and it's going to take some time, will they wait for you to achieve that before cutting off the arrangement?

MR. SYKES: We just renewed our lease with them for this year, so we've got this year.

And, Mr. Satterfield, we -- each year, Doug gets an appraisal on all of these type properties that we're managing that we don't own, so we have already what the hunting lease appraises for. We do that every five years for our federal paperwork. And unlike where we have

bought property together and we're buying one tract of land, what -- we have to do independent appraisals because one tract that we buy, the portion that we buy may appraise for 3500 an acre. What Forever Wild is paying for may appraise for 2500 an acre. So we have to do that. With this, they're lumping it together. just say it's \$8 an acre for the 2400 It's not going to have to be split apart where what we lease is \$12.50 an acre, what Forever Wild leases is \$4 an acre. It's across the Board. So I think the -- getting that done is going to be a lot simpler.

MR. SATTERFIELD: And you can you use Pittman Robinson funds --

MR. SYKES: Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

MR. SATTERFIELD: -- for a lease as
opposed to a purchase?

MR. SYKES: Absolutely.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Mr. Chairman?

MR. JONES: Yes, Mr. Holloway?

MR. HOLLOWAY: What is your long-term plan for the property? Do you have a long-term plan?

MR. SYKES: For us, long term is ten years. We're locking it in for ten years because we lose these -- again, 95,000 acres have been pulled out over the past decade. Even despite the fact that Forever Wild has been very aggressive working with us and working with other partners to try to keep the field level, we're still losing little bits be degrees, and I'm just trying to stop the bleeding on the WMAs. And this is a way that it's not costing us a lot of money, but yet, we're locking it in for ten years.

MR. JONES: Dr. Saloom, you had a question?

DR. SALOOM: I would assume that the appraisal on that lease would be consistent with what we're paying on the other lease, the adjacent properties, since there's a significant amount of

Forever Wild acreage recreation leases already happening now. So --

MR. SYKES: I'll let Patti speak to that, but that was done a long time ago.

DR. SALOOM: Yeah. But if so -- that depends on what the appraisal's going to be. But if so, is that -- would that new lease be -- would it be locked in per -- as a -- for five years or ten years for the same amount or lease per acre?

MS. MCCURDY: Let me answer one thing. Then I need to ask Chuck something. The recreational leases, the ones we did — the program did previously was an upfront payment for the long-term lease, and so it was appraised with the lease conditions known to the appraiser and appraised — and appraised in a onetime installment, not a traditional — as you may think of a lease like annual payment. You know, that could be — that, again, bears some discussion with our appraisers, but that's a potential concept here, whether it's

annual or some form of a transaction like that where it's, you know, maybe a single payment.

1.5

2.1

But let me ask Chuck one thing.

(A discussion was held off the Record.)

MS. MCCURDY: We may have some details to work out on how the lease would work.

I think the -- but anyway, the main thing I think Chuck wanted to emphasize was although a unique transaction, why it did score high or why it is something that he is mentioning to the Board now and not just on this tract, but as a potential for future -- maybe not always with PR fund support but as a potential regular transaction we might see.

So additional questions?

MR. JONES: Mr. Childers?

MR. CHILDERS: In looking at the map, there's about ten or 12 of these parcels scattered all around this Wildlife
Management Area. Are you currently paying

a lease for the Wildlife Management Area 1 2 hunting grounds? 3 MR. SYKES: On this portion, it's an in-kind lease. We provide services, we do 4 5 road maintenance, we do upkeep. No money 6 is changing hands. 7 MR. CHILDERS: What about hunting? 8 MR. SYKES: Yes, we manage the hunting on all of those. 9 MR. CHILDERS: On the Wildlife 10 Management Area? 11 MR. SYKES: Yes, sir. 12 MR. CHILDERS: So this would just tie 13 right into that? 14 MR. SYKES: Yes. We're trying to keep 1.5 it from being pulled away. 16 MR. JONES: You got any other 17 questions? 18 19 MR. CHILDERS: No, that's fine. If you will look at the 20 MS. MCCURDY: 21 map, everything you see hatched is what Chuck's group is managing as a WMA. 22 23 just that some of the underlying acreage

is Forever Wild acreage subject to that 2009 long-term lease. Some of the other acreage that doesn't have the yellow or orange-ish yellow behind it is part of that voluntary program that Chuck was describing where the private entities allow them to manage acreage — manage it for hunting purposes. And so what you see in red are the tracts that comprise together the nomination from the landowner that would be subject of the lease. Hold on.

MR. SYKES: Just to make it clear, this is in the WMA now. We've been managing it for years. We're just trying to keep it from being pulled out in the future.

MR. CHILDERS: So the acreage we're talking about is already in the WMA?

MR. SYKES: It's already in the WMA. We're already managing it. The public is already used to hunting it.

MR. CHILDERS: You just don't want to

lose the lease on it?

MR. SYKES: Yes, sir.

MS. MCCURDY: The landowner has gone from voluntarily allowing them to have -- provide that public hunting to wanting a structured lease and to be compensated for that value of the recreational opportunity.

MR. JONES: Dr. Powers, I think you had a question?

DR. POWERS: Yeah, I've just got a couple quick ones. Chuck, so why -- what's so special about these little blocks? I mean, the big area, y'all are doing it as in kind and getting to use it. Why specifically are these little blocks being offered as they actually want some cash?

MR. SYKES: This is a conglomeration of a bunch of different TMOs and RETs.

This just happens to be the piece that this group has are all of these little blocks. So honestly, there's nothing that

special about it, other than it would make it very difficult boundary marking, access, if we start losing these little pieces around the bigger blocks.

DR. POWERS: And these next two questions get more into your business than ours, so if you don't want to answer them, that's fine. Are you worried that if you make this arrangement, then the other property owners are going to say why don't we get cash?

MR. SYKES: Sure they are. Yeah, they are.

DR. POWERS: And do you have an arrangement with -- I know not using grant funds, but do you lease for cash anyplace else?

MR. SYKES: No, sir. This is something that we're having to rethink our model. That's why this -- why we've come to you with this opportunity. We have never done it in the past. It's always been in-kind services, but that's not

working anymore. Times have changed. 1 2 DR. POWERS: So you think that -- I 3 mean your division will have to start considering this kind? 4 MR. SYKES: Yes, sir. 5 MR. JONES: Mr. Satterfield? 6 7 MR. SATTERFIELD: Dr. Powers asked my 8 question. MR. JONES: Any remaining questions? 9 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I have one 10 question. 11 MS. MCCURDY: Speak into the 12 microphone, Mr. Wright. 13 MR. WRIGHT: On the north end, there 14 is no slashes through the -- this part. 15 Is that some special area on the north end 16 17 up there? MS. MCCURDY: What it would represent 18 on our map -- and unless, again, we've got 19 a mapping error. I'm looking at staff --20 21 it's just not being managed for hunting. MR. WRIGHT: It's that little area --22 23 MS. MCCURDY: Yes, I see the -- I

Right -- let me walk over to 1 Mr. Wright and I'll be sure to point it 2 3 out to the Board to be sure we're talking about the same thing. One second. 4 5 MR. SYKES: What Doug said was they 6 may -- those that's unhatched may be properties that are coming out of the 7 8 lease right now, that has been in the WMA but may be coming out. 9 10 MS. MCCURDY: And for the Board's purposes, I'm speaking to the two orange 11 upper left corner that aren't hatched. 12 MR. JONES: Any other questions? 13 (No response.) 14 MR. JONES: Okay. Are you ready to 1.5 move on --16 MS. MCCURDY: I think so. If there's 17 no more questions, I think we're ready to 18 move to general discussion. 19 Okay. We'll now move --20 MR. JONES: 21 shift into general discussions, and I think Mr. Darnall is up first. 22

MR. DARNALL: Yeah, so my name is Jack

23

And for the Oak Mountain State Darnall. 1 Park-Belcher Lake Addition, I would like 2 to make a motion that we go into second 3 appraisal and closed to purchase. 4 (Multiple Board members 5 seconded.) 6 MR. JONES: Hold on. We have 7 Okay. 8 first a motion for the Belcher property to move into second appraisal. And I heard 9 about 16 seconds, so who is going to do 10 that? 11 I'll do it. DR. MCCLINTOCK: 12 MR. JONES: Dr. McClintock will be our 13 second. 14 Thank you. 1.5 Any discussion? 16 Mr. Chairman? MR. SATTERFIELD: 17 MR. JONES: Yes? 18 MR. SATTERFIELD: I have a question or 19 20 two just to be sure we're getting these 21 questions on the Record, because I'm not sure I've heard the answer in the previous 22

discussions of this project, which I'm

23

much in favor of, but I want to be sure that we are on the Record knowing how it's going to be used. And that is who is going to manage and maintain this property. Is it going to be the State Parks Division? And if so, how is that going to be set up between Forever Wild and State Parks for the future operation of this property?

1.5

MS. MCCURDY: State Parks will be managing -- Director Lien come on up, because I know this will be -- I'm going to defer to you in a second here. Why don't you just -- why don't you explain -- you go ahead and talk about how you will manage it, also discuss the two parcels that you would be partnering with the program on and just give a big picture, and then I'll connect back with Forever Wild.

MR. LIEN: Yes, sir. So this property would be managed as an addition to the state park just as many other Forever Wild

acquisitions that are adjacent to our state parks are managed by the State Parks staff. And that's laid out in those individual management plans, which you review and approve each year for new properties. So this would follow that same process.

MR. SATTERFIELD: And so you would have maintenance and operations funding the State Parks budget to operate this property. It would not have to come out of Forever Wild Stewardship Funds?

MR. LIEN: No, we would still rely on Forever Wild Stewardship Funds for the same type of activities that would take place there. No different than what Chuck does on the WMA and what we do already on other Forever Wild acquisitions that are adjacent to our state parks. That might be a parking lot, gravel for a parking lot, or it might be, you know, some other material needed that facilitates the public's ability to use that property.

MR. SATTERFIELD: But as far as improvements on the property -- for example, I know the roads on that property to be able to be utilized as a state park for the public, they're going to have to be dramatically improved. So who's going to pay for those improvements?

1.5

2.1

MR. LIEN: So if the road needs to be graded and our staff goes out there and grades it, then there might be fuel that's charged against the stewardship account to do that work, again, similar to what you see on WMAs. If there's gravel that needs to be bought to gravel the road, that money would come out of the stewardship account if that was needed. And, again, I'm speaking to the Forever Wild portions of the property.

MR. SATTERFIELD: Well, I'm thinking
about -- I've been on that property.

MR. LIEN: Yes, sir.

MR. SATTERFIELD: I know

Dr. McClintock has. And it seems to me in

order to make it usable to the public in a similar fashion as Oak Mountain State Park is done now, it's going to require some significant improvements in terms of blacktopping of roads and other things so that the public can utilize that property safely. And I'm just wondering what kind of -- where's the shift of responsibility going to take place in making those decisions?

1.5

MS. MCCURDY: Let me try to -- let me throw this in. Management of all the properties and the Stewardship Funds that are available does require a prioritization and a management of the available stewardship funding with the needs of the properties. And we always look first to the -- what I call the hard land management, you know, costs first. So, for example, there may be things on the property that are -- and not every property comes out of the gate fully, optimally improved and developed. It's a

progressive process. Now --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So Oak Mountain or a need at Oak Mountain would be factored into that prioritization and analysis that our staffs have to work together on all the properties, and it's not going to be -- I mean, to be honest, it's not going to be every dime that State Parks probably ultimately wants to spend on that property, and there's going to have to be, you know, quite -- I'm sure State Parks funding just as on what Wildlife does and some things they want done sometimes, you know, comes from their money. I mean, we -- so it's not -- Oak Mountain would not -- it would not be different from the other properties. So would there be needs that don't get met immediately the first year? Probably. Would there be needs that Greg doesn't want to wait on because we didn't have money one year that Parks steps in and fills? I'd imagine, you know, that's a possibility too.

but the acreage -- I mean, that's just how it is. I mean, the program can only do so much and do so much without a special allocation from Stewardship Fund from the Board. So I imagine we'd both work within that. But they'll not -- they'll be one just like all the other properties in that evaluation process.

MR. JONES: Any other discussion?

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman?

MR. JONES: Mr. Wright?

MR. WRIGHT: I would just like to say one thing about this. I think this is an opportunity for the Birmingham area. I mean, I'm all for it, but will this increase the public access like from 280 or the other side road to get into Oak Mountain Park?

MR. LIEN: Yes, sir. And, you know, the two pieces that the Parks -- State Parks system has offered to purchase, are on those two road adjacent corridors, 280 and, I believe, County Road 11. And both

of those parcels have residences on them, and that's, in part, why we have offered to buy them is that we know that the Forever Wild Board doesn't like to spend its money on improvements like houses, and we can use those structures for housing our staff to be caretakers of the property just as we do the other portions of the park. So those are indeed the opportunities that we see through this acquisition.

1.5

2.1

MR. WRIGHT: Will these two areas, though, be accessible to the general public to get into Oak Mountain State Park without having to drive all the way around?

MR. LIEN: Potentially, yes, sir. I think that the initial opportunities to the public will come through the construction of trails and additions to our existing trail system that we have in the park, which is extensive. And we have great capabilities of building trail and

relying on partners, both the county --Shelby County and above the -- the Birmingham Urban Mountain Peddlers Club that has built a lot of our mountain biking trails at Oak Mountain State Park. So to me, that's one of the greatest immediate opportunities through this acquisition is more trail and better trail for the public to utilize. And they don't necessarily need other access points to be able to benefit from that. They can come in the main gates that we already have in the park, jump on our trail, and ride into the new property. Those are the most immediate and best opportunities that will come through this potential acquisition. And then, you know, the opportunity to pave a road one day is certainly there, but we don't have any immediate plans to pave any roads on this property. There is a good extensive gravel road, but I don't know that that needs to be opened up to the public to be able to access the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

property immediately. And the same for the lakes back there. People that come to Oak Mountain State Park might want a remote lake that they have to ride a bike to or hike to rather than drive right up to. And so those are things that we would figure out over time and articulate in the management plan if the Board chooses to move forward with this.

MR. JONES: Dr. Sims?

1.5

DR. SIMS: Just a quick question. A statement that you made triggered a question for me, Patti. You mentioned that unless there is a -- the Board comes -- authorizes a special allocation from the Stewardship Fund if there were some priority needs, has that happened? Has there been occasions where --

MS. MCCURDY: No. No, there has not.

And what I meant, we have -- you know, the last few years, we have tried to work within the 1.5 million that you appropriate. The quirk in the amendment

forming -- the constitutional amendment forming the program is that we have to set that amount in advance. The fiscal year, you know, we talk about that when we do And so it is a possibility that the Board could designate whatever amount that they want to and could generally increase it or could increase it but designate that X amount is only to be spent either for a certain purpose or on a certain tract or could earmark it for that purpose. would have to be something decided on and sort of specifically addressed if it wasn't just a general increase at that time we do that each year. So that would -- I think normally we do it at the May meeting, and so -- but that's an option open to the Board.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

MR. HOLLOWAY: Mr. Chairman?

MR. JONES: Yes, Mr. Holloway?

MR. HOLLOWAY: Mr. Lien, where there is not an immediate access to the property for 280, that's not to say that down the

road there couldn't be, correct? 1 MR. LIEN: That is correct. 2 Yes, sir. MR. JONES: Any other discussion? 3 DR. MCCLINTOCK: I would just add that 4 in the quality of the roads that exist, I 5 6 drove my Prius into the far end of the property, so that would speak -- you know 7 8 how low those cars are. So it really is a pretty-good graded road right now, 9 certainly not blacktopped, but if it was 10 to be, I mean, it's in good condition to 11 go that direction down the road. 12 roads are, I thought, pretty decent for 13 dirt roads. 14 MR. JONES: Any other discussion? 1.5 (No response.) 16 MR. JONES: We have a motion. We have 17 a second for that. All those in favor, 18 state -- do we need to do a show of hands? 19 It wouldn't hurt. MS. MCCURDY: 20 We 21 can certainly do that. MR. JONES: All those in favor, aye? 22

Let the Record reflect that it's

23

unanimous, so the motion passes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Any other discussion -- general discussion by the Board?

(No response.)

MR. JONES: Okay. Seeing none, I guess we will move on to the next item of business, which is our miscellaneous reports. That's Tab 5.

MS. MCCURDY: If the Board will turn to Tab 5, we'll kind of be going through those more or less -- in order more or less. What we generally do, while you're getting to Tab 5, is -- the first thing I usually do each time is run through the report as to the nominations that, without additional Board action, will roll off either the short list or the appraised nomination list due to the number of meetings that have passed without any type of Board action or request by a Board member to keep them on the list. Without further action today or request by Board member, the following two nominations will

roll off the short list and will not appear at our next — will not have the opportunity to appear at our next meeting, and that's the Cypress Creek Tract in Lauderdale County and the Perdido Headwaters—Brushy Creek Tract in Baldwin County. So I'll just ask at this time if any Board member is opposed to those rolling off, just speak up now. If not, I'll move to the next item.

1.5

(No response.)

MS. MCCURDY: And that was Tab 5-B. I may not have announced that.

will find Tab 5-C. As you know, we -- for each tract that you acquire, staff prepares a management plan, which by law is to be adopted within a year of acquisition. We do bring these to the Board. We try to bring them to you a meeting ahead of when it would have to be adopted in case there are additional questions or considerations the Board

wants to bring forward.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

At this time for this meeting, we need to consider management plan approvals for the following tracts: Little River State Forest Addition, Escambia County. This management plan was adopted and coordinated between Wildlife & Freshwater Fisheries Division, State Lands Division, and also Alabama Forestry Commission. fact, if you'll recall, this is a tract that was supported by Forest Legacy Funds. I forget now exactly when it closed, but it was supported by those funds. We then also need to develop the management plan for Thigpen Hill. Now, I will say on Thigpen, you know, we have two phases. We have another phase that is currently closing, so this one will come back around fairly quickly but we wanted to keep within our requirements of the phase 1 and go ahead and address that tract.

So the proposed draft management plans were included in your Tab 5-C. I

will note that the Little River State Forest Addition, there is a forestry management plan that is being developed in association with the Forestry Commission. That is part of the Forest Legacy Program requirements. That is attached. believe it's the last exhibit, I believe Exhibit C; is that correct? I'm looking at Evan as I'm flipping. Yeah, Exhibit C. And I'll just note that that is still in draft, very much in draft, and will ultimately -- once finalized with the Forestry Commission will have to go -- the Forest Legacy Program will have to receive their approval, so that one may be a draft for a while.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

But with that, unless there are any questions as to either of the management plans, there is a motion proposed on memo 5-C that if there are no questions and you're ready to proceed to a motion, it's available.

MR. JONES: Any questions?

Yeah, I have one DR. SALOOM: 1 question. I may be mistaken and -- but it 2 3 appears that -- never mind. I've got -- I think I've got my -- it answered. 4 sorry. I was looking at the plan earlier, 5 and I just saw on there --6 MS. MCCURDY: I'm glad you asked. 7 MR. JONES: Dr. Jordan? 8 DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: So the Board 9 approves the State Lands Division 10 preceding development of a new management 11 plan for the Little River State Forest 12 Addition and Thigpen Hill Forever Wild 13 Tracts as set forth in the memorandum 14 dated August 5, 2021. 15 MR. JONES: So we have a motion. 16 Do we have a second? 17 MR. HOLLOWAY: Second. 18 MR. JONES: Okay. Mr. Holloway. 19 All those in -- any discussion? 20 2.1 (No response.) MR. JONES: All those in favor, aye? 22 (All Board members 23

indicated aye.)

Motion carries.

MR. JONES: Motion carries.

1.5

2.1

MS. MCCURDY: Ask if there are any opposed?

MR. JONES: Any opposed?

MR. JONES:

(No response.)

MS. MCCURDY: I didn't think I saw any, but I wanted to double check.

The next memo in your packet,

Tab 5-D, is an update of a status we have had at past meetings. Members of CRATA have presented to you seeking approval for different actions on the property, and I wanted to update the Board that we've previously been talking about both an outpost building on the tract as well as the construction really or restoration and building back of a fire tower that CRATA wanted to purchase and place on the Yates Lake WMA as both a fire tower, both sort of the historical connection to it and how we used to utilize those fire towers here

in the state, but also to provide a lookout opportunity over the Yates Lake WMA.

1.3

1.5

2.1

And so we at the Board's direction and with Board member David Wright's help have had ongoing discussions with CRATA working through their request. They have informed us that they are sort of putting on hold for now the outpost building and wanted to focus as a priority on the fire tower as well as some additional trail work that they would like to do on the property kind of over the next three years and presented to us a three-phase plan over the three years, installation of some additional trails.

So we had several meetings with CRATA and the Commissioner sat in with us on a couple -- on one of those meetings and worked through, again, that the fire tower and the development of a license agreement as we have discussed was their immediate priority at Yates.

legal section at DCNR developed a license agreement -- a draft agreement that was provided to the Board and also provided to CRATA. CRATA has -- CRATA has only had it really the same length of time as you've had it with the packet. CRATA wanted to be sure that its membership and its leadership had had ample opportunity to review the agreement and have identified possibly a few questions that may lead to a few revisions that they may request.

1.5

2.1

I do have Mr. Jimmy Lanier and some other officials with CRATA here today if the Board had any questions based upon your review of the agreement. One thing I wanted to do today was see if from the Board's review of the draft agreement — again, it's very much a draft and work in progress — to see if the Board had any questions or had any consideration that they would like addressed in the lease that was not currently reflected in this

draft, and so I mean, obviously you can call me but I wanted to bring that up, ask that specifically in the event it was a known question so that the Board could discuss it.

So does any Board member have something that they were concerned was left out or would prefer to operate differently as reflected in the current draft?

MR. JONES: Dr. Powers?

1.5

DR. POWERS: So just a question.

There's a performance bond and then there is the clause about removal of the structure. Are those two -- is that \$10,000 bond in the bond -- the idea is if they back out or abandon the structure, we could use that money to pay for its removal? I know they're responsible for its removal when the license is up, but I mean, do you feel -- and specifically, what are the protections we have if they just pull out and we want to remove the

structure, I mean, and obviously not have Forever Wild be paying for that?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. MCCURDY: Well, you have -- the bond could be used to complete the tower. Say you get partially into it and you do not get it all the way erected would be to help top it off, so to speak -- no pun intended -- and then CRATA is responsible for the -- would be -- under the current draft would be responsible for the expense of removal, if required. If they did not complete that removal as required an additional -- addition to actions that could be taken legally pursuant to the agreement in the bond, we'd word it It provides what we want it to however. provide, so it could also contribute to the removal. So it could go either -- it could go up or down, so to speak, either direction.

DR. POWERS: I guess my two questions was how did you get to the \$10,000 --

MS. MCCURDY: It is just a proposed

amount. It is unknown to have any real concept of the -- and let me say you're going to have cement footings poured that by no means we're going to be able to do that cement footings, but could you render it to a remove and/or save condition? I mean, no, it's still probably not that, but, you know, CRATA is the first line of responsibility if we were to require them to, you know, remove it.

DR. POWERS: But if they dissolve as -- then we have no one to sue or get money from or -- I assume they probably don't have assets anyway, so I --

MS. MCCURDY: Mr. Lanier would probably differ, but, no, you're exactly right. So, yes, there is a risk here and there's — to be quite honest, there's no particular magic to the 10,000 other than, you know, trying to identify an amount. That is an example. The Board can set whatever, you know, amount they would like as that requirement, but not knowing what

might happen, I don't know what the amount is but also trying not to set an amount that cannot be achieved by the organization. But that is up to this Board.

DR. POWERS: Yeah, I guess my

preference -- and, again, I don't know the

amount -- is to have an amount sufficient

to remove the structure if we need to.

MS. MCCURDY: Yeah. And that's just a very difficult thing for us, the cost, what it would take to remove, other than, again, the expectation that cement footings were coming up. I mean, that's certainly super expensive. So if the Board has a proposal or wants to discuss a particular amount...

MR. JONES: Mr. Darnall?

MR. DARNALL: Yeah, Jack Darnall again. A performance bond is simply that, they agree to perform whatever it takes to finish the work. When you set a dollar amount, you set the upper limit of what

they're willing to pay. So if that is a concern of yours, I would suggest that we just accept a performance bond, end of statement, and that bond is backed by a security, which is a listed company and, you know, of course, they're obligated to do whatever it takes if that's a concern of yours.

MS. MCCURDY: But I think the concern may be if the Board decides that they -- without CRATA's commitment to, you know, ongoing maintenance of the tower, but you may choose -- I presume, Dr. Powers, you may choose you'd just rather not have the tower on the property. I mean, you're talking if the -- if you wanted to remove it if you wanted to be sure in addition to being able to finish it out -- again, as I said, top it off -- that you could get it out.

MR. DARNALL: Well, I'm not a fire
tower expert but --

MS. MCCURDY: We're not either

unfortunately.

1.5

MR. DARNALL: -- 10,000 won't build it and 10,000 won't take it out. I mean, so a performance bond --

DR. SALOOM: And whether you do it by OSHA standards or not.

MR. DARNALL: Well, I would be willing to bet my Forever Wild Board salary that 10,000 won't cover it. But I mean, my point is a performance bond is a guarantee backed by a publicly traded insurance-type company to complete the work, and that's the safest way to take it. But I'll also suggest that we're talking about — it's kind of like car insurance, you know, you really don't ever need it. If you want to be protected, just ask for the performance bond. If not, you know, the dollar amount's worth something.

MS. MCCURDY: Correct. And that's the amount of the bond. The performance bond -- anyway, I see what you're saying. You're saying don't attach -- you're

saying just a performance bond without a dollar figure attached to it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. DARNALL: The way I read it, it's one or the other or the other. You know, it's a performance bond or a certified check.

MS. MCCURDY: I think there are different options and that we have gotten before a certain amount that we're -- that it's topped out. So, for example, the performance bond is -- it's topped out, but also -- letter of credit is another So it's difficult for some option. entities to get a bond, so we do allow a letter of credit. But I think the key here to me is if there's a certain dollar amount that the Board feels more comfortable with. But, again, can I or my staff give you what it would cost, I mean, I mean, frankly, if you really had to remove it, depending on what stage it happened, depending on whether you want it completed or get it out, it's an unknown.

It's a risk.

1.5

2.1

DR. POWERS: And I'm in favor of the idea. I don't want it to be prohibitive for them not to be able to do. I was just wondering if there was a way that \$10,000 figure came or if that was just what y'all thought that they could perform. But I will leave it up to the attorneys. But that was my concern, the actual dollar amount and how much to negotiate. I trust y'all.

MS. MCCURDY: And I think it's not really a lawyer concern. It's a risk tolerance concern of us not knowing what it would cost either way. And that figure is just a figure that we have used in some other scenarios and in light of CRATA's organization that that is a risk tolerance question for this Board.

MR. JONES: Mr. Satterfield?

MR. SATTERFIELD: My question is -- deals with practicality of accessing this property and getting in there to build

this tower. When I look at the Exhibit A that's attached to this proposed license agreement, there's -- part of what they're proposing to build this road is right now just a hiking trail, but the second half of this up and over into the top of that mountain is going to be a new road.

1.5

2.1

MS. MCCURDY: It's not -- I believe it's a trail that runs along a roadway.

MR. SATTERFIELD: Well, it looks like when you get to the bottom of the hiking trail, the access road is going to be a new road coming to the west and then back up to the north to access that site; is that correct?

MS. MCCURDY: Is it an -- it will require improvements, a portion -- and I'll get Evan Lawrence on my staff, he can give you better detail as to relation to the map. There is an existing trail road that was the last part that will require some improvements that CRATA has said that they will cover the cost of access

improvements necessary to get the trucks up there.

1.5

2.1

MR. SATTERFIELD: Well, I'd sort of defer to my friend Jack Darnall down here who knows more about road construction than I do, but it seems to me -- I don't know how much these tower pieces are going to weigh, but I suppose they're made out of steel. And they're also having to bring in concrete trucks --

MS. MCCURDY: Concrete trucks, yes.

MR. SATTERFIELD: -- to build the pad and other things. And you can't do that on a dirt trail. You're going to have to have a significantly --

MS. MCCURDY: Correct.

MR. SATTERFIELD: -- new built, improved major road in there that is going to get to that tower and that is going to be -- first of all, it requires some significant engineering, and secondly, it's going to require some significant expenditure of cost to build that road.

And I know everyone wants to be helpful with this project, as do I, but I also want to look at the practicalities of what we're getting into just in the construction of a road to build — to get in there and then maintaining that road on a permanent basis after that. This is not a simple project unless they're going to air lift the parts in by helicopter, which is another way of building fire towers that may actually end up being cheaper than building an access road. So I wonder —

1.5

2.1

MS. MCCURDY: Unless if we take it -MR. SATTERFIELD: -- if we really
looked at -- wait a minute. Wait a
minute -- I wonder if we've really looked
at all these options sufficiently to even
be at this stage in trying to negotiate.
We're looking at negotiating the details
of a license agreement without having
looked a little further down the road as
the practicalities of actually getting

this project done, how it's going to be engineered, and how much it's going to cost. And I would like to hear a lot more detail about all of those plans and how CRATA is going to accomplish all that so that that responsibility ultimately doesn't fall on Forever Wild to deal with a project that only gets half done.

That's where I'm coming from.

Thank you.

1.5

2.1

MS. MCCURDY: Right. And there is no question it's a complex project. So let's try to take it a little -- one -- a couple of pieces at a time of what we do know. And first to explain, I'll let Evan help you by looking on the map as to what the road structure is and the segment that staff is most concerned about needing improvements and improvements of a significant nature that we have discussed with CRATA and discussed on site and CRATA has said that they -- again, you don't have to accept that. I'll let Mr. Lanier

speak to that, but I'm trying to tell you what we've done so far. So let's first talk access road, and then let Evan help you where it would take over the part that staff is at least concerned about. And then Mr. Lanier, I will certainly not speak for him as to how much the tower weighs. He would know you. But I will let him speak to any concerns.

1.5

There is no question that this a significantly complex project that I too agree is going to involve significant cost, and there's significant cost that CRATA has more than represented that they will be covering, as necessary. But I do not disagree with your assessment of complexity or cost. But let's get an understanding of the roads first. Okay. So I'm going to let Evan —

Evan, tell them the type of roadway and try to help them on the map the point at which, you know, we were concerned of the cost and the need of

access due to the cement footings.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. LAWRENCE: So I'll see if I can describe to y'all a little bit -- so if y'all are looking at the map from where we have labeled parking area, if you will follow that around and you will see kind of where the road makes a sharp 90-degree turn and goes back to the north. the parking area to that point is relatively good road. And to give you an idea of what I mean by relatively good road, Alabama Power is currently working on their major transmission line that you can kind of see on the map there to the west, and they're taking in their big Now, I don't know what those trucks. trucks weigh, but we're taking their large, you know, triaxle vehicles in there. Now, it is, you know, pretty rough You know, they will probably on the road. fix it on the way out to some extent.

Yes, sir?

MR. SATTERFIELD: And that's what part

of the road? Is that the red part?

MR. LAWRENCE: The black dashed line

from the parking area.

MR. SATTERFIELD: But is that the black dashed line which is colored in red on --

MS. MCCURDY: Why don't you take a minute and -- but don't say anything so the Record's not missing anything, but kind of help the Board just walk by. And I'd ask the members to hold on just talking so the...

Hey, Evan, hold on a minute. If you're going to speak, that's okay, but speak up where the court reporter can hear you. So would y'all like to discuss? I mean, I'm trying to help the court reporter, so --

Evan, go ahead.

MR. LAWRENCE: Yeah. So just kind of leaving off there, from the parking area to that roughly 90-degree turn there, I don't think there's too much concern.

There will need to be some improvement, some rock put down for heavy trucks, but like I said, Alabama Power's currently taking their trucks through there with no improvements. Now, it is a little bit muddy with all the rain that we've had, but they're doing it.

1.5

From that 90-degree turn where the road turns back and goes pretty much north, that is where we are going to have to do some improvements to a woods road. That is an old logging road there. I'm not exactly sure when that hilltop was cut last, but that's obvious what that was is they were, you know, taking the timber out of there. It's grown back up a little bit, but the road is very visible there and would not require very much removal at all. There's very few trees along there. And, again, it's going to take some work, not unfeasible, can be done.

MR. SATTERFIELD: And what's the elevation there? Is that going back up

the mountain? Is that -- is this the low point down here where it turns that 90-degree? What's the elevation there? Is it coming up to the tower?

1.5

2.1

MR. LAWRENCE: It's pretty flat through there. There's a little bit of elevation change, but once you get to the 90-degree turn there, you're pretty on top of a hill so it kind of follows the ridge back.

MR. SATTERFIELD: You're on the ridge at that point?

MR. LAWRENCE: On the ridge.

MR. JONES: Yes, Mr. Childers?

MR. CHILDERS: Are we building roads?

Are we in the road building business,

Forever Wild?

MS. MCCURDY: It depends on the tract. And we have installed parking lots. We have built roads at Coldwater Mountain in the past because DOT was not able to do it and we have done it. We do -- we routinely have to replace gravel on

2

1

4

3

5

7

8

9

11

12 13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

various roads internally in a tract. But, no, we don't pave -- we don't have the general ability normally to pave and build roads, but, yes, we put a lot of gravel down and improve internal roads. We've done parking lots.

MR. CHILDERS: But with this acquisition, we're not obligated to build that road to that parking area, are we?

MS. MCCURDY: Well, actually, the road -- you mean to the tower? The tower won't have parking up there. It will be accessed publicly through a new hiking trail that will be coming up sort of the other side of the mountain. This access road is solely for construction purposes, and then, frankly, would be -- and later maintenance, but would be gated off after It is not leading up to a parking that. It is solely for construction and maintenance.

MR. CHILDERS: But it will be an obligation of Forever Wild to build that

road?

1.5

MS. MCCURDY: It's not an obligation of ours at all, and we're not proposing to cover that expense. CRATA has said whatever road improvements are necessary in order to get trucks or construction trucks, either with the tower or with cement or whatever, that they will cover the cost of those improvements to make them accessible for that purpose.

DR. VALENTINE: Patti, we have a naive question. Why can't they just draw a road from the parking lot directly to it instead of going all around the property?

MS. MCCURDY: The elevation from the parking lot -- the reason the road -- and I apologize. I didn't understand that question. The reason the road layout -- which we didn't build. We acquired the property with the road on it -- is that way is because of the elevation. If you go the straight line, you'll be going like that. So that's why. And it allows us to

work off of existing road to get to an elevation point where you could do the access improvements to get the tower up, but those are existing roadways.

1.5

2.1

MR. JONES: Any other discussion?

Dr. Saloom, did you have something?

DR. SALOOM: Yeah. What do you need from the Board to move this forward?

MS. MCCURDY: Well, there are a couple of different options, or more than a couple, I guess. One's if you want to do something affirmative and definitive today, it would have to be a motion in a form giving the -- you know, Commissioner Blankenship as the Chair working with staff the discretion to proceed with finalizing the license agreement. Again, all you have today is draft, so it would have to be the discretion to get to a final agreement. Or you could -- that would be, I think, the motion that would be -- a motion today would have to be the

motion because there are -- you do have a draft agreement, you have some unanswered questions. Although, you know, I too don't want to foreclose the opportunity. If you would like to ask anyone from CRATA a question, they're here today. But that would be -- if you wanted to do -- I don't think you can do more than that today, would be provide Chairman Blankenship the discretion working with staff to get to a final agreement with CRATA.

MR. JONES: Mr. Darnall?

MR. DARNALL: Yes. So I'm going to start with a statement, and then I'm going to follow up with a motion, if that's okay.

Contained in the language here basically -- assuming this draft becomes final, if I read it correctly -- they're going to propose on how they're going to build it, what they're going to do with the roads. Whatever they propose has got to be approved by Forever Wild staff, you

know, and it deals with roads and access 1 and all of that. I would like to make a 2 3 motion that we allow the staff to continue negotiations in completing this agreement 4 to bring back to the Board for final 5 6 approval would be my motion. 7 MR. JONES: So we have a motion. Do 8 we have a second? MR. WRIGHT: I'll second it. 9 MR. JONES: Mr. Wright, second. 10 Any further discussion? 11 (No response.) 12 13 MR. JONES: All those in favor signal by saying aye. 14 (Several Board members 1.5 indicated aye.) 16 17 MR. JONES: Opposed? MS. MCCURDY: Do we have opposed? 18 MR. SATTERFIELD: I'll abstain. 19 Abstain. MR. JONES: 20 MS. MCCURDY: One abstention. 2.1 The 22 rest were affirmative with one abstention from Mr. Satterfield. 23

The next tab would be Tab 5-E, and this is -- we do this every year at the August meeting. I bring forward staff reports that give you an idea of the activity so far this fiscal year that the -- my various staff members have engaged in. This includes research on our tracts, this includes records that are gathered in the Natural Heritage Database, it includes very identifiable activities, such as prescribed fire that go on every day, our enforcement activities that occur on each of our tracts, both to enforce our requirements as well as protect the And I've included those in your public. I always feel bad because the packet. staff does so much that isn't covered -frankly, because it goes well -- and then I stand up like I'm doing everything, and it's very much my staff. But we've run a little long today, so I don't want to take too much time covering them, but I do want to ask if the Board has any questions.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And I will note they're divided. I just group them into single division. the types of activities that go on in a couple of the facilities, such as the Wehle Land Conservation Center and the Forever Wild Field Trial Area that are partnerships between State Lands and Forever Wild where we carry on various activities that we sure hope benefit the public. But I don't want to -- I don't I will just take any want to run long. questions that the Board has, but I would -- I ask you and encourage you to read through those to see what all goes on.

Dr. Powers?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

DR. POWERS: Yeah, I don't have any questions. I just want to say I'm very impressed with this. I mean, you continue -- your staff publishes scientific contributions and goes into the databases. And as the scientist on board -- upon the Board, we really

appreciate that. I mean, that really adds value for us for this.

MS. MCCURDY: Thank you.

MR. WRIGHT: Patti, I'd just like to say thank you for that report too. I enjoyed reading it and just knowing what's going on.

Thank you.

MS. MCCURDY: Well, thank y'all very much. I enjoy getting to work with all of y'all and appreciate the time that each of you put into the program in reviewing these packets too. But is there any other -- any questions?

(No response.)

MS. MCCURDY: All right. And anytime -- if any of you have any questions on any of the specific reports or would like to, you know, get on the ground anywhere or lend a hand -- I will say we might put you to work if you do join us -- but please let us know because we're happy to have you tag along at any

time, and I'm sure as well as Chuck and Greg on the tracts that they also work on. And obviously a lot of what we do is with the assistance of the other divisions. These reports are just really to show you what the State Lands staff has been doing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So the next item is Tab 5-F. We also -- your -- the prior tab, 5-E, includes an update on some of the timber activity from the prior fiscal year, but we like to try to give the Board insight each year into what we anticipate are going to be timber actions on properties for the upcoming fiscal year. Now, you know, this will shift both by need and opportunity. Weather never cooperates and, you know, other factors will contribute. Also, all of these -- of course, part of it depends being able to get the activities completed by contractors involved.

But Tab 5-F is what is the staff's report or summary of what we think will be

various timber actions, including thinnings, including final harvest. broke down by tract. Some of the thinnings that are anticipated -- again, there are different sections that have been done before will be done in the future -- but some work -- Barbour WMA, Coosa WMA, Freedom Hills WMA, Old Cahawba Tract Addition, Red Hills Tract, Skyline WMA, Uchee SOA, Upper Delta WMA with final harvest anticipated with the Gothard-Yates Lakes WMA, Little River Canyon WMA. also -- I've left in there reforestation That's a category where we activities. don't anticipate any reforestation work within the upcoming fiscal year. But that is an idea of what we, again, anticipate will take place.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

What we have done in the past is that we have generally presented the request for approval for timber actions but asking also for the Board's understanding that as we begin to

implement them, that, you know, there may be some changes that -- or revisions that will be implemented maybe different from But we do try to update you as the memo. to the planned activities. If the Board has any questions about anything that we have identified, I'd be happy to answer I'd be happy for further detailed discussions with the Board as to why these were highlighted potentially over other I'm happy to walk potential actions. through any of that with y'all, and we can do it in detail after the meeting if you would prefer. But I'll take any questions now, and then if there are no questions --

DR. MCCLINTOCK: Patti, I have a question. Does Forever Wild have any sort of best practices for the thinning process of these forests, or these are just done different each time by a different company or --

MS. MCCURDY: No, we in the procurement of the activities would

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

outline, you know, the best management practices to be followed. Opportunities are offered to bidders through the State procurement practice and accepted through that and then monitored by our personnel on site. You know, our contracts include some discretion of ours depending on, for example, wet conditions and limiting access where there would be damage, you know, to the roadways. So it goes through a standard procurement process, but it is developed specifically for each tract offered, if that helps.

MR. JONES: Yes, Mr. Childers?

MR. CHILDERS: Are these management activities bid out State bid-wise, or who does the cutting or whatever?

MS. MCCURDY: We have to follow State purchasing procurement procedures, so they are bid out.

MR. CHILDERS: Competitively bid?

MS. MCCURDY: Competitively bid, yes,

And to remind the Board, the, you

1.5

2.1

1	know, revenue generated from these
2	activities by law goes to the general
3	fund.
4	Any questions on the
5	MR. JONES: If not, we need a motion
6	for this?
7	MS. MCCURDY: We would need a motion.
8	MR. JONES: Mr. Wright?
9	MR. WRIGHT: The Board authorizes the
LO	State Lands Division to implement or
L1	continue as applicable forest management
L2	activities for the FY 22 fiscal year as
L3	described in memorandum dated 8-5-2021.
L 4	MR. JONES: So we have a motion. Do
L5	we have a second?
L 6	DR. SALOOM: Second.
L7	MR. JONES: Dr. Saloom with a second.
L 8	All those in favor?
L 9	(All Board members
20	indicated aye.)
21	MR. JONES: Any opposed?
22	(No response.)
23	MR. JONES: The motion carries.

MS. MCCURDY: I think that's all --1 2 I'm looking to staff if I've missed 3 something -- that I have unless the Board has thought of something in the interim. 4 MR. JONES: We have to approve the 5 6 minutes. MS. MCCURDY: Yes, I meant in the 7 8 miscellaneous section. I was going to circle back to you. 9 10 All right. MR. JONES: All right. We also need 11 to approve the minutes of the May 6, 2021, 12 meeting. That's found in Tab 6 for your 13 reference. Is there any amendment to 14 those minutes? 1.5 (No response.) 16 MR. JONES: Seeing none --17 MR. DARNALL: I make a motion we 18 approve the minutes as submitted. 19 MR. JONES: All right. Seconded by --20 DR. SIMS: Second. 2.1 22 MR. JONES: -- Dr. Sims. All those in favor? 23

(All Board members indicated aye.)

MR. JONES: Opposed?

1.5

2.1

(No response.)

MR. JONES: Next quarterly Board meeting will be November the 4th. The location is to be determined. If you have an idea of where you would like for that to be obviously reach out to the Commissioner or to Patti and they will do that.

It is somewhat with sadness that this is Dr. Tolley-Jordan's final meeting with us. She has served this Board with distinction, and we are so glad to have her. And we have a presentation for you to commemorate your service, and we're supposed to go over here and get a photo.

MS. MCCURDY: And I'll let Evan direct y'all.

Dr. Tolley-Jordan, I just want to thank you on behalf of the staff. We have so much enjoyed working with you and you

have always been accessible. And when 1 2 I've had special requests and needed 3 special help along the way, you were just always so gracious with your time. 4 just want to thank you because you've been 5 6 a truly valuable Board member and just a 7 great new friend to all of us. So thank 8 you very much. DR. TOLLEY-JORDAN: Thank you. Well, 9 it was a real honor to serve. 10 Thank you. 11 MR. JONES: Seeing as that is our last 12 13 items of business, can I entertain a motion to adjourn? 14 MR. HOLLOWAY: So moved. 1.5 MR. JONES: Dr. Holloway. 16 MR. DARNALL: Second. 17 MR. JONES: Second by Mr. Darnall. 18 All those in favor? 19 (All Board members 20 2.1 indicated aye.) 22 MR. JONES: Opposed? 23 (No response.)

1	MR. JONES: We are adjourned.
2	(Proceedings concluded at
3	12:56 p.m.)
4	12.50 p.m.,
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
L O	
11	
12	
L3	
4	
L5	
L 6	
L7	
L 8	
L 9	
20	
21	
22	
23	

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF ALABAMA

AUTAUGA COUNTY

I, Stacey L. Johnson, Certified Court
Reporter and Commissioner for the State of
Alabama at Large, hereby certify that on
August 5, 2021, I reported the proceedings
in the matter of the foregoing cause, and
that pages 3 through 153 contain a true
and accurate transcription of
aforementioned proceedings.

I further certify that I am neither of kin nor of counsel to any of the parties to said cause, nor in any manner interested in the results thereof.

This the 19th day of October, 2021.

1.5

_ _

/s/Stacey L. Johnson
STACEY L. JOHNSON, CCR
Commissioner for the
State of Alabama at Large
CCR 386, Expires 9/30/2022
COMMISSION EXPIRES: 6/22/2023