1	MINUTES OF THE
2	FOREVER WILD BOARD MEETING
3	The University of Alabama
4	Bryant Conference Center
5	240 Paul W. Bryant Drive
6	Tuscaloosa, Alabama
7	November 3, 2022
8	10:00 a.m.
9	
10	* * * * * * * * *
11	Transcript of Proceedings
12	* * * * * * * * *
13	
14	PROCEEDINGS, taken before Stacey
15	L. Johnson, Certified Court Reporter and
16	Commissioner for the State of Alabama at
17	The University of Alabama, Bryant
18	Conference Center, 240 Paul W. Bryant
19	Drive, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, on the 3rd day
20	of November, 2022, commencing at
21	10:00 a.m.
22	* * * * * * * *
23	

```
BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:
1
2
      Commissioner Chris Blankenship, Chairman
      Mr. James "Mickey" Childers
3
      Mr. Reginald N. Holloway
      Dr. Sean P. Powers
      Mr. David Wright
4
      Mr. Rick Oates
      Dr. James B. McClintock
5
      Mr. Jack Darnall
      Mr. William Satterfield
6
      Mr. Raymond B. Jones, Jr.
7
      Dr. Patricia Sims
      Dr. Heather Howell
      Dr. A.M. "Jay" Neumann, Jr.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
```

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: So I'll go 1 2 ahead and call the meeting to order of the 3 November 3rd Forever Wild Board meeting. When I call your name, just indicate that 4 you're here so we can ensure we have a 5 6 quorum. 7 Chris Blankenship's here. Mr. Childers? 8 MR. CHILDERS: Here. 9 10 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Darnall? MR. DARNALL: Here. 11 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Holloway? 12 Dr. Howell? 13 Here. DR. HOWELL: 14 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Jones? 1.5 MR. JONES: Here. 16 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Oates? 17 MR. OATES: Here. 18 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Powers? 19 DR. POWERS: Here. 20 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Sims? 21 Mr. Wright? 22 MR. WRIGHT: Here. 23

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. McClintock?

DR. MCCLINTOCK: Here.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Neumann?

DR. NEUMANN: Here.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP:

Mr. Satterfield?

1.5

MR. SATTERFIELD: Here.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Valentine?

Dr. Saloom?

So we do have a quorum.

Alabama allowing us to use the Bryant
Conference Center today to host the
meeting here. It's a beautiful facility,
beautiful campus. I will go ahead and let
you know if you're a fan of the other side
of the state, we plan to be there next
November in Auburn, and then in Mobile
more than likely at the University of
South Alabama for the meeting in August
next year. So we're trying to move around
the state and let us see some of the nice
universities. And plus, they, most of the

time, let us meet for free and that's always a good thing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I would like to -- I'll pass this around, but this is a proclamation that the Governor signed for National Public Lands Day. That was in September, September 24th, that the National Public Lands Day was recognized. To support that, we provided free admission to our Alabama State Parks in recognition of Public Lands Day, but a lot of that work that takes place around the state is in thanks to you on this Board for the work that y'all do on Forever Wild to provide more land for the public. So I'll just pass this down so y'all are welcome to see that.

For the Record, I will say that Mr. Holloway has joined us.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Good morning, everybody.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: I know y'all had a terrible traffic jam coming from the

Birmingham area today.

1.5

2.1

MR. HOLLOWAY: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: I don't have any other comments, so we'll start with the public comments.

When I call your name, just please come to the microphone, and you'll have three minutes. We only have a few speakers today, it looks like. Our first speaker will be Mr. Steve Northcutt on the Belcher Phase II. That's Tab 3b page 2.

MR. NORTHCUTT: And I want to apologize. I was not the intended speaker for this project, but one of my colleagues was unable to attend. So I may not know intricate details, but I'm very familiar with the property.

And if you remember, a while back you were able to acquire close to 1700 acres from EPSCO that was considered Belcher 1. Belcher is an old timber family that has been around in the state and done a lot of work. So it was named

after the Belcher family. That property is an absolute jewel and a unique addition to the state parks.

That area in Birmingham is rapidly developing, and I think that the acquisition of the larger tract was just an absolute great decision by the Board. And this is the second phase because it was split purposefully by a railroad tract and was unknown if this was going to be offered or not, but the corporation decided to make it a part of the transaction. They felt very good about the public response from the first acquisition.

And so as you see, that 277-acre property is a highly developable property. And so I'm sure -- I don't know the price of it, but I know you have a first appraisal and it's probably rather high. Many properties, of course, it has to do with location and a potential for development. This would be protected

forever if the Board were to add this to
Oak Mountain State Park. And there are
very few large adjacent properties that
you're going to be able to buy, and so I
would hope that you would consider doing a
second appraisal and closing as the motion
today.

Again, I don't have a lot of details, but if you have any specific questions, I'll try to answer them.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Wright?

MR. WRIGHT: Is there going to be any problem with the railroad in crossing it or if you put trails or whatever? I mean, I just don't know.

MR. NORTHCUTT: Yeah, I'm sure the

State Park will put together a safety plan
and a management plan for the entire

property. So Greg Lein will probably have
a better answer for that, but that's

something that comes up on properties all
the time so I'm sure they'll have a very
good plan in place to address that.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

1.5

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thank you. And while you're there if you would like to speak on the Red Hills-Flat Creek Phase V.

MR. NORTHCUTT: So that's the main reason that I came today. I don't know if all the Board members know, but the Nature Conservancy working with the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources/Wildlife Freshwater Division have worked on this since about 2008.

And so if you look at your map, you'll see multiple properties that have been acquired by the Department using RLA funds or funds that were either through that under Section 6 recovery -- this is Fish and Wildlife federal money -- or through Habitat Conservation Planning money, HCP money. HCPs, if properties were under that designation, which basically is for timber companies or private landowners to protect the intact slopes the Redhill salamanders need to

survive, they don't cut the timber, disturb that -- HCP allows federal dollars to be brought in. So you get kind of two for one, Section 6 recovery and HCP dollars. And if you look at the history of the acquisitions there, a few tracts have been bought with all Forever Wild money, but most of the property had a 75 percent or around 75 percent funding from the RLA funds.

about this from the staff when they come up to talk about your grants -- you were awarded around 2.6 million dollars for the acquisition of Flat Creek Phase V. And I think the most important thing that I would say besides talking about the biodiversity, Flat Creek is considered an SHU, or Strategic Habitat Unit, for rare fish and mussels, but also, you have extremely good hunting, deer and turkey. It's great for botany -- it's a really unique terrestrial community -- as well as

your aquatics.

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

But the main point I want to make before my time runs out is this property will be lost if you don't today decide to make a motion, a second appraisal and close. And the reason I know that is I spoke to one of the principles that own the property and its conservation All their property is going to resources. be sold and it's going to go on the market next month. This property will be included as well as another 6500-acre block to the south that we're trying to acquire. But, again, we have very little time to make an acquisition of that size. So this will be your opportunity to include this.

If you look at the map, there's great connectivity to the rest of the WMA, and I believe it is WMA. It's the Red Hills WMA. That's the designation now, if I'm not mistaken. So I know you have a lot of good projects, but this one comes

with 2.6 million dollars and it's designated for this tract. So I hope you make the motion to second appraisal and close.

And I can answer questions about that property if you have any.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thank you, sir.

MR. NORTHCUTT: Thank you.

## CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP:

1.5

The next speaker is Mr. Pat

Byington, and he just wanted to talk about
the program.

Pat, let me first -- before you speak -- thank you for the articles that you wrote on the Forever Wild program over the last month or so and very positively received. Good work.

MR. BYINGTON: And thank you to the Department, which I've got to tell you when I write stories about wildlife and conservation, the Department of Conservation is wonderful, and y'all do an incredible job.

I just wanted to come up and say happy birthday today. Today, 30 years ago, actually today, on November 3, 1992, we were voting for Forever Wild. So literally this is our birthday, and I want to say happy birthday.

I also wanted to throw out a whole bunch of names of people -- and I'm going to miss people. I'm going to say that -- who I just want to get on the Record for part of being that group of folks that made it all happen. And we've got one of them right here, Bill Satterfield, who actually -- he and Glenn Waddell, Bob Reed, they were those lawyers in the backroom that wrote the bill. Bill, I want to give you applause.

Just other names, of course, Jim Martin, I mean, he was the man behind it. Jim Griggs worked with him hand in hand. I'm just going to throw out names. Elberta Reed. I mentioned Bob Reed. You had this dynamic dual with the Audubon

Society, and you had Elberta and Bob, and they looked at every word within that bill. My friend Pete Conroy. I mentioned Glenn Waddell worked with you. Freeland with the Nature Conservancy, she helped lead the campaign. Doug Ghee and Jim who was a senator at the time from Anniston and Jim Campbell who was the rep, they were the sponsors of the bill. think everybody eventually put their name on the bill. Ann Bedsole. The Alabama Wildlife Federation, Jim Taylor. throwing all these names out. Harris with Alabama Power. Just so many folks. It was a coalition that was incredible. And I do want to say one other person to recognize and that was Bill Ireland. Bill Ireland, you know, he really made it happen too.

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 I just wanted to -- and I know
I missed some people and I'm going to get
in trouble, but it was an incredible group
and it's something to be very proud of.

I'm very proud to have been a part of it.

I was a young person -- I was only 25 at
the time -- and I was with the Alabama

Conservancy. I was the executive director
then. And so it was a pleasure.

1.3

1.5

2.1

So thank you and thank you for the work you do too.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thanks, Pat.

Since I saw what you were going to be speaking on, I decided to let you have the -- I didn't bring up the 30th anniversary in my opening comments. I was leaving that for you and since you did such a good job on the articles. But thank you for that.

Our next speaker is Ms. Reba Hicks on Natural Bridge Park.

MS. HICKS: Good morning. Thank y'all for letting me speak.

On behalf of the Denton family, they did ask that I thank the Board members -- and I don't know which ones it was -- that made a trip to actually come

visit the park and see it, and they appreciated that.

Also, the University of Alabama had just sent a group of students to research the ecosystem there, and they wanted to thank the university for that too.

My part of it is to let you know of a price reduction. The Denton family has reduced the price to 1.25, which averages around \$8300 an acre, which is quite different than the last time.

I did get a call last night from Commissioner Hayes. He had planned on being here today. Something came up with his hospital Board and he could not make it, but he did want to say that he did have some hard numbers for the gate system, around \$10,000. And to remind y'all that he and the Commission, the county, and the Town of Natural Bridge have made it — they will be responsible for demolition of any structures that you

have, removal of that, and then reclaiming the land on that.

1.5

And Representative Estes texted me just a few minutes ago. He had planned to be here but he was called to Montgomery, so he gives his apologies for that too.

And that's all I have.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thank you.

We have one more speaker. If there's anybody that wanted to speak that didn't get a chance to sign up, if you'll raise your hand, I'll get somebody to bring you a slip.

All right. Our last speaker is Mitchell Marks, and he wants to talk about prescribed burning in the Freedom Hills area.

MR. MARKS: Hello, I'm Mitchell Marks.

I'm a retired wildlife biologist and

assistant district supervisor at Freedom

Hills Wildlife Management Area.

Since I've retired, I've started a small business and I do prescribed

burning. Since I've retired in the last eight years, I've saved this program and Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries nearly \$90,000 in prescribed burning cost. Most specifically in the last two years, I've saved this Board 64,000 in prescribed burning.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

In 2019, State Lands decided to do a cost-effectiveness study, and they gave the Forestry Commission a thousand acres in September of 2019. In February of 2020, I got to bid on 2607 acres at \$27 an By April 4th, I was finished with By May 15th, they'd only burned The next year, State Lands bid 80 acres. all 4414 acres out. I got the bid for \$25 an acre. I started February 1st, and I finished May 15th. My thank-you for saving money and doing it effectively is Conservation and Forestry is now signing an MOU to do 600 acres at Freedom Hills this year for \$35 an acre. I ask that this Board scrutinize this MOU. And the

question I have for you, while there's only \$6,000 difference in my price and their price, at what point do you stop spending extra money to get the work done.

I have a scripture I'd like to read. It's Luke 16:10. Whoever can be trusted with little, can be trusted with much, and whoever is dishonest with little is also dishonest with much.

I'll take any questions.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thank you.

That concludes our public comments. Now, we will --

MR. SATTERFIELD: Mr. Chairman, I do have a question.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes,

Mr. Satterfield. I'm sorry.

MR. SATTERFIELD: In regard to this, how does -- can we have somebody on the staff explain to us how they go about this bid process and how this results in this difference that this gentleman was talking about?

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Sure. I'll be glad to give you an overview.

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

You know, we do have burning operations that are going on all over the state from one end to the other. a memorandum of understanding with the Forestry Commission to be able to do some of those burns, we have an agreement with the Nature Conservancy to do some of those, and some of those we bid individually. And then we do have the option of doing an RFP, request for proposals, so that we can have some different companies around the state on contract so that when we have burning in geographic areas that they can do that for So it's not a -- we don't bid every single burn because some of those we already had those MOUs in place to be able to do those or a contract in place through an RFQ process.

MR. SATTERFIELD: Well, I know in -- Raymond raised the question last time

about the burning process and the timetable especially that would interfere with the turkey nesting process, because if you get into a late season past March into April or May, in some of the properties that interferes with the turkey nesting process. And so I wondered if that figure -- if that played into these contracts as well.

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

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: And I think one thing that's important to point out is there are a lot of different factors that go into that. But the Forever Wild property is only a portion of the property that we manage as the Department of Conservation. We have about 750,000 acres that we're managing around the state. so I can talk about specific tracts or get more information on specific tracts, but it's pretty broad and we're doing work all over the state for habitat and for forest management. Some of it's, you know, longleaf restoration, some of it's habitat

management for wildlife, and it's just a lot of different initiatives and it depends on the location and the particular property.

MR. SATTERFIELD: Okay.

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. OATES: I'd also just like to add that, Bill, we may charge a little bit more, but we also bring bulldozers on site and we are better equipped to put out a fire if one escapes. And we -- sometimes you get what you pay for, I guess. our folks are trained firefighters, and we have equipment there that other folks when they burn don't have on site to put out fires and protect the property from escapes and things like that. So we may charge a little bit more -- I don't know about those numbers for sure. I'd have to look at them to see exactly how that works out -- but we're better equipped than a lot of folks to protect when we do burn. So I would just put that out there.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Powers?

DR. POWERS: So the lowest bid is not always the only thing y'all factor into these decisions?

1.5

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: I would say that we make -- it depends on the property on what we're looking at and whether the bidders meet the specs. So it's not always the low bid. It has to meet the specifications and other things. Like I say, it's very complicated because we're doing -- it's property specific, so it's a difficult just yes or no answer on that.

MR. CHILDERS: Commissioner?

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Childers?

MR. CHILDERS: What was the date on the memorandum of understanding that this gentleman is talking about?

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: I don't know off the top of my head.

MR. OATES: It's probably been in place since 2018, 2019, I think.

MR. CHILDERS: So it's been in place awhile?

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir. 1 MR. OATES: I could be wrong about 2 that, but I think that's about right. 3 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: So we'll now 4 recess for executive session. 5 6 By regulation, appraisal values are confidential during periods of 7 8 negotiation. Accordingly, in order to discuss tract appraisal values, the Board 9 will need to go into recess for an 10 executive session. 11 Is there a motion for the Board to 12 now recess to attend the executive 13 session? 14 DR. MCCLINTOCK: I so move. 1.5 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Motion by 16 Dr. McClintock; seconded by Dr. Powers. 17 As I call your name, please state 18 your position on the motion to recess. 19 Those in favor say aye, and those opposed 20 21 say nay. Chris Blankenship, aye. 22 Mr. Childers? 23

1		MR. CHILDERS: Aye.
2		CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Darnall?
3		MR. DARNALL: Aye.
4		CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Holloway?
5		MR. HOLLOWAY: Aye.
6		CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Howell?
7		DR. HOWELL: Aye.
8		CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Jones?
9		MR. JONES: Aye.
10		CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Oates?
11		MR. OATES: Aye.
12		CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Powers?
13		DR. POWERS: Aye.
14		CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Wright?
15		MR. WRIGHT: Aye.
16		CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. McClintock?
17		DR. MCCLINTOCK: Aye.
18		CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Neumann?
19		DR. NEUMANN: Aye.
20		CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP:
21	Mr.	Satterfield?
22		MR. SATTERFIELD: Aye.
23		CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All are in

favor. We are now in recess for executive session. It is 10:30. We will plan to be back at 10:50.

1.5

2.1

(Recess from 10:30 a.m. to 11:12 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: I'll call us back into regular session. It is 11:12.

And I'd also like to note for the Record that Dr. Sims is in attendance. Thank you for being here. Sorry you had such traffic issues coming this morning.

Now we are on program reports,

Tabs 2a, b, and c, and Jo Lewis is going
to handle that for us today.

Go ahead, Ms. Jo.

MS. LEWIS: Good morning. I'm Jo

Lewis of the State Lands Division. I will

be covering the usual financial reports in

our packets. We're going to begin with

Tab 2a, the adjustment report.

This is our current cash balance in the land acquisition account, and then we subtract out all of the approved for

purchase but pending acquisition values.

This time we included the Autauga 112 to be on the conservative side so that if you chose to go forward on that, you would know that the value at the bottom addresses that expense.

1.5

2.1

So as of November 1st, the balance was approximately 20 millions dollars, and then we are going to -- I'm going to list the ones -- list them without using their exact values, of course.

We have the Coldwater-McVey
Addition in Calhoun County, the Autauga
WMA-Hart Addition in Autauga County,
Bon Secour River Wetlands Addition in
Baldwin County, Cahaba River-Shelby County
Park Peel Addition in Shelby County,
Coldwater Mountain-Robertson Addition in
Calhoun County, Freedom Hills WMA-Bodie
Addition in Colbert County, Perdido
WMA-Snowden Branch Addition in
Baldwin County, Red Hills-Flat Creek
Phase IV in Monroe County, and, as I

mentioned, Autauga WMA-County Road 112

Addition in Autauga County. For the purposes of this calculation, we included that. Your remaining balance of unencumbered cash is approximately 13 million 900,000.

I'll be happy to attempt to address any questions.

1.5

2.1

All right. Moving to the next page, this is the page that we provide to list completed or declined projects. For FY23, 2022/2023, we have not closed on anything this month basically is what we're showing there, so I'll just run through the ones that we did close at the last year, which included a number at the end of the fiscal year.

Cedar Creek SOA Addition was declined, Coldwater Mountain-Carroll, we closed; D'Olive Bay Addition was closed; Hollins WMA Addition was declined; Oak Mountain State Park-Belcher Lake Addition closed; Red Hills-Parris Trust Addition

closed; Styx River Wetlands closed; TCNP, which is Turkey Creek Nature Preserve,
Parker Addition was closed; and Thigpen
Hill Option A Phase 2 closed.

1.3

1.5

2.1

All right. If there are no questions on the adjustments, we'll move to Tab 2b, which is the Stewardship. And I'm sorry. I should have reminded you that there are updates to these reports in your green folder. They're on the ivory-colored paper in the usual manner.

In 2b, we have the unusual attribute for this meeting in that we have end of last fiscal year and the beginning of this fiscal year represented in two separate reports.

So the first report is the finishing up of last year's Stewardship Fiscal Fund. There are a number of accounting procedures yet to be completed in the 13th accounting percent. This is not the absolute final, but we're getting close. So you can see here what was spent

of the budgeted amount.

1.5

2.1

The next page is the starting over again with the fiscal year '23, and in the past month, we have spent approximately \$18,000 of the budgeted amount.

All right. I'm going to move on to 3a, which is for the minutes, and basically what we covered in the executive session. 3a is the overview of appraised nominations as of November 1st. I will not read the actual appraised value.

We're going to be generalizing.

As discussed, Oak Mountain State
Park-Belcher Addition Phase II in
Shelby County is returned and the value is
available for consideration. The
Red Hills-Flat Creek Phase V in
Monroe County is an appraisal that has
been received and reviewed. It's in
Monroe County. Sorry. I'm reviewing my
notes that Patti left me. There's lots.
I haven't covered most of them. Basically
that's what we have to say.

The Riverton CHA is Community Hunting Area, Barnett Mill Hollow in Colbert County, and Riverton-Hurd Hollow Addition also in Colbert County are two tracts the Board asked for first appraisals on. The landowners were somewhat delayed in getting us the deed information. Therefore, we were somewhat delayed in getting -- we sort of missed time gaps with purchasing and such. So actually getting those appraisals bid out and awarded was delayed because the deed information was delayed. So they have not come back yet. They are underway, and we should have those values for you at the February meeting.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

All right. At this point, Patti usually skips over Tab 4. We discuss the grant memo, 5a, going over the status of the various opportunities, funding opportunities, and partnerships. So on 5a in addition to what I'm going -- in addition to 5a, there is a Tab 5i in your

green folder and a Tab 51, which provides additional details on some of the grant programs, the specific grants we have going.

1.5

The first grant in the list of nominations approved for acquisition is the Autauga Hart Addition. Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries Division continue to utilize its Pittman-Robertson funds at a 75/25 split, and things are progressing as procedurally they should. We expect that will succeed.

The next one is Bon Secour

Wetlands Addition, which is a National

Coastal Wetlands Conservation grant. That

grant provides -- that specific grant.

They vary -- that one provides 68 percent

of the land value that will be reimbursed.

That one is in Baldwin County and is

progressing as expected. No particular

problems we need to describe.

The third in that category is the Red Hills-Flat Creek Phase IV. Again,

this is a Wildlife and Freshwater

Fisheries Division partnership. They've

been awarded approximately 1.2 million of

Recovery Land and HCP, Habitat

Conservation Plan, funding. It will cover

64 percent of the cost of the acquisition

approximately. Therefore, the 36 percent

remaining is to be purchased by

Forever Wild. Again, that one is

progressing as expected.

Now, the next section is for appraised nominations that are in the appraisal but not authorized by you for purchase. You haven't made the motion to go forward with purchase. Autauga WMA-County Road 112, the grant as described will cover approximately 74 percent of the acquisition, and the Forever Wild would cover approximately 36 percent. Again, there is additional information in Tab 51 in your green folder.

The next one is the Red Hills-Flat

2.1

Creek Phase V. Again, this a Recovery Land and Habitat Conservation Plan funding program project grant through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that has been awarded to Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries, so there's a partnership there. This grant would cover approximately 66 percent of the acquisition cost, and that land would be -- as usual with these Red Hills grants would be titled to Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries and 34 percent would be acquired with Forever Wild funds and titled to Forever Wild. There is a motion available for you in Tab 5a if you are interested in moving forward on that one. This is some suggested language if you like it.

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

There are three nominations on the short list which have funding opportunities that relate to them. There is the Dugdown Mountain Corridor. That is a partnership with the Alabama Forestry Commission. The Forestry Commission has

submitted a Forest Legacy grant. It has not yet been decided or awarded. We expect that would be occurring around June. The Forestry Commission is not seeking a motion for a first appraisal at this point until the grant process furthers to where we know if that grant can be awarded.

1.5

2.1

The second tract is Portland

Landing SOA, Special Opportunity Area,

Donald Addition. That's a Wildlife and

Freshwater Fisheries grant with the U.S.

Fish and Wildlife Service and Pittman
Robertson funds. The split on that one is about 70 percent PR funds and 30 percent

Forever Wild.

The final one is new -- you haven't seen anything about this one -- and that is the Skyline WMA-Fowler Cove Addition. Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries is offering to utilize its Pittman-Robertson funds at a 75/25 match. On Tab 5i that I mentioned, there is a

split map provided as to which portions of the tract would be owned by Wildlife and which would be owned by Forever Wild.

I'd be happy to address any questions, me and the backup, on the grant funding.

I think we got it.

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

All right. Then we're going to flip back and run through the short list very quickly. Looking at Tab 4a is an alphabetical list. For the Record, the nominations that have the top three scores in each category of use in each geographic region of the state are considered a priority or short list. There's hypothetically up to 36. Due to some categories of use not having any nominations that are compatible for that use and other nominations that will short list in more than one category, we have far less than 36 that I haven't counted. So I'm going to run through them. They're arranged alphabetically. If you'd like,

you can flip through 4b as we go, and these are each of the nominations.

There's a narrative and a map. If you have any questions, please speak up because I will be reading and not doing a very good job keeping track of your thoughts.

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

I'm going to start with the Alligator Bayou in Mobile County; the Butler Foster Praytor Mountains in Jefferson County; Coldwater Mountain-Martin Addition, Calhoun County; D'Olive Bay-North Addition, Baldwin County; Dugdown Mountain Corridor in Cleburne County -- and this is the one that I referred to with the AFC partnership -- Lillian Swamp-Blackwater Addition in Baldwin County; Little River Forest-Lomax Branch in Escambia County; Martin Slough Tract in Hale County; Oak Mountain State-Odess Addition in Shelby County; Persimmon Knob in Morgan County; Portland Landing SOA-Donald Addition in Dallas County; Red
Hills-Blanton Addition in Monroe County;
Sipsey River Swamp-Brownville Addition in
Tuscaloosa County; Skyline-Fowler Cove
Addition in Jackson County -- as I say,
there's additional information on the
split under 5i in that one -- and then the
last one is WBR, which is Weeks Bay
Reserve, Marney Addition, in
Baldwin County.

I'll be happy to take any questions about the nominations.

1.5

2.1

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Wright?

MR. WRIGHT: Jo, I have one question on the Little River Forest-Lomax Branch.

In looking at it, I'm under the impression that DCNR is purchasing that?

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir, I would say that our Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries is working towards purchasing that outright without Forever Wild assistance.

MR. WRIGHT: Gotcha.

MS. LEWIS: It stays on because the 1 2 landowner hasn't taken it off, and we 3 don't have a procedural reason -- even though we think this is going to happen, 4 we don't want to offend the landowner by 5 6 removing this concept. 7 MR. WRIGHT: It's not a done deal. Ι 8 gotcha. CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: But once it 9 closes, then it will come off? 10 MS. LEWIS: Yes. 11 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All right. 12 Thank you. 13 So now the next on our agenda is 14 for general discussion, the part where we 15 generally entertain motions from the Board 16 for first or second appraisals and other 17 business. 18 Is there any Board member that 19 would like to --20 2.1 Mr. Wright? MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I would 22 like to -- I really don't know how to make 23

this motion -- to go with 90 percent of the second appraisal on County Road 112 property. I'd like to make that as a motion of the second appraisal, 90 percent of the second appraisal.

MR. CHILDERS: Offer to purchase?

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Let me make sure I get the motion right. To move to purchase at no more than 90 percent of the second appraisal appraised value for Autauga-County Road 112 tract?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

1.5

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Is there a second?

MR. SATTERFIELD: Second.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: So motion by Mr. Wright; seconded by Mr. Satterfield.

This is a little bit of an unusual motion. Let me state it again, make sure everybody knows what we're voting on. To move to purchase at no more than 90 percent of the second appraised value for Autauga County Road 112.

MR. SATTERFIELD: That's correct. 1 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All those in 2 3 favor say aye. All those opposed say no. 4 MR. DARNALL: No. 5 6 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: The motion carries with one negative vote. 7 8 All right. Anyone else? Mr. Jones? 9 10 MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move for first appraisal of the Skyline 11 WMA-Fowler Cove Addition in 12 Jackson County, Alabama. 13 MR. DARNALL: I second that. 14 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Motion by 1.5 Mr. Jones; seconded by Mr. Darnall for a 16 first appraisal on the Skyline-Fowler Cove 17 Addition. 18 Mr. Satterfield? 19 MR. SATTERFIELD: That's on the short 20 light, right? 21 22 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: MR. JONES: Sorry. 23 Yes. Tab 4

page 1.

MR. SATTERFIELD: I have a question.

It's really for staff. As I remember several meetings ago, we had comments from Chuck Sykes about not needing to acquire any more land in Jackson County in the Skyline area, and now apparently DCNR has changed their mind. I'm wondering what caused that, why have we -- why is the Department now proposing to help with the purchase of this property?

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Jones?

MR. JONES: I'd like to speak to that first because my esteemed colleague,
Dr. Sims, and I had this conversation back a few years ago.

This particular piece of property is a large piece of property. It's very strategic. I think what -- I'll let the Department speak for themself. But this property is very strategic in where it lays. What was happening at the time is we were buying little bits and pieces of

property that was kind of in the area. 1 It's more of the shotgun approach. 2 think the Department would probably --3 I'll let them say it -- but I think 4 because this is such a strategic piece of 5 property and in some mass that it's worth 6 us investing our dollars to do that. 7 8 again, I don't know if that's how y'all feel or not. That's the way I feel. 9 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: And since 10 Chuck's not here, I'll speak on behalf of 11 the Department. That's correct. 12 MR. SATTERFIELD: And my second 13 question is the Department does have the 14 Pittman-Robertson funds on hand and 1.5 available to purchase that part of the 16 property, or is it --17 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: 18 MR. SATTERFIELD: -- or are we waiting 19 on future grants? 20 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: 2.1 No. We have that. 22

MR. SATTERFIELD:

23

So it's already

appropriated? 1 2 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir. 3 So the motion is for a first appraisal on the Skyline-Fowler Cove 4 Addition. All those in favor say aye. 5 6 Any opposed? None opposed. The motion carries. 7 Dr. Powers? 8 I'd like to move for DR. POWERS: 9 first appraisal on the Lillian 10 Swamp-Blackwater Addition. 11 I'll second that. MR. DARNALL: 12 13 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Motion by Dr. Powers; seconded by Mr. Darnall on the 14 Lillian Swamp-Blackwater Addition. 15 questions about that? 16 MR. SATTERFIELD: Which tab are we 17 under? 18 19 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir. That is in Tab 4 page 13. 20 Page 13. 21 DR. POWERS: And if you look, it's just we have 22 a lot of property in that area that is --23

MR. SATTERFIELD: I'm sorry. I just didn't hear the nomination. Which one is it?

DR. POWERS: The Lillian Swamp-Blackwater Addition.

MR. JONES: Tab 4 page 13.

MR. SATTERFIELD: Okay.

## CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP:

## Mr. Satterfield?

1.5

2.1

MR. SATTERFIELD: My question on that is that involves two separate tracts, one in the north end of the Lillian Swamp adjoining the Lillian Swamp complex and one in the southeast corner of the property that is a DCNR and another State agency property. If we move forward on this, how will the appraisal be handled? Will that be handled — because they're not contiguous, not part of one parcel, but located in different places with adjoining lands next to them, will that be handled with two separate appraisals, one for the north property and one for the

south property? How would you go about appraising that?

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. LAWRENCE: So both of those are owned by one owner. Generally, staff would probably have that discussion with the appraiser and let the appraiser make that determination as to the highest and best use of that property and what they think it needs to -- how it needs to go about being appraised.

MR. SATTERFIELD: Well, that seems to me to be a little unusual. I would think you would want to get two different appraisals because they're in such -- even though they're the same owner, it doesn't That has nothing to do with the matter. appraised price. The appraised price is totally independent of who owns it. appraised price should be based on the characteristics of that particular piece of property, and I would think that they're different because of where they're located. One's on a major road -- the one in the south is on a major road of Boykin Boulevard. The other one is up in the northwest where there's no roads and it's all swamp. You know, they're different characteristics, so I don't think you can necessarily blend those two into one general appraisal. That's the reason I asked the question.

1.5

2.1

MR. CHILDERS: Commissioner, is it possible to ask the appraiser to do them separately?

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: We can -- yeah.

I mean, you -- we can ask them to be appraised separately or ask the appraisers once we provide them the information is that -- do they have different -- would they have different values, would that need to be done. If you would like them to have two separate appraisals, I guess we could do that.

MR. CHILDERS: I think I'd make that suggestion. If it takes a motion, I'll make a motion.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: For the Record, identify yourself, please.

1.3

2.1

MS. WEBER: Jennifer Weber. I'm an attorney with the Department of Conservation.

So if it's one nomination and you want two appraisals, then you would have to vote and approve the one nomination.

If you're trying to split it up into two separate closings, then you would need two different nominations and then you could do two separate appraisals. Does that make sense?

MR. DARNALL: It's offered as one property, and that's the --

MS. WEBER: But if you're trying to do two closings at separate times, then you would need two nominations. If the idea is to get two appraisals and do it all at the same time, you could leave it as is, one nomination. Does that make sense?

Did I answer the question?

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Go ahead, Jack.

MR. DARNALL: If I understood the conversation correctly, I think that the Belcher property was broken up and offers on this right here so we could have different appraisals?

MS. WEBER: Yes.

2.1

MR. DARNALL: So I think it would have to be represented in order to get two appraisals, if I understood you correctly. What's offered is one --

MS. WEBER: Right. One piece.

MR. DARNALL: Right, right.

MS. WEBER: But if you wanted to buy it together at the same time, you could do two appraisals. Am I understanding?

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: So the question is whether we direct the appraiser to look at these two properties separately for valuation -- not that we would close them at different times, but that you would get two valuations -- or whether we would just do one on a -- leave it to the negotiation with the appraiser if they feel like there

is a need for one appraisal that covers 1 both pieces of property or if he felt like 2 we needed to appraise them separately. 3 MS. WEBER: Yeah, that would be fine. 4 MR. CHILDERS: It seems to me that we 5 6 could get them appraised separately, and if it comes down to purchasing them, we 7 8 could make a motion to purchase A or purchase B at the appraised price. 9 MS. WEBER: So if you purchase A or 10 you purchase B, my understanding is right 11 now it's the one nomination. 12 But we don't have to MR. CHILDERS: 13 take it like that. If we get two 14 appraisals, we can change it and take one 15 and not take one. 16 MS. WEBER: 17 18

It should be then rescored and renominated as two different pieces if you want to look at it separately.

19

20

21

22

23

Well, they're certainly MR. CHILDERS: different values on the two pieces of property.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Well, that's not --

1.3

2.1

MR. DARNALL: It's got to be represented.

MR. SATTERFIELD: Mr. Chairman, it looks like they've already scored them separately. Haven't you?

MR. LAWRENCE: So the two scores that you see there on page 13, that is a Nature Preserve valuation score and a recreational valuation score. Yes, it is two scores, but it's looking at it from two different perspectives and that's how we --

MR. SATTERFIELD: I'm sorry. I'm reading it wrong.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: So I would think that we would either -- the motion is that we move for a first appraisal on this nomination as presented.

MS. WEBER: Right.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: And I think we need to vote yes or no on that. If there's the desire for the Board to have

the landowner renominate these and break them apart as two different nominations, that could be a different motion, but I think that's how procedurally we would need to handle that, not -- because what we have been presented here and what has been scored is a single nomination for both of these pieces of property that --

DR. POWERS: Chris?

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

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Powers?

So I understand the DR. POWERS: concern about the appraised value, but if we renominate it as two separate parcels, who knows if both parcels will make the cut to be able to be put on the nomination And one of the reasons I'm list. supportive of this property is because it will then be continuous throughout the So I understand the concern about region. appraised values. And this is something maybe we can have a discussion once we get to first appraisal, but the advantage to this nomination to me is it completes this corridor. And there is no guarantee that both parcels will make the cut if they're nominated separately.

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: And that's exactly If they don't make the cut, my point. that means they have different characteristics, and if they have different characteristics, the appraisals will be different. That's where I'm coming from. That's why I think we need to have separate appraisals because they're not contiguous, they're not co-located, and they have obviously different characteristics because the one in the southeast is on a major road and the one in the northwest is totally inaccessible for the public to use. think that's a really key issue, and that's why I suggest we need separate appraisals.

And I would suggest based on that,

Mr. Chairman, and your recommendation that

we vote no and send this back to the

drawing board to have further discussions with the landowner to see if he wants to bring them up as separate parcels. That's

what I would recommend.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Powers?

DR. POWERS: But, again, I mean, my point is it was scored high from a nature preserve point of view. So the reason to me -- and I'm an ecologist. I'm not a real estate person. The reason that it scored so high from that nature preserve is because it represents a continuous corridor for the animals, the movement, the nature. That's what I'm arguing for. I'm sure the properties have different characteristics that will influence the appraisal, but I'd like to see if we can get this whole corridor preserved -- or conserved.

DR. HOWELL: Could we just have an itemized appraisal where you have each parcel itemized and then added together?

MS. WEBER: Yeah. And that was --

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

right. So you could appraise them separately, but in order to move forward separately, they would have to be renominated.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Let me make sure -- that's a very good point. So if somebody made a motion to move for a first appraisal on this nomination but to have the different parcels itemized in the appraisal, then we would have all the information I think that you're asking for.

MS. WEBER: Correct.

DR. POWERS: And I'm fine with amending the motion to do that.

MS. LEWIS: It would probably also cost less to do one appraisal than two separate appraisals.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: So, again, we have a motion and a second on the floor. Would you like to withdraw the motion?

DR. POWERS: Or if we could just do it as a friendly amendment. And I will just

add to it that the appraisal be itemized for the parcels involved. And it's my understanding, as long as my second is fine with that friendly amendment, that we could proceed.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Are you good with that, Mr. Darnall?

MR. DARNALL: Yes, sir.

1.5

MR. LAWRENCE: Can I clarify something right quick? I was talking to Jennifer just trying to think ahead a little bit.

If we do itemize the appraisal and the Board wanted to move forward with a second or like one or the other, it would then need to come up as a new nomination at that point. Y'all would not be able to move forward on one or the other even though you had the itemized appraisal, if that makes sense.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Okay. So the motion now as amended is for a first appraisal on the Lillian Swamp-Blackwater Addition with the appraisal to be itemized

for each of the two portions of the nomination. Is that --

1.5

All right. All those in favor say aye.

Any opposed?

Any abstentions?

The motion carries.

Thank you.

DR. MCCLINTOCK: Commissioner?

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. McClintock?

DR. MCCLINTOCK: I'd like to move for second appraisal on the purchase of the Oak Mountain SP-Belcher Addition Phase II under the rationale that I believe the per-acre valuation that that property represents, its heightened potential for development, because this is the last chance to add a significant acreage to the Oak Mountain State Park, because this property has unusually high recreational value, and because it's potentially one of the premier parks in the state of Alabama.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: So the motion

is for a second appraisal and move to purchase on the Oak Mountain-Belcher Phase

MR. CHILDERS: I'll second.

Is there a second?

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Seconded by

Mr. Childers.

II.

1.5

2.1

Any discussion?

MR. SATTERFIELD: Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP:

Mr. Satterfield?

MR. SATTERFIELD: I really like where this property is located in that it could perhaps be an extension of the Oak Mountain State Park because it's almost contiguous to the Belcher property. I say almost contiguous because it's separated from the Belcher property by a railroad, which makes access from the Belcher property that's already been purchased problematic back and forth across the railroad. So it would have to be managed as really a separate piece of property with different access and trail

locations and so forth.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

My second concern about this property is the premium that the appraisal has come back in. It's essentially a significant premium over what we purchased the Belcher tract for. And my concern is each time we purchase another property, particularly in these locations like this, we're essentially setting a floor in the next offering of that property because we have now created an adjacent comparable. And so those are my concerns. And while I understand the interest in trying to acquire and preserve more of that to make it into the park, I just am troubled by both of those issues with this offering.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir.

Any other thoughts? Discussion?

All right. All those in favor of a second appraisal and move to purchase on the Oak Mountain-Belcher Phase II
Addition, please say aye.

Any opposed?

2.1

Let's make sure we have nine affirmative votes, so we'll just do that by raising hands.

All those in favor, please raise your hand, of moving forward with the purchase. Eight.

And then all those opposed.

All right. The motion fails by not acquiring the nine votes required for action.

DR. POWERS: Chris?

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Powers?

DR. POWERS: Sorry. I'm not sure of the formality of this, but I offer a separate motion since that one -- to proceed to purchase that same property at 80 percent of the appraised value.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: So the motion by Dr. Powers is --

DR. MCCLINTOCK: I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: -- to move

forward -- and Dr. McClintock has

seconded -- at 80 percent of the appraised 1 value to purchase. I'm sorry. Let me 2 3 make sure -- I want to make sure everybody is clear. I want to make sure I'm clear, 4 much less everybody else. But the motion 5 6 is to move forward and purchase for a value not to exceed 80 percent of the 7 8 first appraised value. So that's your motion. And that's -- you seconded, 9 Dr. McClintock? 10 DR. MCCLINTOCK: Correct. 11 MR. JONES: It hasn't had a second 12 appraisal. 13 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: That's a good 14 15 point. MR. SATTERFIELD: Can you do that, 16 Mr. Chairman? 17 DR. POWERS: I guess it's almost the 18 same as the other property. We would move 19 for the second appraisal but not move to 20 21 purchase --MR. JONES: Correct. 22 DR. POWERS: -- quite yet, that we 23

would want the second appraisal but not to move to purchase; and let the Board then look at the second appraisal, and if we wanted to offer less or --

1.5

Sorry about that, Chris.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: So you want to withdraw your original motion?

DR. POWERS: Withdraw my original motion, and then change that to move to second appraisal but not to purchase without further Board action.

DR. MCCLINTOCK: I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: So the motion is for a second appraisal, and then come back to the Board for additional direction on moving to a purchase on the Oak Mountain-Belcher.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Is that a certain percentage? I didn't understand that.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: No. This would just be a motion for a second appraisal with no further -- appraisal only. Any further action would take Board approval

after that second appraisal.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. HOLLOWAY: Understood.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: So that's second -- motion by Mr. Powers; seconded by Dr. McClintock.

Yes, sir, Mr. Darnall.

MR. DARNALL: Well, I have a couple of comments, and I guess -- I think I was the only dissenting vote on the conditional offer last time.

I understand what this Board is trying to do, and I think conceptually it I just fundamentally have a makes sense. problem with an arbitrary price reduction knowing that I'm not an expert. And so, you know, if we're going to do this for this second portion of the Belcher property, it seems to me like we ought to have a motion to get a first appraisal on the Odess portion because it's kind of all the pieces and things like that. So I'm not opposed to the motion. I just feel like we're heading in a direction that I'm just not comfortable with individually.

MR. SATTERFIELD: Mr. Chairman, I agree with Jack's concern that we're setting a precedent here that could just begin to carry over into all future properties, and I'm concerned that that would disrupt the normal process that we're required to follow under our regulations and established procedures. So I'm concerned with that.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: I understand.

But I think the motion as presented for a second appraisal only and then come back to the Board for additional direction I think would be appropriate at this time, and then the Board would have an opportunity to make further decisions on that property with the second appraisal.

So with that, I'll call the question. All those in favor of a second appraisal only on the Oak Mountain-Belcher Phase II, please say aye.

Any opposed?

1.5

MR. SATTERFIELD: No. 1 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: One opposed. 2 The motion carries. 3 Jack? 4 MR. DARNALL: I'd like to make a 5 6 motion for first appraisal on the Oak Mountain-Odess Addition, motion for 8 first appraisal. MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, discussion 9 on that? 10 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir. 11 The motion is for the first appraisal 12 on the Odess Addition. Is there a second? 13 DR. POWERS: Second. 14 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Seconded by 15 Dr. Powers. 16 Now Mr. Jones. 17 MR. JONES: Do I not understand -- I'm 18 asking staff on this -- doesn't that 19 addition have several structures on it 20 21 and, therefore, that's been an issue that we've had to deal with? 22 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: You know, we --23

that property does have several structures. Director Lein with State Parks is here. I can let him speak for himself, but we have looked -- they have looked at that and that was not a great fit for the park because it had -- because of the structures on the property.

Do you want to speak to that?

Just state your name for the Record,

please.

MR. LEIN: I'm Greg Lein. I'm the State Parks Director.

appraised property to better understand the opportunity. If the Board wanted to, you know, consider moving forward, they could adopt that appraisal, but I want to remind the Board that this nomination is unique compared to others and that it has structures on it and that has bearing on the value of the property itself. And so if you're just looking to explore the value, we already have that information.

MR. SATTERFIELD: Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP:

## Mr. Satterfield?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

MR. SATTERFIELD: Greq, I appreciate your comments. We had been operating -based on the last couple three meetings, we've been operating on the assumption that State Parks was really going to go forward with this purchase and having it appraised and bringing it into the State Parks system under the State Parks ownership because of these three structures because they're single-family residences and have significant square footage in these residences, along with this private lake, and that's why I think at least I had held off on any further consideration of this property as a Forever Wild purchase because we don't buy land that has structures on it.

And as we've seen with the Skyline WMA-Cove Addition, the way we resolved that motion today is those properties that

have the structures and the ag land and so forth on that property were going to be purchased by Wildlife through DCNR in the way the property is split. We don't have that option here. We don't have a split with Pittman-Robertson funds, say, for example, on this property. So I think that's a significant issue that would be a precedent-setting issue for this Board to do to acquire this small piece of property with these major structures on it. somebody has to go through the expense and cost of removing the structures, and I don't think we're into that business. me, that particular piece of property does not qualify as a wild property. It is a developed property. It's not what Forever Wild was set about to do. And so I would hope that we would not move forward on this given these circumstances.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thank you,

Mr. Satterfield.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

Any other thoughts or questions?

Dr. Powers?

DR. POWERS: So if Forever Wild was to acquire this land, the State Parks would have no interest in managing 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

Well, when we appraised the MR. LEIN: property, we appraised it in total. if you'll recall, over the last year our priority was to work with the Board on the Belcher opportunity, and in that situation, we did split and share the cost of that property with the Forever Wild program where the State Parks Division bought the two portions of the property where there were residences on the There was one on the south and property. one on the north. And so at the time that we looked at the Odess property ourselves, the cost of the Parks Division buying it in total was cost prohibitive because we had made a commitment to carry the cost of the two parcels on the Belcher property and conclude that transaction. So I think

if there is an interest on the part of the 1 Board to contribute to the cost of the 2 Odess property, we would just have to 3 revisit that as a fresh opportunity with 4 I didn't come here today 5 the Board. 6 prepared to suggest or offer how that could be split or how that could be 7 8 coordinated with the Board, but if that's the Board's desire that we explore that 9 and look at that, we could do that and 10 report back at a later time. 11 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Mr. Darnall? 12 MR. DARNALL: I'd like to withdraw my 13 offer. I didn't mean to create a 14 windstorm here. 1.5 COMMISSIONER BLANKENSHIP: He's going 16 to withdraw his motion. 17 MR. DARNALL: I withdraw my motion. 18

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Is that okav

with you, Dr. Powers?

DR. POWERS: Yes, sir.

I'm sorry.

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Powers says

it's okay as the seconder. So motion 1 2 withdrawn. 3 Thank you. MR. DARNALL: I don't want to be a 4 troublemaker. 5 6 Mr. Oates? 7 MR. OATES: I would like to move for a 8 second appraisal and purchase of the Red Hills-Flat Creek Phase V property. 9 10 MR. SATTERFIELD: Mr. Chairman, could you repeat the nomination for those of 11 12 us --CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: 13 Sure. Be glad to. 14 So let me ask this question of the 15 motioner. Would you like to make that 16 motion contingent on the Wildlife and 17 Freshwater Fisheries Division providing 18 grant funds? 19 MR. OATES: Yes. Should I read that 20 21 motion exactly as it's --22 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: That would

probably be good.

23

MR. OATES: Sorry. I forgot. I make 1 a motion for the staff to proceed with the 2 second appraisal and purchase of the 3 Red Hills-Flat Creek Phase V nomination 4 contingent upon Wildlife and Freshwater 5 6 Fisheries Division providing funds for its acquisition in the amount of approximately 7 8 2.6 million dollars. DR. MCCLINTOCK: I'll second that. 9 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Second by 10 11

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Second by

Dr. McClintock. So the motion is for a second appraisal and move to purchase on the Red Hills Phase V contingent upon the Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries Division providing approximately 2.6 million dollars in grant funds towards the purchase price.

Any discussion or questions about that?

All those in favor say aye.

Any opposed?

None opposed. The motion carries.

MR. OATES: I'll just note for the

21

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

Record my motion generated the least 1 discussion. 2 3 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Anything else from the Board? 4 DR. MCCLINTOCK: Yes, Commissioner, 5 6 I'd like to put a motion forward for 7 second appraisal and purchase of the 8 Cahaba River-Shelby County Park Peel Addition. 9 10 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: That property is already in negotiation. We did that at 11 the last meeting. It just hasn't closed 12 13 yet. DR. MCCLINTOCK: Okay. Thank you. 14 withdraw. 15 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Yes, sir. 16 Thank you. 17 All right. I think that's all of 18 the general discussion. 19 Next, we'll pick up on the 20 21 miscellaneous reports. Evan, you're going to handle that? 22 MR. LAWRENCE: Yes, sir. That's 23

correct.

So if everybody will turn to Tab 5b, I'll provide a -- or go over the report on proposed updated appraised nominations list.

As part of the normal process, nominations that go a certain amount of time without Board actions, those roll off. The two that are rolling off after this meeting will be Sipsey River Swamp-Brownville Addition and the Weeks Bay Reserve-Marney Addition.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: I would like to keep the Sipsey River-Brownville Addition on for one more meeting, please.

MR. LAWRENCE: Yes, sir. Any more discussion?

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: No.

MR. LAWRENCE: If everybody will turn to Tab 5c. As part of our normal process in staff, we develop tract management plans. At this meeting, we put together two plans that are in addition to existing

plans and one plan that is all new, and in order to put those plans into effect, we need to have Board action. Those would be on the D'Olive Bay Forever Wild Tract, D'Olive Bay Addition in Baldwin County, and the Turkey Creek Nature

Preserve-Parker Addition -- those two are the additions to current plans -- and the Styx River Wetlands Forever Wild Tract in Baldwin County is the new plan. I would like to point out too that 5c is two pages, and you'll see a second page there with suggested language.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Is there a motion from the Board?

Mr. Jones?

1.5

2.1

MR. JONES: I'd like to make a motion the Board through the State Lands Division proceeding with the inclusion of the D'Olive Bay Addition and Turkey Creek Nature Preserve-Parker Addition into the existing management plan and development of a new management plan for the

Styx River Wetlands Forever Wild Tract as set forth in the memorandum dated November 3, 2022.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Second.

1.5

2.1

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: The motion is approve the State Lands proceeding with the inclusion of the D'Olive Bay Addition and Turkey Creek Nature Preserve and existing management plans and then development of a new management plan for Styx River Wetlands.

All those in favor say aye.

Any opposed?

None opposed. The motion carries.

MR. LAWRENCE: Moving on. In your packet, you were provided -- in what will Tab 5d, there was a memo on the Freedom Hills-Timber Reservation Extension Request. There is some updated information in your green folder, 5j.

I'll give everybody a second to get there.

All right. So we received an extension request on a 31-acre tract in

the Freedom Hills WMA. That request comes from Mr. Tomlinson of Growing Assets. request again is for an extension on the timber reservation so they have time to harvest that timber. As part of that extension, staff suggests that we grant that request. However, there needs to be a little bit of a value swap there in order to grant that, and as a part of that value swap, Mr. Tomlinson has offered to do some management on the property in the form of fire lanes and some prescribed burning. If the Board is okay with granting that extension, there's some suggested language at the bottom of the page there.

DR. SIMS: Mr. Chairman?

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

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Dr. Sims.

DR. SIMS: I make a motion approving the State Lands Division staff finalizing an agreement granting a timber reservation extension pursuant to terms substantially similar to those detailed in the

memorandum dated November 3, 2022.

MR. OATES: Second.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Motion made by Dr. Sims; seconded by Mr. Oates.

All those in favor say aye.

Any opposed?

None opposed. The motion carries.

MR. LAWRENCE: All right. The next miscellaneous report, if you'll look under Tab 5e -- that will be in the packet that was mailed out -- there was an update from CRATA on a letter that was sent to staff. I would like to inform the Board that they have decided to pick a new location for their fire tower project and have since requested withdrawal of their proposed license agreement with the Board. The staff feel that that has been very positive, and they picked a wonderful location on Lake Martin and think they'll do good there.

All right. Moving on. Another additional item, if you will look in your

green folder under 5k. I'll give y'all a second to get there. The City of Dothan has requested -- or sent a request into staff to construct a dog park with pavilion and restroom area and a playground on the -- it's called the north trailhead of the Dothan trail park, but it's actually on the western end of the property.

1.5

2.1

As you can see -- I don't have the page number in front of me. It should be the last page in that memo, though -- there is a map of the property with an aerial view so you can kind of get a representation of where that would go. But being that this is a little bit of a different request to staff, we wanted to bring this before the Board for any discussion and to see if that was something the Board was interested in moving forward with.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Any questions from the Board or any motion?

MR. DARNALL: I make a motion for 1 State Lands staff to proceed with 2 negotiating and finalizing the license 3 agreement with the City of Dothan similar 4 to the one attached to the memorandum 5 6 dated November 3, 2022, approving the City's request to implement park 7 8 enhancements at the Forever Wild Dothan trail tract. 9 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Is there a 10 second? 11 DR. POWERS: Second. 12 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Seconded by 13 Dr. Powers. 14 Mr. Chairman? MR. SATTERFIELD: 1.5 CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: 16 Mr. Satterfield? 17 MR. SATTERFIELD: I have a question in 18 regard to that particular piece of Forever 19 Wild property. How is its use designated 20 21 now, and is this proposal consistent with that present designation? 22

Yes.

To answer your --

MR. LAWRENCE:

23

in general, yes, it is consistent with the present designation, but it is a recreational tract. There is no hunting on it. It's within city limits of Dothan. I won't say it's downtown but it's a very populated area, and it's primarily for recreational use.

MR. SATTERFIELD: That's what I wanted to know.

Thank you.

1.5

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All those in favor say aye.

Any opposed?

No opposed. The motion carries.

MR. LAWRENCE: That was all I had for the -- I think. Unless I have missed something -- that should be all that we have for the miscellaneous report.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Thank you.

The next item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes from the August 4th quarterly meeting. Those are in Tab 6 in your folder. Is there a

motion to accept the minutes?

MR. DARNALL: So moved.

DR. SIMS: Second.

1.5

2.1

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Motion by

Mr. Darnall; seconded by Dr. Sims.

Any additions? Corrections? Changes?

All those in favor of approval of the minutes from the August 4th meeting say aye.

Any opposed?

None opposed. The motion carries.

The next meeting will be February the 2nd in Montgomery at the Alabama Activity Center, the RSA Activity Center on Dexter. And then our meetings — you'll see in Tab 7, we'll meet in Guntersville in May and then the Mobile area more than likely at the University of South Alabama in August and the Auburn area on November 2nd next year. Maybe Auburn will have them a good coach by then.

But I do have some presentations that I would like to make. Do you have something else?

1.5

2.1

MR. LAWRENCE: No, that was it.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: They're making sure I didn't forget.

We have three Board members that have served with great distinction over the many years that I've been on the Board. I have appreciated serving with them and would like to recognize them individually.

So, Dr. Sims, I have enjoyed getting to know you and learning about the work that you do at Drake State and all the good things in North Alabama and other things you're involved in. And I will sorely miss seeing you on the Board, but we'll have opportunity, I think, to work together on some of the other things that you do for the State of Alabama and places that you serve. So thank you so much for your service on the Board.

DR. SIMS: It's been a pleasure.

Thank you.

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

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: And our next member is probably -- I would like to say is probably the most active Board member that I have ever had on the Forever Wild Board and that's Mr. Wright, Mr. David Wright. Mr. Wright does a fantastic job and is very thorough at looking at the properties and is very thoughtful, and I appreciate your professionalism and dedication to the decisions that you've made on the Board and information you've provided over the five years that I've been here. I've enjoyed serving with you very much.

MR. WRIGHT: Chris, it's been an honor. It's been an honor to serve with all of y'all. I'm sorry I'm such a problem over in the State Lands office -- I wanted to tell Patti that -- but she's officially through with me.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Well, I will

say this. You are dedicated, and when you commit to doing something, you take it very seriously and put the time in to make sure that your input is valued and that it does have value and that you really put the time in on the decisions that you make. I thank you and I've enjoyed very much getting to know you.

MR. WRIGHT: It's been an honor,
y'all.

Thank you.

1.5

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: And then last but not least, Mr. Bill Satterfield.

Mr. Satterfield has, as you heard from Pat Byington, been involved in the program since its inception. And I appreciated getting to know you, appreciated your insight and history of the program, and the thoughtfulness and thoroughness of the questions and the examination of the properties in the process over the last several years and look forward to continuing to maybe call you from time to

time if I need answers for some history and how things work going forward. I hope that you'll be available for phone calls.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. SATTERFIELD: Thank you, Chris.

And as Pat said, today is the 30th anniversary of Forever Wild, but I've had actually a 32-year love affair with Forever Wild because that began with Jim Martin when he had the inspiration to create Forever Wild. And I had the benefit of working with him and the drafting committee and the legislature on getting amendment passed in the legislature and then approved by the So I've enjoyed my service with public. Forever Wild for 32 years and in particular my service with the fellow Board members here and you in particular.

In closing, I'll say from now on you'll probably have shorter Board meetings.

CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: Let me get all three of you back up here, please, to take

a picture together. And that's all the business that I think we have today. I will entertain a motion to adjourn. MR. JONES: So moved. MR. SATTERFIELD: Second. CHAIRMAN BLANKENSHIP: All those in favor say aye. We are adjourned. Thank you. (Proceedings concluded at 12:17 p.m.) 

## 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
November 3, 2022, I reported the
proceedings in the matter of the foregoing
cause, and that pages 3 through 87 contain
a true and accurate transcription of the
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 11th day of January, 2023.

1.5

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