

**PROGRESS ENERGY
YADKIN-PEE DEE RIVER PROJECT RELICENSING
MEETING SUMMARY
TERRESTRIAL RESOURCES WORKING GROUP
MEETING No. 4
November 14, 2003**

The following is a summary of the items and issues that were discussed during the fourth meeting of the Terrestrial Working Group held on November 14, 2003 in Pinehurst, NC. The meeting agenda and sign-up sheet are provided as Attachment A.

- (1) Scott Fletcher of Devine Tarbell & Associates, Inc. (DTA) introduced himself as a consultant for Progress Energy serving in the capacity of Meeting Leader. All attendees introduced themselves and their affiliation. Scott reviewed the agenda for the meeting, a copy of which had been provided to all attendees.

Meeting Purpose: The first and second Resource Working Group (RWG) Meetings resulted in the preparation of a comprehensive list of issues. Progress Energy had grouped the issues in advance of the second RWG. Since the second RWG meeting, held June 11th, Progress Energy had prepared Issue Evaluation Templates for each of the 10 identified and agreed-to issues. The use of the Issue Evaluation Templates provides a consistent approach for the assessment of each identified issue. The initial point of the issue evaluation process results in one of the following conclusions:

- (a) There is sufficient existing information to address some or all of the issue.
- (b) A study is needed to address the issue.
- (c) There is no Project effect or the issue is not relevant to relicensing; therefore, no study is needed.

On August 5, 2003, Progress Energy distributed the completed Issue Evaluation Templates to the RWG members for review and comment. The purpose of the fourth meeting was to review each of the issues for which draft study plans had been prepared and previously forwarded to the RWG members.

- (2) Review of RWG Meeting No 3 Meeting Summary

Scott referred to the meeting summary for Meeting No 3 that had been forwarded to the members of the RWG and asked if there were any comments. There were no comments on the meeting summary; but some stakeholders asked for additional review time. All agreed to an extension to November 21 (no additional comments were received.)

(3) Issue Evaluation Template Review

Scott explained that Robin Bryson of Progress Energy and he would be going through the Issue Evaluation Templates for which study plans were prepared. A copy of each draft study plan as previously forwarded to RWG members is included as Attachment B. A brief description of the discussion on each study plan is provided below.

(a) Issue No 1 – Monitoring of RTE Species

Progress Energy reviewed the study plan for this issue. Progress Energy was asked if the study would be limited to the Project Boundary. They answered that it would be largely limited to the Project Boundary; but if habitat types suitable for RTE species are found adjacent to, or extending from, the Project Boundary, then these also would be subject to directed searches. Regarding downstream of Blewett Falls Dam, Progress Energy does not believe, and no evidence exists, to indicate that RTE species are affected by the regulated operation of the Project. However, if studies being conducted under the Water Resources RWG Issue No 6 (Floodplain Connectivity) and Terrestrial Resources RWG Issue No 2 & 7 (see below) indicate potential RTE species impact, then directed searches and monitoring would occur.

It was also clarified that:

- (i) no nighttime sampling is being proposed
- (ii) GIS database will provide information on water level fluctuation areas along the reservoir shoreline
- (iii) Progress Energy transmission lines are already covered by a management plan specifically protecting RTE species
- (iv) Progress Energy will forward the list of potential RTE species to resource agencies prior to field work
- (v) Progress Energy will examine project structures for bat use, but will not be sampling, i.e. using mist nets
- (vi) Progress Energy will add meander survey techniques to the scope of work
- (vii) Progress Energy clarified that the spacing between point counts would be 700 feet or a change in habitat

(b) Issues No 2 and 7 – Downstream Project Effects on Wildlife

Progress Energy clarified, upon comments by Eric Krueger (TNC), that if floodplain habitats are studied (depending on the results of Water Resources Issue No 6), then the field work would be habitat based on an aerial extent, not just along a sectional line.

(c) Issue No 4 – Operational Effects on Waterfowl Habitats and Wetlands

Scott Fletcher reviewed the study plan, and clarifying that the inundation and exposure of the project wetlands and waterfowl habitats would be examined as to frequency, amount, timing, and duration, and aerial extent.

Progress Energy agreed/commented, upon comment by Chris Goodreau, that:

- (i) Lake Tillery was to be included in the assessment and Progress Energy would add this to Section 5.4
- (ii) Future operational scenarios would be assessed using the results of Cheops modeling, GIS information, and the application of professional judgment (versus a specific model, e.g. HEP) related to the probable impacts of these habitats of potential new operating scenarios.

(d) Issue No 8 – Wildlife Inventories

Progress Energy clarified the following aspects of this study plan:

- (i) Progress Energy committed to providing the list of specific areas to be inventoried to RWG members prior to the start of field work
 - (ii) Progress Energy indicated it would GPS-locate and map the areas surveyed
 - (iii) Progress Energy indicated that the study plan was specifically not an effort to evaluate and categorize all Progress Energy lands adjacent to the Project Boundary
 - (iv) An area of natural beaver marshes on the Richmond side of the river downstream of Blewett was mentioned in the meeting. This area is outside the Project Boundary and Project influence, but may provide opportunities as off-site mitigation and enhancement.
- (4) It was agreed by all at the meeting that since there was general agreement on the study plans, with the changes agreed to in the meeting, that the final review and acceptance of the Study Plans could be handled electronically.
- (5) Progress Energy thanked all the participants for their work, dedication, and active involvement. The potential for further cooperative relicensing meetings would be discussed with the participants after the issuance of the Final Study Plans.

ATTACHMENT A

**MEETING AGENDA
MEETING PARTICIPANT SIGNUP SHEET**

AGENDA
PROGRESS ENERGY
YADKIN-PEE DEE RIVER PROJECT
TERRESTRIAL RESOURCES WORKING GROUP
MEETING NO. 4
NOVEMBER 14, 2003
9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| 1. Meeting Purpose and Introductions | 9:00 – 9:10 |
| 2. RWG Meeting No. 3 Meeting Minutes | 9:10 – 9:20 |
| 3. Review of Draft Study Plans | 9:20 – 11:45 |
| 4. Agenda for Meeting No. 5 | 11:45 – 12:00 |

Terrestrial RUG meeting
Yadkin-Pee River Project

11/14/03

Name	Organization	E-mail
Jody Cason	Long View Associates (Yadkin)	jrcason@att.net
Eric Krueger	The Nature Conservancy - SC	ekrueger@tnc.org
John Crutchfield	Progress Energy	john.crutchfield@pgnmail.com
Scott Fletcher	Devine Tarbell + ASSO	Scott.Fletcher@devinetarbell.com
Steve Cahoon	Progress Energy	Steve.Cahoon@pgnmail.com
Robin Bryson	Progress Energy	robin.bryson@pgnmail.com
CHRIS GOUDREAU	NCWRC	goudrecj@wnclink.com
Todd Ewing	NCWRC	todd.ewing@ncwildlife.org
Bruce Sorrie	NCNHP	bsorrie@earthlink.net
Phil Lucas	Progress Energy	phillip.lucas@pgnmail.com
John Devine	DTA	john.devine@devinetarbell.com
BARRY ARNEY	PROGRESS ENERGY	barry.arney@pgnmail.com

ATTACHMENT B

ISSUE EVALUATION TEMPLATES