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TRIBAL SHIPPING ADDRESSES

1. Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma
Ms. Karen Kaniatobe
Director of the Cultural/Historical Preservation Department
2025 South Gordon Cooper Drive
Shawnee, OK  74801
405-275-4030 ext. 124
Tribal Leader:  Scott Miller, Governor

2. Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas
Mr. Bryant Celestine, Historical Preservation
571 State Park Road S6
Livingston, TX 77351
936-563-1181
Tribal Leader: Oscola Clayton Sylestine, Principal Chief

3. Alabama-Quassarte Tribal Town of the Creek Nation of Oklahoma
Ms. Rovena Yargee, Historical Officer
101 East Broadway
Wetumpka, OK 74883
405-452-3987
Tribal leader: Tarpie Yargee, Tribal Town Chief

4. Caddo Tribe of Oklahoma
Mr. Robert Cast, THPO
5 miles East Intersection 281 and 152
Binger, OK 73009
405-656-2901
Tribal Leader: LaRue Martin Parker, Chairperson

5. The Catawba Tribe of South Carolina
Dr. Wenonah Haire, CIN-THPO
1536 Tom Steven Road
Rock Hill, SC 29730
803-328-2427
Tribal Leader: Donald Rogers, Chief

6. The Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma
Dr. Richard Allen, Ed.D., THPO
22361 Bald Hill Road, 74464
Tahlequah, OK 74464
918-456-0671
Tribal Leader: Chadwick Smith, Principal Chief

7. The Chickasaw Nation
Ms. Virginia Nail, THPO
2020 East Arlington, Suite 4
Ada, OK 74820
580-436-2603
Tribal Leader: Bill Anoatubby, Governor

8. Chitimacha Tribe of Louisiana
Kimberly S. Walden, Cultural Director
3289 Chitimacha Trail
Charenton, LA 70523
337-923-4395
Tribal Leader: Lonnie Martin, Tribal Chairman

9. Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma
Mr. Terry D. Cole, Director Historic Preservation Dept
3010 Enterprise Boulevard
Durant, OK 74701
580-924-8280
Tribal leader: Gregory E. Pyle, Chief

10. Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana
Dr. Linda Langley, Section 106 Contact
1940 CC Bell Road
Elton, LA 70532
337-584-2261
Tribal Leader: Kevin Sickey, Tribal Chairman
11. Eastern Band of the Cherokee Nation
Russell Townsend, THPO
Tyler Howe, Section 106 Specialist
88 Council House Loop
Cherokee, NC 28719
828-497-2771
Tribal leader: Michell Hicks, Principal Chief

12. Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma
Robin Dushane, Cultural Preservation Officer
127 West Oneida Street
Seneca, MO 64865
918-666-2435
Tribal leader: Glenna J. Wallace, Chief

13. Jena Band of Choctaw Indians
Christine Norris, Chief
1052 Chanaha Hina Street
Trout, LA 71371
318-992-2717
Tribal leader: Christine Norris, Chief

14. Kialegee Tribal Town of the Creek Nation of Oklahoma
Jennie Lillard, Town King/Mekko
627 East Highway 9
Wetumpka, OK 74883
405-452-3262
Tribal leader: Jennie Lillard, Town King/Mekko

15. Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida
Mr. Steven Terry, Land Resources Manager
U.S. 41, Mile Marker 70
Tamiami Trail
Miami, FL 33144
305-223-8380
Tribal Leader: Billy Cypress, Chairman

16. Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians
Mr. Kenneth H. Carleton, TPHO
101 Industrial Road
Choctaw, MS 39350
601-656-5251
Tribal leader: Beasley Denson, Chief

17. Muscogee (Creek) Nation of Oklahoma
Ms. Joyce Bear, THPO
Highway 75 and Loop 56
Okmulgee, OK 74447
918-732-7600
Tribal Leader: A.D. Ellis, Chief

18. Poarch Band of Creek Indians
Mr. Robert Thrower, THPO
5811 Jack Springs Road
Atmore, AL 36502-5025
251-368-9136
Tribal Leader: Buford Rolin, Chairman

19. Quapaw Tribe of Oklahoma
Carrie V. Wilson, THPO
5681 South 630 Road
Quapaw, OK 74363-0765
918-542-1853
Tribal Leader: John Berrey, Chairman

20. Shawnee Tribe
Ms. Kim Jumper, THPO
29 South Highway 69A
Miami, OK 74355
918-542-2441
Tribal Leader: Ron Sparkman, Chairman

21. Seminole Nation of Oklahoma
Ms. Jennifer Johnson, THPO
Junction 270 and 56 Highway
¼ Mile East on 270
Wewoka, OK 74884
405-257-7200
Tribal Leader: Enoch Kelly Haney, Principal Chief

22. Seminole Tribe of Florida
Mr. Willard Steele, THPO
6300 Stirling Road
Hollywood, FL 33024
954-966-6300
Tribal Leader: Mitchell Cypress, Acting Chairman/President
23. Thlopthlocco Tribal Town
Mr. Charles Coleman, Warrior, THPO
Exit 227, 7 miles east of Okemah on I-40
Okemah, OK  74859
918-560-6198
_Tribal Leader:_ Vernon Yarholar, Mekko

24. Tunica-Biloxi Tribe of Louisiana
Earl J. Barbry, Jr., Director, THPO
151 Melacon Drive
Marksville, LA 71351
318-253-9767
_Tribal Leader:_ Earl J. Barbry, Sr., Chairman

25. United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians in Oklahoma
Lisa Stopp, CSI Office, THPO
18771 Wiskeetoowah Circle
Tahlequah, OK  74464
918-431-1818
_Tribal leaders:_ George C. Wickliffe, Chief

26. Santee Sioux Tribe of the Santee Reservation Nebraska
Mr. Roger Trudell, Chairman
108 Spirit Lake Avenue West
Niobrara, NE  68760
402-857-2772
_Tribal Leader:_ Roger Trudell, Chairman
Ms. Karen Kaniatobe  
Director of the Cultural/Historical Preservation Department  
Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma  
2025 South Gordon Cooper Drive  
Shawnee, OK  74801

Dear Ms. Kaniatobe:

The U. S. Department of Energy (DOE) is beginning the process of preparing an environmental impact statement (EIS) under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for DOE’s involvement in the proposed Kemper County Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) Project under the Clean Coal Power Initiative (CCPI) Program. DOE published a Notice of Intent to prepare the EIS on September 22, 2008. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) will be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the EIS. DOE and the Corps are also required to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) for this undertaking as well as with NEPA. The Mobile District of the Corps would be managing the Corps participation in this process.

The proposed IGCC is an electrical generating facility. It would be constructed on an approximately 1,650-acre undeveloped site located in east-central Mississippi near the town of Liberty, in Kemper County. This site is approximately 20 miles north of the city of Meridian (see enclosed map). It is estimated the IGCC facility would occupy approximately 150 acres of the site. The balance would remain undeveloped, with the exception of new transmission lines, a natural gas supply pipeline, a carbon dioxide (CO2) pipeline and site access and fuel handling infrastructure. While the proposed project would consist of the gasifiers to generate synthesis gas from lignite coal, cleanup systems, two combustion turbines and heat recovery steam generators, a steam turbine, and supporting facilities and infrastructure, the EIS will also address the proposed construction and operation of the neighboring surface lignite coal mine, associated transmission lines (and substations), CO2 capture systems and CO2 pipeline, and a natural gas pipeline, as connected actions.

The proposed mine would be operated by North American Coal Corporation and would provide the primary source of fuel for the project. The outer boundary of the mining area would encompass approximately 31,000 acres principally in Kemper County and partially in Lauderdale County. Within this area, a total of approximately 15,500 acres would be disturbed and reclaimed over the life of the mine. Mining would disturb uplands, wetlands and require stream diversions. The proposed mine would use draglines and a truck and shovel operation to remove the overburden, mine the lignite coal, and reclaim the site in accordance with an approved mine plan. The lignite coal would be transported by truck and/or overland conveyor. Following lignite removal, approximately 275 acres/year of mined land would be restored to approximate the pre-mine land contour and re-vegetated to a land use consistent with an approved mine reclamation plan.

The purpose of this letter is to notify your tribal government of this project and to request a response as to whether this proposed project may have any potential effects to any historic properties of traditional religious or cultural importance to your tribe. If you need any additional information to make this determination, please contact George Pukanic at 412-386-6085 or by email at pukanic@netl.doe.gov. If we do not receive a response from you by October 30, 2008, we will assume you have not identified any potential effects to such resources and that it is not necessary to involve you further in our NEPA and NHPA reviews.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Hargis, Jr.  
National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Document Manager

Enclosure
Mr. Richard A. Hargis, Jr.
NEPA Document Manager
U. S. Department of Energy
National Energy Technology Laboratory
P. O. Box 10940
Pittsburgh, PA 15236

October 08, 2008

Re: Proposed Kemper County IGCC Project

Dear Mr. Hargis, Jr.:

At this time, we have no interest in this site. However, we would like to reserve the right to participate in future consultation if discoveries are made or resources are impacted that are of significance to the Seminole Nation of Oklahoma.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact my office.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jennifer Johnson, M.Ed
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
October 21, 2008

George Pukanic  
U.S. Department of Energy  
National Energy Technology Laboratory  
P.O. Box 10940  
Pittsburg, PA 15236

Dear Mr. DeMarcay,

On behalf of Chief Oscola Clayton Sylestine and the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe, our appreciation is expressed on your efforts to consult with us concerning the proposed Kemper County Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle in Kemper County.

Our Tribe maintains ancestral associations within the state of Mississippi despite the absence of written records to completely identify Tribal activities, villages, trails, or grave sites. However, our objective is to ensure any significances of Native American ancestry including the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe are administered with the utmost regard.

Upon review of the September 24, 2008 information summary submitted to our Tribe, impacts to religious, cultural, or historic assets of the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas could not be ascertained. In the event of inadvertent discovery of human remains and/or archaeological artifacts associated with this project, activity in proximity to the location must cease immediately and appropriate authorities, including this office, notified without delay.

Should you be in need of additional assistance, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Respectfully submitted,

Bryant J. Celestine  
Historic Preservation Officer

Telephone: 936 – 563 – 1181  
celestine.bryant@actribe.org  
Fax: 936 – 563 – 1183
22 October 2008

Attention: Richard A. Hargis, Jr.
NEPA Document Manager
PO Box 10940
Pittsburgh, PA 15236

Re: THPO # 2008-29-25
Project description, project location:
US Dept Energy National Energy Tech. Lab. EIS for proposed Kemper County Integrated Gasification

Dear Mr. Hargis,

The Catawba Indian Nation THPO will defer comment on this proposed project to those federally recognized Indian Tribes whose cultural and geographic affiliation to this area are closer than our own. These sites are not within the geographic area that is reviewed by the Catawba Indian Nation THPO.

If you have questions please contact Beckee Garris 803-328-2427 x 232 or email beckeeg@ccppcrafts.com.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Wenonah G. Haire
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Mr. Meling,
Thank you for taking the time to send me replacement copies. Because the proposed mining project has the potential to impact sites of historic and/or cultural significance to the Coushatta people, the Tribal Council has asked me to express their ongoing interest in the project. Please continue to keep me on the project mailing list so that I can give the Council regular updates on the progress of the project.

Thank you again,
Linda Langley, Ph.D.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Jeff Meling" <jmeling@ectinc.com>
To: llangley@mcneese.edu
Sent: Wednesday, November 19, 2008 2:52:28 PM GMT -06:00 US/Canada Central
Subject: consult letter

Dr. Langley,

Thanks for taking the time to speak with me. Here are the missing letters. I’d appreciate your email reply stating interest. Thanks again.

Jeffrey L. Meling, P.E.
Senior Vice President
Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.
3701 NW 98th Street
Gainesville, FL 32606
jmeling@ectinc.com
Off (352) 332-0444, ext 11352
Mr. Pukanic

Thank you for informing the Jena Band of Choctaw Indians of this proposed project for the Kemper County IGCC power plant project and mine and supporting facilities.

At this time, the Jena Choctaw are only concerned with the areas of LaSalle, Grant, and Rapides Parishes in Louisiana. with that being said we will more than likely not participate in the tribal consultation.

if i can be of any further assistance please do not hesitate to call.

Lillie McCormick
Environmental Director
Jena Band of Choctaw Indians
Ph: 318-992-8258
Fax: 318-992-8244
lmccormickjbc@centurytel.net

---

Quoting George Pukanic:

As per our telephone conversation, attached please find a project fact sheet and a map for the proposed Kemper County IGCC power plant project and mine and supporting facilities. After you have reviewed the information on the project, please let me know of your interest in participating in a tribal consultation meeting for the project. If you are interested, DOE’s environmental support contractor (Environmental Consulting and Technology, Inc.) will be contacting you concerning arrangements for a tribal consultation meeting. In any event, you will be included on the distribution list for the draft and final Environmental Impact Statements for the project.
A meeting was held in Jackson, MS, to discuss cultural resources matters associated with the proposed Kemper County IGCC Project and to consult with representatives of interested tribes. Two tribes sent representatives: Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians and Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma. The agenda for the meeting was:

- Introductions.
- Project overviews and updates given by DOE, Mississippi Power and North American Coal.
- Preliminary reports on field surveys and findings.
- Review of draft Programmatic Agreement.
- Other matters of interest to participants.

The list of meeting attendees is attached. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers was also invited but was unable to send a representative. Information handed out during the meeting is also attached (maps showing locations of cultural resources sites have been omitted from the attachments due to the sensitivity of the information).

The meeting began at approximately 9:30 a.m. with an invocation given by Olin Williams.
Following attendee introductions, John Templeton gave an overview of the project, then Joel Truart presented NAC’s surface lignite mine plans. Truart stressed that all land potentially impacted by mining activities will be surveyed for cultural resources and that, given the long-term nature of surface mining, these surveys will be ongoing for decades.

Ken Carleton noted that the long-term nature of survey activities drives the need for a Programmatic Agreement, which should secure the consultation rights of interested tribes and be signed by all appropriate parties.

It was noted that DOE should involve the Advisory Council.

The discussion focused for some time on the particulars of a PA. It was noted that DOE’s direct involvement with the project would end with the completion of the demonstration program (although with some uncertainty regarding the possible Loan Guarantee aspect).

Carleton agreed that an initial PA running through the end of the demonstration program was sensible, although he stressed that he would want the Corps and MDEQ as signatories from the start to provide continuity for the subsequent PAs not requiring DOE’s involvement.

Janet Rafferty summarized the work done to-date to survey portions of the potential mine area. She stated the goal of completing field surveys for the entire mine area and completing assessments of eligibility by the end of 2009.

Hunter Johnson summarized the field work and results of the surveys of planned transmission line and NG pipeline corridors. He noted that 8 potentially eligible sites had been found.
Jeff Meling summarized the similar work completed by another contractor on the southern 40-mile stretch of planned CO$_2$ pipeline corridor.

Carleton expressed satisfaction with the amount of cultural resources survey information and the level of detail in the summary reports.

It was agreed that MDAH and the tribes would be sent the draft Phase 1 reports for their review and comment.

George Pukanic returned the discussion to the PA and provided an outline. It was generally agreed that the outline constituted a good start to DOE generating an initial draft.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:30 p.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Phone #</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Meling</td>
<td>ECT, Inc.</td>
<td>(352) 382-0444</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmeling@ectinc.com">jmeling@ectinc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Harris</td>
<td>U.S. DOE</td>
<td>412-386-3605</td>
<td><a href="mailto:harris@oak.doe.gov">harris@oak.doe.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Abbott</td>
<td>MDHA</td>
<td>601-376-6940</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ddabbott@mdha.state.ms.us">ddabbott@mdha.state.ms.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth A. Balter</td>
<td>MS Choctaw</td>
<td>601-655-7916</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kabalter@chodaw.org">kabalter@chodaw.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark L. McKay</td>
<td>U.S. DOE</td>
<td>304-285-4426</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mckay@wvdoe.wv.gov">mckay@wvdoe.wv.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Warren</td>
<td>Southern Company</td>
<td>205-357-6947</td>
<td>dhw Warren @ southernco.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grady Moore</td>
<td>Balch &amp; Bingham</td>
<td>(205) 226-8718</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gmoore@balch.com">gmoore@balch.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olin Williams</td>
<td>Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma</td>
<td>580-924-8280</td>
<td><a href="mailto:owilliams@choctaw.net">owilliams@choctaw.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Johnson</td>
<td>TVAR</td>
<td>(502) 283-4519</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hunter@tvaresearch.com">hunter@tvaresearch.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Bell</td>
<td>RHIC</td>
<td>812-357-5260</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rebecca.bell@nessal.com">rebecca.bell@nessal.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Tipton</td>
<td>RHIC</td>
<td>662-357-5200</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ftipton@nessal.com">ftipton@nessal.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Troubet</td>
<td>NACC</td>
<td>219-300-8210</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jtroubet@nacci.com">jtroubet@nacci.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Rafferty</td>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>662-325-7521</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rafferty@anthro.mississippi.edu">rafferty@anthro.mississippi.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Templeton</td>
<td>MPC</td>
<td>228-893-4332</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jtemple@southco.com">jtemple@southco.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Pitcherie</td>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>412-386-6085</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pitcherie@nati.doe.gov">pitcherie@nati.doe.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Dielk</td>
<td>MOAN</td>
<td>601-576-6945</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pdielk@indah.state.ms.us">pdielk@indah.state.ms.us</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mississippi Power is revolutionizing the electric utility industry as we know it in Kemper County, Mississippi. Taking unprecedented steps towards the advancement of clean coal technology, Mississippi Power’s state-of-the-art Kemper County IGCC Project is the first of its kind in the world to lead the way in providing affordable, reliable and yes, cleaner energy for Mississippi Power customers, Mississippians and Americans alike.

This literature will provide you with a comprehensive look at the Kemper County IGCC Project as well as explain what makes this advanced technology so extraordinary and how clean coal technology is possible.

*The question is, are you ready to be a part of the future of generating electricity today?*

We believe you are. And we believe Mississippi is the right state and Mississippi Power is the right company to show the world we can make coal, the country’s most abundant fuel alternative, work for our environment and our customers’ pocketbooks.
**Why Kemper County?**

Imagine electricity being supplied across the South with power generated in Mississippi, by Mississippians, with a resource from Mississippi. The unique geology of Kemper County makes this vision possible.

Kemper County possesses a generous supply of lignite coal, a lower-grade coal with very little market application except in a mine-mouth operation like that being considered. Lignite is one of many types of low rank coals that make up half the proven U.S. and worldwide coal reserves. Mississippi has a lion’s share of that coal with an estimated 4 billion tons of lignite reserves. Mississippi Power wants to turn this otherwise underutilized resource into economic opportunity for citizens of Kemper County and Mississippi.

By combining Mississippi lignite and advanced technology, Mississippi and Mississippi Power can help lead the way in demonstrating that we can make coal, the country’s most abundant fuel alternative, work for our environment, our state and our citizens.

The advanced coal gasification facility will draw interest from all over the world and ultimately bring a brighter future to Kemper County and the state of Mississippi.

**Contact Us**

We encourage you to stay informed as the facility is being constructed and put into commercial service in 2013 by visiting our website at [www.mississippipower.com/kemper](http://www.mississippipower.com/kemper) and signing up for regular updates on this exciting project.

You can also email your questions to kemper@southerncp.com or call Mississippi Power Corporates Communications at 1-800-532-1502 to speak with a company representative.

---

Dear Citizen:

We are proud to announce our proposal to build the most technologically advanced electric coal-based generating facility in Kemper County. We expect to achieve three very significant objectives.

First, at Mississippi Power we must plan for the future. This facility will allow Mississippi Power to meet the growing energy needs of our customers as well as be prepared for future energy load growth to successfully accommodate the steady stream of economic development happening in our state. Industry and development will not come without reliable power to light the way. Secondly, President Barack Obama has made clean energy a top national priority. His campaign platform was to “develop and deploy clean coal technology” and we believe we can play a role in that critically important goal by building one of the first, if not the first, full-scale clean coal technology generating facility in the nation. Lastly and perhaps arguably most important to our customers, the utilization of Mississippi lignite as our primary fuel source makes this project the most economical decision for our customers. It provides a fuel source independent from natural gas and coal, and will lessen the grip of volatile and unpredictable fuel markets on our state and our nation. The energy benefits of this project significantly outweigh the upfront capital investment.

After more than a decade of concentrated research and more than two years of due diligence and commitment from my company, Mississippi Power is ready to move forward. Clean coal technology using IGCC is a sound, contemporary solution that will help resolve the long-standing energy and environmental issues facing this country.

The proposed new facility would make a remarkable impact in this area and to the state as a whole. With this project, we can strengthen the Mississippi economy, reduce our national reliance on foreign fuels and protect the environment.

Thank you for your ongoing interest and support as Mississippi Power plans the next generation of coal plants and positions Mississippi as the model for making coal, our country’s most abundant source of energy, work cleaner and smarter for our customers and our environment.

Sincerely,

Anthony Topazi, President and CEO
Mississippi Power
**Simplified Diagram of IGCC with CO₂ Capture™**

**WHAT IS IGCC AND HOW DOES IT WORK?**

The power generating plant proposed for Kemper County is an Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) design.

Unlike a conventional coal-fired power plant – which burns coal to produce heat that converts water into steam that drives a steam turbine-generator – an IGCC plant turns the coal into a synthesis gas called syngas that is used to fuel a combined cycle generating plant.

The figure above is a simplified depiction of the IGCC gasification technology design for the Kemper County IGCC Project.

The IGCC plant will be fueled with lignite which is surface mined at the mine site adjacent to the plant. The lignite will be delivered to the plant over conveyors through crushers, into silos and then into dryers where the lignite is dried to approximately one half of its original moisture content.

The lignite is then pulverized and fed into the gasifier. Inside the gasifier, a proven chemical process heats the lignite and extracts the syngas.

After the syngas is cooled, it goes through the processes necessary to remove the particulates, sulfur, nitrogen oxides (NOₓ) and mercury contained in the syngas.

In the next stage, carbon dioxide (CO₂) is removed from the syngas stream. This CO₂ is then compressed and delivered for sequestration via an enhanced oil recovery process.

The cleaned syngas is then used to fuel a combined cycle generating plant similar to the natural gas-fired combined cycles at Mississippi Power's Plant Daniel.

This combined cycle configuration consists of two gas turbines with associated generators, two heat recovery steam generators and a single steam turbine with its generator.

The syngas powers the two gas turbines and the gas turbine exhaust provides heat to the HRSGs to produce steam which drives the steam turbine.

The combined output of the generators is delivered to the electric grid.
Frequently Asked Questions

What Kind of Power Plant is Being Proposed by Mississippi Power?
The proposed electric power plant is a 582-megawatt integrated gasification combined cycle (IGCC). IGCC is an advanced gasification plant and a combined cycle plant designed specifically to work together. The clean coal facility will be located in Kemper County, Mississippi, approximately 50 miles north of Meridian. It will be owned and operated by Mississippi Power.

Why Does Mississippi Power Need to Build a Power Plant?
The state of Mississippi is growing, and Mississippi Power must plan for the future needs of its customers. After considering fuel and generation diversity, risk of environmental regulation, customer load growth and the available capacity options, Mississippi Power’s planning process indicates a need for additional electricity by the summer peak season of 2014.

Why Did Mississippi Power Choose Kemper County for a Power Plant?
Mississippi Power assessed numerous sites in the state to build a potential IGCC power plant to serve customers. The best site turned out to be outside Mississippi Power’s service territory in Kemper County, because it takes advantage of an untapped, natural resource — Mississippi lignite; is close to lignite and natural gas; and provides geographic diversity to help balance the electric demand and strengthens electric reliability in Mississippi.

What is the Economic Impact on the Region? (Jobs, Tax Revenue, Etc.)
Mississippi Power’s capital investment will be approximately $2.2 billion, which will greatly expand the local tax revenue. About 260 permanent jobs, plus 1,000 jobs during peak construction, will be created. Revenue from the project will enhance local schools, lower property taxes, and will help first responders.

What Environmental Impact Will This Plant Have on the Region and the State?
The Kemper County IGCC plans to capture and sequester 50 percent of the plant’s CO₂ emissions. In addition, the plant has fewer nitrous oxide, sulfur dioxide and mercury emissions than traditional pulverized coal plants.

What is “Clean Coal Technology”?
The IGCC process sends coal through a device called a gasifier. By being subjected to high temperatures and high pressure in the gasifier, the coal undergoes a chemical reaction that creates a synthesis gas. The cleaner “syngas” is then used in a gas turbine to generate power with fewer emissions than traditional coal plants.

How Is CO₂ Used in Enhanced Oil Recovery (EOR)?
Much of the facility’s CO₂ byproduct will be sold for EOR. CO₂ injection is a common method of EOR, in which the CO₂ is injected into abandoned oil wells to force oil out of the ground.

What Will the Plant Look Like?
In appearance, this plant will not be unlike other types of generating plants. Mississippi Power takes great pride in being a partner in the communities in which we live and work, and will ensure the plant’s appearance and integration into the Kemper County community are in keeping with all community standards and regulations.

What is the Noise Level Like?
Neighbors can expect a quiet operation from the project proposed in Kemper County, with noise levels at the site boundary being lower than those of a normal conversation.
How will the fuel be brought into the plant?
All lignite will be transported internally on the mine and plant site by trucks and conveyors that will not cross public roads. Natural gas will be routed to the site from the Tennessee Gas pipeline, which already exists near the property boundary.

Will there be more traffic on Kemper County roads?
Yes. During construction, crews will use an access road just south of Hwy. 493 to enter the plant site. Once operational, the facility will sell byproducts from plant operations which will be transported in approximately 12-15 truckloads per day.

Does Kemper County have to pay for new or improved roads necessary for the power plant?
The county will improve roads and bridges with tax revenue and other sources derived from the project.

What will this do to Kemper County hunting and fishing?
In a similar arrangement with a generating plant and an adjacent mining site in Choctaw County, deer, birds and other wildlife coexist with the project. We expect the same peaceful habitat at the Kemper County IGCC facility.

When do you anticipate construction of the plant?
Construction of the plant is subject to Mississippi Public Service Commission approval. We expect to begin construction in 2010.

Does Mississippi Power hire locally or use its own crews?
Plant operating staff can be hired locally or from within the company, depending upon qualifications. Mississippi Power continually seeks qualified employees. Go to Careers at www.mississippipower.com to submit a resume and/or apply for current job openings.

What happens to the power plant after the lignite supply is exhausted?
How many years will the whole operation last?
Over the life of the plant, only a small fraction of proven lignite reserves in Mississippi will be utilized. Typically, the life expectancy of power plants is 30-40 years, but Mississippi Power plants boast a successful history of being well-maintained and stay in operation longer than the industry standard.
PROJECT HIGHLIGHTS

DEMAND
- Mississippi Power has a need for a new base load generation resource by 2014.
- Mississippi Power has completed financial, technology, environmental and fuel assessments and determined the Kemper County Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle Project provides the lowest cost and is the best alternative of new generation for our customers.

FEDERAL FUNDING
- To offset the costs to construct the facility, Mississippi Power has received a $270 million grant from the Department of Energy for the project and $133 million in investment tax credits approved by the Internal Revenue Service and provided for under the National Energy Policy Act of 2005.

LOCAL IMPACT
- The Kemper IGCC plant, a 582-megawatt lignite-fueled generating facility is a $2.2 billion dollar total investment. Tax revenues from the project will enhance local schools, provide for lower property taxes and help equip first responders.
- The plant and adjacent lignite mine will be situated on approximately 1,650 acre site, located in southwest Kemper County between Hwy. 493 and Hwy. 495, south of Hwy. 16.
- The total acreage expected to be mined over the 40-year life of the project is 10,000 acres. Roughly 899 acres will be in active mining use at any given time.
- This facility would create approximately 500 new construction jobs (1,000 at the peak of construction), for approximately three years. Once put into operation, the facility, owned and operated by Mississippi Power, will require 80-100 permanent jobs while the lignite mining operation will require an additional 180 permanent jobs.

LIGNITE
- The facility will utilize approximately 300,000 tons of locally mined lignite per month or almost 140 million tons over its expected 40-year life.
- Lignite, an abundant local resource, is an affordable fuel alternative and not subject to the highly volatile pricing swings experienced with natural gas and transported coal.

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY
- The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Mississippi Power’s parent company, Southern Company of Atlanta, Georgia, and KBR have conducted partnership research on advanced coal technologies at the Power Systems Development Facility (PSDF) outside Birmingham, Alabama, for more than a decade readying the innovative technology for commercial application.
- IGCC is a coal gasification plant and a combined-cycle plant designed specifically to work with each other.
- The facility will use advanced coal gasification technology called TRIG™ (Transport Integrated Gasification), developed at Southern Company’s PSDF in Wilsonville, Alabama.
- The advancement of clean coal technologies is critical to our nation’s energy future. TRIG™ technology will show the world we can make coal, the country’s most abundant fuel alternative, work for our environment.
- The TRIG™ technology being utilized for the Kemper County IGCC Project will capture and sequester 50 percent of the plant’s CO₂ emissions. With 50 percent CO₂ capture, the plant’s emissions would be comparable to natural gas-powered generation.
- CO₂ captured for the plant will be sequestered via Enhanced Oil Recovery (EOR). EOR is a process where CO₂ can be injected into depleted oil fields, generating more domestic oil production and sequestering CO₂.
**DEMAND**
- Mississippi Power has a need for a new base load generation resource by 2014.
- Mississippi Power has completed financial, technology, environmental and fuel assessments and determined the Kemper County Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle Project provides the lowest cost and is the best alternative of new generation for our customers.

**FEDERAL FUNDING**
- To offset the costs to construct the facility, Mississippi Power has received a $270 million grant from the Department of Energy for the project and $133 million in investment tax credits approved by the Internal Revenue Service and provided for under the National Energy Policy Act of 2005.

**LOCAL IMPACT**
- The Kemper IGCC plant, a 582-megawatt lignite-fueled generating facility is a $2.2 billion dollar total investment. Tax revenues from the project will enhance local schools, provide for lower property taxes and help equip first responders.
- The plant and adjacent lignite mine will be situated on approximately 1,650 acre site, located in southwest Kemper County between Hwy. 493 and Hwy. 495, south of Hwy. 16.
- The total acreage expected to be mined over the 40-year life of the project is 10,000 acres. Roughly 899 acres will be in active mining use at any given time.
- This facility would create approximately 500 new construction jobs (1,000 at the peak of construction), for approximately three years. Once put into operation, the facility, owned and operated by Mississippi Power, will require 80-100 permanent jobs while the lignite mining operation will require an additional 180 permanent jobs.

**LIGNITE**
- The facility will utilize approximately 300,000 tons of locally mined lignite per month or almost 140 million tons over its expected 40-year life.
- Lignite, an abundant local resource, is an affordable fuel alternative and not subject to the highly volatile pricing swings experienced with natural gas and transported coal.

**RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY**
- The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Mississippi Power’s parent company, Southern Company of Atlanta, Georgia, and KBR have conducted partnership research on advanced coal technologies at the Power Systems Development Facility (PSDF) outside Birmingham, Alabama, for more than a decade redefining the innovative technology for commercial application.
- IGCC is a coal gasification plant and a combined-cycle plant designed specifically to work with each other.
- The facility will use advanced coal gasification technology called TRIG™ (Transport Integrated Gasification), developed at Southern Company’s PSDF in Wilsonville, Alabama.
- The advancement of clean coal technologies is critical to our nation’s energy future. TRIG™ technology will show the world we can make coal, the country’s most abundant fuel alternative, work for our environment.
- The TRIG™ technology being utilized for the Kemper County IGCC Project will capture and sequester 50 percent of the plant’s CO₂ emissions. With 50 percent CO₂ capture, the plant’s emissions would be comparable to natural gas-powered generation.
- The CO₂ captured for the plant will be sequestered via Enhanced Oil Recovery (EOR). EOR is a process where CO₂ can be injected into depleted oil fields, generating more domestic oil production and sequestering CO₂.
Cultural Resources Meeting – Kemper County ICGG/Mine Project

Jackson, MS

February 5, 2009

NACC Overview and Update:

1. Timeline with detail:
   a. Initial cultural resources report for the EIS: January 2009
   b. Ongoing cultural resources field work for the MDEQ permit: to be finished June 2009
   c. MDEQ permit preparation starts in February 2009 with a submittal of February 2010
   d. MDEQ review starts February 2010 and it is anticipated to be complete February 2011
   e. Anticipated MDEQ permit approval: February 2011
   f. Dragline shipped to Kemper County by August 2009 (Page 757)
   g. Dragline construction starts December 2009 and should be completed by June 2011.

2. Permitting process with regard to cultural resources:
   a. The work for the EIS provides a representation of the density and types of cultural resources to be expected on the mine site. As Janet will address, there were 170 sites in 21% of the mine project area. (I don’t think a direct correlation to 100% of the project is appropriate at this juncture.)
   b. Ongoing cultural resource field work is occurring for the state mine permit. This work will cover the majority of the remaining mine project acres with special emphasis on the first five years of mining and mine related disturbance.
   c. The ultimate goal is to have 100% Phase I cultural resources survey on the Life of Mine disturbance site by mid-year 2009 and, once approved, to initiate the Phase II assessment on the first five year blocks in subsequent years.
   d. Even as each mine block is cleared through the Phase I, II, and III process, as mining and soil disturbance occurs these areas are visually monitored for evidence of additional cultural resources.

3. The mine plan for Kemper County:
Systematic Archaeological Survey of a Mine Area in Kemper and Lauderdale Counties, Mississippi

Janet Rafferty
Jeffrey Alvey
Keith A. Baca

Cobb Institute of Archaeology
Mississippi State University
P.O. Box AR
Mississippi State, MS 39762

Submitted to North American Coal Corporation by Cobb Institute of Archaeology, Mississippi State University

January 2, 2009
Management Summary

This report presents the results of systematic, intensive archaeological survey of 21% (6,461 acres) of the 30,420 acre lignite mine area proposed by North American Coal Corporation and to be located in Kemper and Lauderdale counties, Mississippi. The report’s focus is on the data, including location, site description, artifact analysis, and chronological and use information, that has been recorded for 170 archaeological sites that were found in the 21% survey. The report is planned to be used in support of the Environmental Impact Statement for the project to be prepared by the Department of Energy. In order to obtain information on the diversity of site locations in the area, the survey was stratified by soil slope categories. The amount surveyed in each of the four strata reached the 19-22% level, so it is believed that the archaeological sites found include most of the kinds of sites that will be found in the ongoing 100% survey of the proposed mine area. Efforts to complete the full survey continue, with that anticipated to occur by the end of May, 2009. The final report on all of the Phase I work, covering 100% of the proposed mine area, will be submitted to North American Coal Corporation by December 31, 2009. Included in that report will be National Register significance assessments for archaeological sites, cultural landscapes, and standing structures in the mine area. These latter include houses, stores, and bridges, the recording and assessment of which will be done by an architectural historian.

The fieldwork methods used in the 21% archaeological survey followed the plan proposed to North American Coal, with shovel testing at 30 meter intervals in all areas covered with forest, pasture, or other vegetation and that had slopes between 2 and 8%. Floodplain areas were tested using a tractor-mounted auger, with holes being placed at 500 meter intervals. No evidence of buried soil horizons or artifacts was found in the augering program. Land with a greater than 8% slope was not shovel tested, but was walked over in order to identify any areas of lesser slope, which were tested.

Artifact analyses were done to extract chronological, use, and technological data for each assemblage. Detailed analysis of aboriginal and historic period pottery, glass, projectile points, and lithic debitage was included. The 170 sites found in the 21% sample included 44 dating to the prehistoric/Protohistoric/Historic Indian periods, 91 that contained historic components only, and 35 that produced evidence of both aboriginal and historic period artifacts.

This survey represents part of a Phase I effort, the goal of which is to find, record, and assess the significance of as many archaeological sites and standing structures as possible within the project area. Significance will be linked to National Register of Historic Places eligibility statements, as required under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. A plan for significance assessment of archaeological sites is included in the report, but such assessments cannot be made until the completion of the 100% survey. Significance will be assessed by using information on occupational duration and intensity, combined with measures of the richness and evenness of artifact classes in each assemblage.
Project impact assessment will be an important step before Phase II and Phase III archaeological work can be planned. Impacts to archaeological sites come primarily from ground-disturbing activities, including mining, road construction, utility line placement, and other related work. Impacts to standing structures additionally may include viewshed alterations and activities that affect the integrity of the structure’s setting. Such impacts cannot be assessed until the mine plan has been completed by North American Coal Corporation. Once this has been done, it will be possible to identify which archaeological sites, cultural landscapes, and structures, among those that have been found to be potentially eligible for the National Register, will be impacted and the kinds of impacts that are likely. Potentially eligible sites that will be adversely impacted will then require Phase II work to decide whether they are eligible or ineligible for the Register. In cases where sites are determined eligible in the Phase II work, Phase III archaeological work will be necessary. Included within Phase II and Phase III work will be plans to investigate all Protohistoric/Historic Choctaw sites, as these are of special concern to the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians because they may contain burials. Impacts on eligible cultural landscapes and standing structures can be mitigated through recording them, as well as through use of buffer zones, viewshed protection, and other changes to project plans, if necessary.
Kemper County IGCC Project
Phase I Cultural Resources Surveys

Southern 40 miles of CO₂ pipeline corridor surveyed by New South Associates, Inc. New South found:

- 33 archaeological sites and 20 isolated finds.
- 1 archaeological site recommended as eligible for NRHP listing.
- 13 sites recommended as potentially eligible for listing.
### Archaeological Sites Identified by New South as Eligible or Potentially Eligible for NRHP Listing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Site Number</th>
<th>Field Site Number</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Size (meter)</th>
<th>Depth (cm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22LD743</td>
<td>SG-4-01</td>
<td>Undiagnostic Prehistoric lithic artifact scatter and Historic artifact scatter</td>
<td>80 × 40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22LD744</td>
<td>SG-6-01</td>
<td>Late Archaic Period and Undiagnostic prehistoric lithic artifact scatter and residual sherd</td>
<td>60 × 50</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22LD745</td>
<td>SG-6-02</td>
<td>Undiagnostic Prehistoric lithic artifact scatter and residual sherd</td>
<td>20 × 40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22LD746</td>
<td>SG-6-03</td>
<td>Undiagnostic Prehistoric lithic artifact scatter</td>
<td>20 × 25</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22LD748</td>
<td>SG-7-01</td>
<td>Late Archaic/Early Woodland Period Prehistoric lithic artifact scatter</td>
<td>20 × 20</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22LD750</td>
<td>SG-9-03</td>
<td>Woodland Prehistoric lithic and ceramic artifact scatter</td>
<td>10 × 30</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22LD752</td>
<td>SG-9-06</td>
<td>Undiagnostic Prehistoric lithic artifact scatter</td>
<td>20 × 30</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22LD755</td>
<td>SG-10-01</td>
<td>Middle to Late Archaic Period Prehistoric lithic artifact scatter</td>
<td>60 × 60</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22CK653</td>
<td>SG-11-04</td>
<td>Early to mid twentieth century historic artifact scatter</td>
<td>70 × 60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22CK657</td>
<td>SG-13-02</td>
<td>Undiagnostic Prehistoric lithic artifact scatter</td>
<td>10 × 30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22CK659</td>
<td>SG-14-02</td>
<td>Undiagnostic Prehistoric lithic artifact scatter</td>
<td>35 × 20</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22CK660</td>
<td>SG-14-03</td>
<td>Undiagnostic Prehistoric lithic artifact scatter</td>
<td>40 × 20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22JS671</td>
<td>SG-19-01</td>
<td>Undiagnostic Prehistoric lithic artifact scatter</td>
<td>40 × 40</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22JS674</td>
<td>SG-23-01</td>
<td>Woodland Period Prehistoric lithic and ceramic artifact scatter</td>
<td>130 × 20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Information on Eligible and Potentially Eligible Sites

Archaeological Site **22LD755** is a mid- to late Archaic site that was recommended as *eligible* for NRHP. The site’s dimensions were found to be 60 meters north-south by at least 60 meters east-west within the corridor. The site appeared to continue outside the corridor to the east and west. This site exhibited evidence that recent looting had occurred. There was a cut into the bank of the Chunky River that extended approximately 20 meters onto the landform exposing soils and lithic artifacts. Shovel size and shaped holes were present in and along the cut bank and lithic artifacts were observed in small piles near these areas. A total of 15 shovel tests were placed at the site, and 12 contained artifacts. A surface inspection and collection was made in the exposed areas. No diagnostic artifacts were observed on the surface. It was suspected that the looters collected any diagnostic projectile points/knives and, therefore, none were recovered during the current survey. A total of 401 lithic artifacts were recovered from the surface and from shovel tests excavated; artifacts were recovered between 0 to 130 centimeters below surface (cmbs). A proximal and medial portion of a projectile point/knife was recovered but could not be clearly identified by type; it is believed to date to the mid- or late Archaic periods.


Site **22CK653** is an early to mid-20th century historic artifact scatter likely associated with a farmstead. A total of 82 artifacts were recovered from shovel tests, and most were identified as kitchen remains including glass and ceramics. Eleven architectural artifacts were recovered including five brick fragments, five nail fragments, and one piece of flat glass, indicating the likelihood that a house or other building once stood here. Fragments of a tobacco tin were also recovered. A possible subsurface feature was encountered in one shovel test. At approximately 60 cmbs, burned clay and a dense charcoal lens were encountered. The function of the feature was unclear. A large circular depression approximately 2 by 2 meters in size was observed between three trees. The nature of the depression was unclear, and no artifacts were found in association with the feature. It is possible that the depression is a well.

Site **22CK657** is an undiagnostic prehistoric lithic scatter. It probably continues west outside of corridor. Due to the size and slope of the landform, only one additional shovel test was excavated east of the initial positive test. Both shovel tests contained a total of 26 pieces of lithic debitage. Artifact density from the initial positive shovel test was moderately high and appeared to yield artifacts from two separate levels or cultural strata (0 to 30 and 30 to 100 cmbs).

Site **22CK659** is a prehistoric lithic artifact scatter. A total of 85 artifacts were recovered from the shovel tests, including 61 Tallahatta Quartzite lithic artifacts, 20 unmodified sandstone fragments, and four pieces of hardened clay or daub.

Site **22CK660** is a prehistoric lithic artifact scatter, possibly extending outside the corridor to the west. A total of 12 lithic artifacts were recovered, including six shatter fragments, two flake fragments, one interior flake, one primary flake, one biface thinning flake, and one core. Site 22CK660 is separated from 22CK659 by what appears to be a
breach in the landform. It is possible that the two sites are related or were once the same site.

Site 22JS671 is an undiagnostic prehistoric lithic scatter. It is possible that the site continues to the west, outside the corridor. A total of eight lithic artifacts were recovered, including one chert uniface fragment and three chert shatter fragments.

Site 22JS674 is a Woodland period lithic and ceramic scatter. The site continues west outside the corridor. A total of 30 prehistoric artifacts were recovered including two sand tempered sherds and three residual sherds. The ceramic artifacts recovered were collected from between 10 and 30 cmbs, while lithics appeared to be present between 60 and 70 cmbs.

Site 22LD743 was found to consist of an undiagnostic prehistoric lithic and ceramic scatter. The site was believed to continue outside of the project area to the west. A total of 42 prehistoric artifacts were recovered, including 38 lithic artifacts, two prehistoric ceramics, and two red ochre fragments. Of the lithic artifacts recovered, two projectile point/knife fragments were recovered. Unfortunately, they were unidentifiable as to type.

Site 38LD744 is a late Archaic lithic artifact scatter and residual sherd. The site appears to extend outside the corridor to the west. A total of 224 lithic artifacts were recovered. All of the lithic material was identified as Tallahatta Quartzite, with the exception of one chert biface fragment. One projectile point/knife, a late Archaic stemmed point, was recovered. One residual sherd and one fragment of fossilized animal bone were also recovered.

Site 38LD745 is an undiagnostic prehistoric lithic scatter and residual sherd. The site is essentially surrounded by wetlands. A total of 62 pieces of prehistoric lithic debitage were recovered, as well as one residual sherd.

Site 22LD746 is an undiagnostic prehistoric lithic scatter. Eighty-eight lithic artifacts were recovered including one core and a Stage 2 biface.

Site 38LD748 is a late Archaic/early Woodland period lithic scatter. A total of five lithic artifacts were recovered including a complete projectile point/knife to a depth of 70 cmbs. The point resembled late Archaic/early Woodland styles with a triangular blade and long rounded contracting stem. The stem was longer than the blade, and it was found likely that the blade was modified from its original length to the current form.

Site 22LD750 is a Woodland lithic and ceramic scatter. A total of 24 lithic artifacts were recovered as well as one decorated sand tempered sherd of an undetermined type.

Site 22LD752 is an undiagnostic lithic scatter. A total of 24 lithic artifacts were recovered including 10 interior flakes, seven flake fragments, four biface thinning flakes, and three shatter fragments down to 70 cmbs.
Draft Outline

Elements for Consideration in Programmatic Agreement For the Kemper County IGCC Project

Tribal Consultation Meeting February 5, 2009
WHEREAS CLAUSES

I. PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT AND NEED FOR A PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

II. ROLES OF SIGNATORIES

III, STATUTORY BASIS

STIPULATIONS

I. COMPONENTS OF THE UNDERTAKING

This section would describe the components of the project to be covered by this Programmatic Agreement:

A. IGCC Power Plant
B. Lignite Mine
C. Transmission Lines
D. Pipeline Corridors
E. Substation Modifications
F. New Access Roads
G. Staging/Laydown Areas
H. Borrow Areas
I. Other Areas

II. AREAS OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS (APEs)

This section would describe the area of potential effect for the components listed in (I) above, as well as the process to be followed for amendments to APEs.

III. STANDARDS

This section would describe the professional qualifications required of persons involved in the identification, treatment, etc., of cultural resources, as well as documentation and curation standards.

IV. IDENTIFICATION

This section would describe the steps involved in the identification of cultural resources.

A. Records, Literature and Site File Check:
B. Phase I Surveys

C. Phase II Surveys

D. Confidentiality:

V. DETERMINATIONS OF ELIGIBILITY

This section describes the process by which a determination of eligibility to the National Register is made, including the roles of the signatories in making this determination.

VI. DETERMINATIONS OF EFFECT

This section will describe the procedure for the responsible Federal agency to follow in making an effect determination.

VII. HISTORIC PROPERTIES TREATMENT PLAN

This section will describe the procedure to follow in developing a treatment plan, including avoidance and mitigation.

VIII. REVIEW, COMMENT, AND CONSULTATION

This section will describe the procedure for the responsible Federal agency to follow in distributing and finalizing reports and plans, as well as the responsibilities of signatories in reviewing the reports and plans.

IX. DISCOVERIES AND UNANTICIPATED EFFECTS

This section will describe the implementation of a plan for discovery of cultural resources.

X. DISCOVERY OF HUMAN REMAINS OR CULTURAL ITEMS

This section will describe the procedure to follow in the event that human remains or cultural items are discovered during inventory, testing, mitigation or any construction-related activities.

XI. UNDERTAKING MODIFICATIONS

This section describes the procedure for modifying the treatment plan (VII above).

XII. INITIATION OF CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES
This section describes conditions under which construction activities can be initiated.

XIII. AMENDMENTS TO AGREEMENT

This section describes the process to follow in amending the agreement.

XIV. DISPUTE RESOLUTION

This section describes the procedure for dispute resolution (36 CFR 800.13).

XV. REVIEW OF PUBLIC OBJECTIONS

XVI. REQUIREMENTS OF STATE AGENCY PARTICIPATION

XVII. TERMINATION

XVIII. DURATION OF THIS AGREEMENT

XIX. FUNDING

SIGNATORIES

APPENDICES/ATTACHMENTS
June 23, 2009

John Templeton
Mississippi Power
PO Box 4079
Gulfport, Mississippi 39502-4079

Dear John Templeton:

We have reviewed the following proposed project(s) as to its effect regarding religious and/or cultural significance to historic properties that may be affected by an undertaking of the projects area of potential effect.

Project Description: Cultural Resource Survey of a 40-mile Pipeline

Comments: Please keep the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma Tribal Historic Preservation office apprised of what is close to potentially register-eligible sites. Please contact our office @ 1-800-522-6170 ext. 2137 with any questions.

Sincerely,

Terry D. Cole
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma

By: [Signature]
Ian Thompson PhD, RPA
NAGPRA Specialist/Tribal Archaeologist
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma

IAT:vr

RECEIVED
JUL 7 - 2009