



BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Aquatic Resources Working Group

May 13, 2004

9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

U.S. Forest Service

Conference Room A/B (425-775-9702)

21905 64th Avenue West, Mountlake Terrace, WA

AGENDA

1. Review Agenda, Notes, Actions	9:00 – 9:30
2. Fish Passage Technical Working Group Report	9:30 – 10:00
3. Instream Flow Technical Working Group <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Refinements to SNF.04/Status of New HYDROPS Runs• Summarize Action/Decision Items <i>Break at 10:30</i>	10:00 – 12:00
<i>Lunch (meeting snacks or bring your own)</i>	12:00 – 12:20
4. Policy Team Report & Status Draft Proposed Actions <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 3.1.1 Provide Fish Propagation & Enhancement• 3.4.1 Implement Fluvial Geomorphic Management• 3.4.3 Shoreline Erosion Management• 3.4.4 Aquatic Habitat Restoration	12:20 – 1:30
5. Study Updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A01a/b/A26b: Reservoir Tributary Study: <i>Final Draft Report</i>• A05: Water Quality Sampling: <i>Final Draft Report</i>• A15: Upper Baker Delta Scour: <i>Draft Report</i>• A24: Part 1: Hydrology: <i>Final Draft Report</i>• A37: Without Project Alternative: <i>Draft Report</i>	1:30 – 2:55
6. Set Agenda for June 10, 2004 (9:00-3 USFS-Mountlake Terrace)	2:55 - 3:00

May 13, 2004

Driving Directions to US Forest Service Office:

- 1) Driving North from Seattle (or South from Everett) on I-5, take the 220th St. SW exit (exit 179).
 - 2) Turn west (right if from southbound I-5, left if from northbound I-5) onto 220th St. SW.
-



-
- 3) Drive west about a block and turn right onto 64th Ave W.
 - 4) The office building is about ¼ block down the street on the right side of the road.
-

BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

AQUATIC RESOURCES WORKING GROUP MEETING

**May 13, 2004
9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.
U.S. Forest Service Building
Conference Room A/B, Mountlake Terrace, WA**

FINAL MEETING NOTES

Team Leader: Arnie Aspelund, PSE (arnie.aspelund@pse.com)

ATTENDEES: Arnie Aspelund and Cary Feldmann, Jory Oppenheimer (HDR), Stan Walsh (Skagit River Systems Cooperative), Arn Thoreen, (SFEG), Dick Raisler (Fidalgo Fly Fishers), Scott Lentz by phone and Dean Grover (USFS), Mike Stansbury and Jeff McGowan (Skagit County Public Works), Brad Caldwell and Bob Wright (DOE), Steve Fransen (NMFS), Ruth Mathews (TNC), Chuck Ebel (ACOE), Irena Netik by phone (Powel Group), Gary Sprague (WDFW), Phil Hilgert (R2), Lyn Wiltse, facilitator and Mary Jean Bullock, note taker (PDSA Consulting Inc.)

Future 2004 Baker Aquatic Meetings: June 10, August 12, September 9, October 14, November 11, December 9. These meetings will be at the Forest Service in Mountlake Terrace (except October & November meetings are at Bellevue).

Note: Our July meeting has been cancelled.

Future Instream Flow Meetings

May 24: Conference Call from 9:30-11:30, June 24: In person at Mountlake Terrace from 9:00-2:00.

Announcements:

Arn Thoreen invited the group to attend the annual “Maltby Party” during the weekend of August 13-15. More on this later.

Agenda for May 13, 2004 at the USFS Building in Mountlake Terrace (Start at 9:00)

1. Review Agenda, Notes, Actions
2. Fish Passage Technical Working Group Report
3. Instream Flow Technical Working Group
 - Refinements to SNF.04/Status of New HYDROPS Runs
 - Summarize Action/Decision Items
4. Policy Team Report & Status Draft Proposed Actions
 - 3.1.1 Provide Fish Propagation & Enhancement
 - 3.4.1 Implement Fluvial Geomorphic Management
 - 3.4.3 Shoreline Erosion Management
 - 3.4.4 Aquatic Habitat Restoration
5. Study Updates:
 - A01a/b/A26b: Reservoir Tributary Study: *Final Draft Report*
 - A05: Water Quality Sampling: *Final Draft Report*
 - A15: Upper Baker Delta Scour: *Draft Report*
 - A24: Part 1: Hydrology: *Final Draft Report*
 - A37: Without Project Alternative: *Draft Report*
6. Set Agenda for June 10, 2004 (9:00-3 USFS-Mountlake Terrace)

NEW ACTION ITEMS

- Arnie: Update schedule.
- Arnie: Reserve phone line for May 24 Conference Call and June 24 Instream Flow Meeting.
- Cary: Re-visit the widest operating range possible (with new runners etc.) with Joel.
- Gary: Work on “back of the envelope” costs of proposed 3.1 PME by March 19th.
- Stan: Review 3.4.1 and suggested wording changes and send to Arnie to distribute by May 15.
- Arnie: Follow up on who is issuing shoreline permits. Are they required for CZMA and 401? Bob shared his perspective that shoreline permits need to be handled by local jurisdictions before the State can issue CZMA.
- Cary: Explore possible costs of coordinating flows with Seattle City Light, also “abusing “ existing runner in a controlled fashion so that it’s a goner just before it is replaced.
- Phil: Begin an economic analysis of “no generation band” idea.

OLD ACTION ITEMS

- Cary: Verified that SNF.03 and .04 had been run with Skagit County’s flood control storage of 150K acre feet. When these runs are complete, share the results.
 - Irena confirmed that SNF.03 was run with Skagit County’s (prior) flood proposal of 140 K acre-feet, but it failed due to violating recreation reservoir levels and exceeding the flood rule curve in 1996.
- Lyn: Checked with the Cultural Working Group re: flexibility of water levels to protect cultural resources. There is no flexibility.
- Greta: Checked with Jan Hollenbeck re: heritage resources – Was there overlap with HPMP and shoreline erosion? We agreed to accept Greta’s recommendation that we go along with the schedule outlined in the HPMP.

- Arnie: Sent out Instream Flows announcement of April 14, meeting from 9:00-12:00, including location asap.
- Arnie: Made changes to PME purpose statements and sent to Legal Working Group to refer to for License Article language. The next Legal Working Group meeting where Aquatics PMEs will be discussed will be June 7.
- Ruth: Emailed IHA handout to Arnie so he could include it with draft notes of this meeting.

FISH PASSAGE TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP REPORT

Steve reported that things were on schedule as of April 13. They are on the critical path. Any delays at this point will likely translate into a delay in implementation by one year. The new barrier guide net and the Net Transition Structure were discussed. Arnie narrated a Power Point slide show of these new structures.

Arnie reported that current out-migration from Upper Baker has been 130,000 since implementing these. We are on track for one of our highest out migrations!

INSTREAM FLOW TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

The minutes from the April 14th meeting were amended: On page 2, we changed the discussion of IHA modifications to “between October 21 – March 31” (instead of until March 1). The last sentence fragment on flood control will be deleted.

Phil reported on the status of the various iterations of the SNF runs. SNF.06 was requested by Margaret. SNF.07 was requested by Ruth and SNF.08 is a combination of these two runs. Each of these with PSE’s proposed flood control became PSE.21, .22, and .23 respectively. These runs are posted to the eRoom under ARWG.051304, Scenario Details. In summary, there isn’t much difference environmentally or economically among runs SNF.04, .06, .07 and .08.

We noted that past years of record aren’t necessarily predictors of future weather trends. We may need to use adaptive management to revise the flow regime under conditions of extreme drought. We will address this in the coming months. How we respond will also be season-dependent.

Next Steps: Look at the IHA factors associated with these runs. We’ll then do a Level 4 Analysis of two runs to compare to PSE.01.

A Conference Call meeting of the Instream Flows Teamlet will take place be Monday, May 24 from 9:30 – 11:30. The aim of this conference call would be to identify an SNF run and corresponding PSE run for the Level 4 analysis.

What should interim flows look like after the IPP runs out in 2006?

PSE’s proposal calls for a 5 year delay (total of 9 years), with a continuation of the IPP (aimed at protecting Chinook).

Our aim is to narrow the gap between spawning and incubation flows. Do existing facilities provide any flow continuation? Yes, by spilling. This would result in 3 million dollars a year in lost revenue. With

regard to 401 certification, it would be difficult to defend a 5 year delay with known impact to fish. They would need an improved IPP to buy a delay.

We brainstormed the following options to improve the IPP:

- Reduce a maximum flow during critical periods?
- Decrease spawning flows?
- Increase minimum flow?
- Coordinate flow with City Light to reduce spawning impacts?
- Look at ramping rates?
- Look at pulsing (running 2 hours on/2 hours off)?
- Pulsing with shorter intervals?
- Front load fish habitat restoration efforts aimed at the target fish (those negatively affected by flow delay/IPP).
- Trade out existing turbine?
- Delay implementation of propagation, PME?
- Increase size of the pie.

Regarding coordination with Seattle City Light, PSE might pay them to provide flows. They might also do a power trade or set a schedule of how much they generate and when (PSE would generate in the “valleys”). Phil noted that Seattle City Light has a pretty flat flow in October. There is not much opportunity to “fill valleys”. There are limited opportunities to augment incubation flows. If you assume 80 cfs, you can calculate a range of flows in the main stem Skagit River above the Baker confluence that you know you can protect. This range of flows creates a “band” during which we wouldn’t want to generate.

There is a Total Dissolved Gas (TDG) issue with cavitation that needs to be addressed.

POLICY TEAM MEETING(S) REPORT & STATUS: DRAFT PROPOSED ACTIONS

PSE will respond to the latest Agency/NGO settlement proposal at the Policy Team Meeting Monday, May 17 at the Embassy Suites in Lynnwood. We delayed discussing PMEs pending the outcome of Monday’s meeting.

3.1.1 Provide Fish Propagation & Enhancement

Not discussed today.

3.4.1 Implement Fluvial Geomorphic Management

Not discussed today.

3.4.3 Shoreline Erosion Management

Not discussed today.

3.4.4 Aquatic Habitat Restoration

Not discussed today.

STUDY UPDATES

A01a/b/A26b: Reservoir Tributary Study: *Final Draft Report*

A preliminary draft report was issued last October. It received some Forest Service comments in December. Phil proposed the October draft report be considered the final draft report as the Forest Service comments can be addressed in a transmittal letter (May 5) that will accompany this report. One of Scott's concerns was the estimates used for production potential. Scott agreed that his concern was adequately addressed in the transmittal letter. We agreed to make these final draft documents. Both the letter and the October report will be posted to the web site.

A05: Water Quality Sampling: *Final Draft Report*

The final Study Report is complete and posted on the website. Arnie distributed hard copies and CDs of the report and supporting appendices.

The monitoring program ran for two years to reflect a variety of flow conditions. The Study focused on temperature, TDG and turbidity. The temperature is in compliance about 98% of the time. TDG was monitored at the adult fish trap and had a 5% exceedence of State criteria (during down-ramping). This may result from the injected air to reduce cavitation. Turbidity monitoring included tributaries. There was wide variation depending on the glacial content of the water. Turbidity levels weren't compared to State standards. The October flood caused increased turbidity levels in the reservoir, Baker and Skagit Rivers. This lasted through the monitoring period (February).

A15: Upper Baker Delta Scour: *Draft Report*

The report is not yet out. Phil is currently editing the draft to be received from Sue.

A16 Lower Baker River Alluvial Fan Assessment

R2 is in the midst of re-doing A16 with a 1,000 cfs instead of 300. Plans are to have those results in time for our June meeting.

A24: Part 1: Hydrology: *Final Draft Report*

The Final Report will be posted on the website. Comments and responses are included in the back of the Report.

A37: Without Project Alternative: *Draft Report*

The Draft Report is out. It shows two without Project scenarios, as outlined in the Study Plan. Assumptions are consistent with the T7B Study (Terrestrial Working Group).

MEETING EVALUATION

What Went Well

- Got out early
- Good attendance
- Sang in tune
- Mmmm! Brownies!
- Power Point slides of new fish passage facilities.

What Needs to Change

Baker River Project Relicense

FERC Project NO. 2150

Aquatics Resources Working Group, May 13, 2004

Page 5 of 6

- Cell phone distractions
- One step forward, two steps back (feeling of lack of progress)
- Uncertainty about how Policy Team Meeting will go on Monday

HANDOUTS

- Meeting Notes, Aquatic Resources Working Group, May 13, 2004
- Aquatic Resource Final Notes, April 8, 2004
- Aquatic Resources Draft Proposed Actions
- Instream Flow Final Notes, April 14, 2004
- Aquatic Working Group List, April 23, 2004
- Long-Term Schedule Aquatics, May 13, 2004
- Milestone Dates December 19, 2003
- Draft Proposed Actions.doc, March 11, 2004
- PME Status, April 14, 2004
- Schedule of Study Plans/Reports and Relevant Filenames
- Email from Greta Movassaghi to Arnie re: Overlap with HPMP, etc.
- Water Quality Final Report and CDs

Tentative Agenda for June 10, 2004 (9:00-3:00 p.m. USFS Building in Mountlake Terrace)

1. Review agenda, notes, actions
2. Phil's Mexico Report/slide show
3. Policy Team Meeting(s) Report
4. Fish Passage Technical Working Group Report
5. Instream Flows Technical Working Group Report
 - Review Level 4 analysis
 - Review/recommend IPP improvement options
6. Study Updates:
 - A15: Upper Baker Delta Scour
 - A16: Lower Baker Alluvial Fan Assessment
 - A37: Without Project Alternative: Discuss comments received
7. Set Agenda and confirm location for August 12 meeting
8. Evaluate meeting