



## BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

### Flood Control Feasibility Teamlet

July 28, 2003  
9:00 to 2:00  
Lower Baker Project Office  
Concrete, WA

### FINAL MEETING NOTES

**Teamlet Leader:** Lloyd Pernela, 425-462-3507, [lloyd.pernela@pse.com](mailto:lloyd.pernela@pse.com)

**Attendees:**

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
Bruce Sexauer	USACE	Lloyd Pernela	PSE
Steve Babcock	USACE	Paul Wetherbee	PSE
Ted Perkins	USACE	Joel Molander	PSE
Bill Fullerton	Tetra Tech	Don Dixon	Skagit County DPW
Jason Schmidt	PSE	John Moffat	Skagit County Pros. Attny
Bill Shaffer	Washington Group	Harry Hosey	PIE
Jay Smith	Tetra Tech	Jim Robertson	PIE
Bob Barnes	PSE	Albert Liou	PIE

**Notes:**

- 1) Lloyd Pernela handled introductions and outlined the agenda.
- 2) Agenda:
  - a) Tetra Tech and Washington Group present their scopes of work
  - b) Discuss schedule
  - c) Comments on Tetra Tech and Washington Group scopes
  - d) Data Requests
  - e) Tour Facilities

- 3) *Flood Control Feasibility Scopes of Work:* Bill Fullerton and Bill Shaffer walked through the Tetra Tech and Washington Group scopes of work, respectively (Attached). Following the walk through, Joel Molander explained that the scopes of work are designed and intended to satisfy technical Corps regulatory requirements so that the work products could be adopted by the Corps in their flood control feasibility study. In response to Joel's explanation, John Moffat (Skagit County Prosecuting Attorney Office) said that the County expects their study to have as much weight as the Relicensing Flood Control Feasibility Teamlet's study. Bruce Sexauer explained that the Corps saw a need to complete two studies (the Corps Feasibility study and the Flood Control Feasibility Teamlet Study) because they focused on different aspects of flood control in the Skagit system. Bruce explained that the Corps/County study focused on broad issues comparing alternatives for flood damage reduction. The Baker Relicensing Flood Control Feasibility Teamlet study is addresses technical flood control issues just in the Baker system.
- 4) *Project Schedule:* Bill Fullerton walked through the proposed schedule, including draft schedules work items performed by Tetra Tech, the Washington Group, and the Corps. As presented, the scopes of work would be completed within 36 weeks from project initiation. This schedule depends in part on power loss computations performed by the Corps. Bruce Sexauer indicated that this analysis is likely to take longer than the two weeks presented in the draft schedule.
- 5) *Comments on Scope of Work:* Joel Molander explained that the Flood Control Feasibility Teamlet's scope of work is part of the collaborative relicensing process and asked for comments. Bruce Sexauer indicated that the scope of works looked acceptable and the Corps looked forward to reviewing the work products. John Moffat (Skagit County Prosecuting Attorney's Office) said that the County is directing its consultant effort into the study with the Corps. He said that the County will not comment on the Baker Relicensing Flood Control Feasibility Teamlet scope of work or get involved with the collaborative effort studies.
- 6) *Data Requests:* Lloyd Pernela walked through the data requests in the County letter dated May 16, 2003.
- a) Probably Maximum Flood Study and report using HMR-57: Bob Barnes explained that these studies had not been completed and the requested reports did not exist.
  - b) Hourly dam discharge at Upper and Lower Baker for November 8 through 28, 1990, and November 26 through December 3, 1995. Paul Wetherbee explained that these data were available via microfiche and would likely be necessary to extract for the Flood Control Feasibility Teamlet study. He indicated that hourly data developed in electronic format for the Flood Control Feasibility Teamlet would be made available to the County. Joel Molander said that the data, in microfiche form, was currently available to the County and if the County was interested in more rapid extraction of the data to hourly form, PSE would like to discuss a cost-sharing arrangement.
  - c) CADD files of Upper and Lower Baker Spillway designs. Lloyd Pernela reviewed the security issued involved with this data requests and indicated that electronic drawings did not exist. To provide access for the County to this data, Lloyd suggested that hard copy

drawing could be made available to the County's if non-disclosure agreements are signed.

The meeting adjourned to a tour of the Upper and Lower Baker facilities.

Attachment:

- 1) Tetra Tech scope of work
- 2) Washington Group scope of work