



BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

<p>Terrestrial Resources Working Group RESOLVE Session</p>

<p>August 8, 2003 8am until noon</p>

<p>USFWS Offices Sawyer Hall Lacey, WA</p>

AGENDA

Review Agenda
Review July 17 th agreements
1.3.3—Provide habitat for riparian cavity dwellers
1.2.2—Provide spring foraging habitat for grizzly bears
1.2.5—Provide connectivity habitat for low mobility species
1.2.4—Provide breeding habitat for amphibians
Meeting review <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agreements reached• Action plans
Agenda for next RESOLVE session, confirm time and place
Adjourn

BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Terrestrial Working Group RESOLVE Session Final Notes

August 8, 2003
8 a.m. until noon

USFS Offices
Lacey, WA

FINAL MEETING NOTES

Team Leader: Tony Fuchs (PSE), 425-462-3553, tony.fuchs@pse.com

PRESENT

Don Gay (USFS—by conference call), Gene Stagner (USFWS), Patrick Goldsworthy (NCCC), Tony Fuchs (PSE), Cary Feldmann (PSE), Marty Vaughn (Biota Pacific), Carl Corey (USFS), Lauri Vigue (WDFW), Bob Nelson (Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation), Len Barson (The Nature Conservancy)

Agenda

- Review notes, agenda, action items
- Review July 17th agreements
- Items to RESOLVE
 - 1.3.3—Provide habitat for riparian cavity dwellers
 - 1.2.2—Provide spring foraging habitat for grizzly bears
 - 1.2.5—Provide connectivity habitat for low mobility species
 - 1.2.4—Provide breeding habitat for amphibians
- Meeting review
- Agenda for next RESOLVE session, confirm time and place

New Action Items

- Tony—button up with Laura re special plants cost estimate
- Tony—in consultation with Gene and Laura, put together a preliminary scope and budget for beneficial plant in drawdown zone test—float to working group by e-mail—by 8/15.
- Don—make estimate for goat thing planning and implementation (by November)
- Tony—Call September meeting with Marty, Carl, Laura and Laurel to finish discussing noxious weed PME.
- Marty—After Tony and Laura have reviewed your re-drafted rare plant PME, send out to group before next meeting (8/21)
- Marty—Re 1.3.3 (Riparian Cavity Dwellers), use Bruce M's earlier snag model and use PHS guidance—propose to group snag management guidance document (by September)

Old Action Items

1. Tony—Review USFS Weeds Best Management Practices
2. Marty—write up PME's as agreed today and send out to working group
3. Tony and Laura—talk to Kathy S. about FERC EA and noxious weed control

Notes from RESOLVE Meetings

To permit the greatest degree of open dialogue, the group agreed that notes for the RESOLVE sessions will be less formal than regular working group meetings. We will primarily document agreements and action items.

RESOLVE Groundrules and Criteria

Following are the original RESOLVE ground rules agreed to by the working group:

- Work at understanding one another.
- Use airtime wisely.
- Speak honestly and respectfully.
- Examine assumptions.
- Make tentative agreements, then look at the whole package together.
- One meeting review rule: we have one meeting to review and change the tentative agreements of the previous RESOLVE session.¹
- Document our agreements.
- Caucuses are okay.
- Caucuses are okay
- For each PME, we will begin by identifying the goal and measurable objectives

¹ All agreements are tentative even after the “one meeting review rule”. However, the one meeting rule gives regular participants an opportunity to bring an agreement back to the table while assuring that tentative agreements are not forever reopened. It also accommodates regular participants who must miss a meeting and may want to weigh in on a decision. The group also agreed that materials to be considered at the RESOLVE session would be sent out in advance, per regular working group rules, if group members were expected to attempt agreement on those materials.

-
-
- We will use the 5/7/03 PME's, as updated, for our RESOLVE discussion.
 - After we have agreed to a PME, Marty will revise it to reflect our agreement. Only after that will draft settlement language be written.

July 17th Agreements

Marty sent out the revised PME's yesterday. Accordingly, everyone will review them by the 8/21 meeting and they will be discussed then.

1.3.3: Riparian Cavity Dwellers

Goal: To contribute to providing nesting and denning habitat for cavity dwelling species in Baker Basin.

Issues

- How is PME related to project effects?
- What lands are we talking about?
- What are the targets?
- Timing for implementation?

Agreements

- The lands in this PME are project forest lands (or other appropriate lands) owned or controlled by PSE (including those acquired during the term of the license).
- The target should be a snag/acre ratio
 - Ratio should be based on existing documents
 - See Marty's action item on 1.3.3
- In addition to the targets in the snag management plan, do something to help cavity users in the drawdown zone (Lake Shannon)
 - Delete wood ducks from PME
 - The number for Swallows is okay as stated (20)
- Put something in the measure regarding a schedule of implementation
 - Define "implementation"—tie it to ages of stands
 - Define "large species"—appropriate to habitat and species at hands
 - Define species of snags to use (PHS, USFS have lists)
- Remember: this is a crossover issue with Aquatics' PME on Large Woody Debris

1.2.2: Grizzly Bears

Agreements

- Habitat acquired for other species that would help bears would count
- Other measures could also meet the needs (e.g., road closures)
- Certain percentage of target could be met through PSE support of USFS road closure effort
- Acre equivalent is what's key
- Three Elements to Grizzly Bear PME
 1. Continued financial support of road closure efforts where it benefits bears (with caps on

amount of credit)

2. Benefits through other land acquisition or designations in BMU
 - Stuff that's already suitable habitat
 - Enhancement of habitat (modifying existing habitat)
 - Enforced access restriction on non-project lands
 3. If don't hit the target number of acres, then acquire/control additional land
 - Acquisition/control would be by a negotiated date certain
 - If bears are documented earlier than the negotiated date, acquisition/control would happen earlier
- Re target acreage: draft PME in flexible way—talk about acreage equivalent, habitat equivalent

Acreage Issue: Discussion of Thinking Processes

PSE's Thinking Process Resulting in its proposed acreage

- Based on future conditions
- Assumes flood control would still be required, even if project went away
- Try to meet interests of other parties (through T7B/T4 Analysis Species)
- Therefore, used Scenario 2 as basis for thinking

BAWG Thinking Process resulting in its proposed acreage

- Scenario 1 is what we should be basing PME's on
- Looked at which habitats would result in what species recovery
- Flood control was seen as part of the license
- Even if flood storage would be required, could still look at scenario in which most areas would still be available during growing season
- Took acres, increased by factor of 1.8 for upland habitats because:
 - In most cases, lands to be acquired would already have some habitat value
 - Many of the lands wouldn't be developed anyway
 - Parcels may be fairly far separated from one another
 - Time lag between license issuance and land acquisition
- Used factor of 3 for wetland habitat (WDOE figure for wetland mitigation)

Discussion of Interests

What are PSE's interests?

- Certainty—knowing what the economic costs of the measures will be
- Profitability—not merely overall profitability but need to meet “prudent” test by WUTC

(Discussion to be continued)

Additional RESOLVE Sessions

- August 21, 2003—8:00 a.m.-Noon, Lacey
- September 17, 2003—8:30 a.m. – 2:00 p.m., Mountlake Terrace
- September 30, 2003—8:30 a.m. – 2:00 p.m., Mountlake Terrace

Agenda for Next RESOLVE Session

- Review July 17th Agreements
- Continue discussion on Acreage Issue
 - What are the interests of all parties regarding habitat acreage?
 - What are alternatives for solving the issue in a way that respects these interests?