



BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Recreational & Aesthetic Resources Working Group

January 9th, 2004
9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.
RESOLVE meeting

USFS Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest Headquarters
21905 64th Ave. West
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043

AGENDA

1. Review Notes/Agenda/Action Items
2. Update on Study Reports:
3. Review of the R5 Draft Aesthetics / Visual Resources Study report.
4. Report on EDAW Recreation cost estimate analysis.
5. Review of 12/19 PME prioritization teamlet recommendations.
6. Discussion of next steps
7. Set agenda for January 26th Meeting
8. Evaluate Meeting

BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

**Recreational & Aesthetic Resources Working Group
RESOLVE Meeting
Final Notes**

January 9, 2004
9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.
USFS Office, Mountlake Terrace, WA

Final MEETING NOTES

Team Leader: Andy Hatfield (PSE): email is andrew.hatfield@pse.com and phone number is (360) 853-8341.

PRESENT: Brian Adams (Skagit County), Cindy Bjorkland (NPS—telephone), Ann Dunphy (USFS), Ardis Bynum (USFS—telephone), Tracie Johannessen (NCI), Andy Hatfield (PSE), Patrick Goldsworthy (NCCC), Carol Effred (Louis Berger), Dave Reid (PSE), Susan Rosebrough (NPS), Saul Weisberg (NCI), Dee Endelman (facilitator), Mark Greenig (EDAW)

January 9 Agenda:

1. Review notes, agenda and action items
2. Report on EDAW review of recreation cost estimates
3. Review of 12/19/03 PME prioritization Teamlet recommendations
4. Next steps to complete PME's
5. Update on Studies Reports: R5 and others
6. Agenda for 1/26/04 meeting

New Actions

1. Andy—E-mail to working group members times and dates for IAC grant workshops by 1/12/04.
2. Andy—Talk to Jim Eychaner about the rationale for New Trails Phase II O & M (Does it come out of the RAM Fund?)
3. Andy and Ann—Review campground O&M formula to assure PSE understands it.

-
-
4. Dee—Talk to Solution Team Adaptive Management Teamlet: when will the PME re Discretionary Funds be ready for working group to look at?
 5. Andy and Ann—Talk to Policy people and revise PME's for discussion at 1/26/04 meeting.
 6. Andy—Call Joan Nichol to start Aesthetics part of the PDEA.
 7. All—Comments on R5 to to Andy by 1/16/4. Andy will forward comments to Mark Greenig and distribute to the WG. If possible, Mark will incorporate comments by 1/26/04.
 8. Ann and Saul—Write a piece on Recreation PME's that are shared resources.

Old Action Items

1. Andy—ask tribes about tribal enforcement policies (for 2.1.3—Law Enforcement)

EDAW Cost Estimate

Andy gave us a report on Chuck Everett's (EDAW) review and comparison of the USFS and PSE's cost estimates. In most cases he recommended using USFS costs recognizing that a decision on who will implement the various actions may effect costs. He also suggested that the Agency's administrative percentage be looked at in different ways to bring down overall costs. This work showed that there is no "silver bullet" to reduce costs.

PME Teamlet Recommendations

Andy, Ann and Saul walked us through the Teamlet discussion of 12/19/04. The Teamlet was able to trim the package from \$43 million to \$27 million in PSE exposure. PSE and Skagit County met yesterday regarding the Lake Shannon PME. Jon and Ed et al are meeting today as a policy team to review the teamlet's recommendations also. The purpose of our discussion today is to make sure that the working group is okay with the teamlet's recommendations and to make suggestions, if they come up, for cost reduction.

As we walked through the recommendations, working group members raised their questions and concerns.

Regarding dispersed sites (2.2.1), the group discussed how the monitoring of dispersed sites would need to be fleshed out as part of the discussion when we put together a Recreation Management Plan.

Regarding New Trails O & M (Phase 1—2.4.2c), we decided to move this to 2.4.1a, so that New Trails PME includes both construction and maintenance.

Regarding Lake Shannon (2.5.3), Brian noted a concern that the O & M amount is not sufficient. The County would also prefer a paved boat launch (rather than gravel) but believe that the cost difference between the two might be covered in another way.

Regarding Kulshan (2.5.4), Ann registered a concern that costs are still a hair high. Andy noted that historic O & M costs have actually been higher than shown on the Teamlet spreadsheet.

Regarding Wildlife Observation (2.5.6), the Teamlet reduced the scope. We discussed how this new

scope could be used as seed money for a grant proposal and/or to do something limited in scope and use the RAM Fund to do additional wildlife observation opportunities.

The group discussed the budget for Information, Interpretation and Education PME's, noting the benefits of these PME's to other groups. We should present this to the Solution Team. Regarding Stewardship (6.5.3), the group discussed the need to flesh this out and to integrate 6.5.1, 6.5.2 and 6.5.3. We will work on this when we re-draft the PME's (and will update this integration on the PME Status summary sheet and the prioritization Teamlet 12/19/03 spreadsheet).

Regarding Park & Boulder Campground decommissioning, the group noted that this action is driven by terrestrial and aquatic interests, not by recreation interests.

Conclusion

The group recommends this proposal (Teamlet recommendation of 12/19/03 as updated today) with the acknowledgement that PSE still has concerns about the cost exposure of the total package. We believe this proposal represents excellent progress and collaboration among working group members.

Studies Update

Andy handed out an update of studies. He explained that Chris Lawson will send R 12 and 13 first, followed by R 11/15 and 16. These studies reports are projected to be finalized by late January.

Regarding R 5 (Aesthetics/Visual Survey), Mark Greenig answered questions and received some feedback from working group members. Overall, the group members who had reviewed the draft were very complimentary about Mark's efforts.

Tentative Agenda for 1/26/04 Meeting:

USGFS Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest Headquarters

9:00am to 2:30pm

1. Review notes, agenda, action items
2. Review PME's
3. Timeline for implementation
4. Review final drafts of R5/Other studies, as available