



BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Recreational & Aesthetic Resources Working Group

August 7th, 2003

9:00 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.

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

AGENDA

1. Review notes/agenda/action items
2. Review Studies in detail:
 - R9 (Recreation Use Survey – Electronic Monitoring)
 - R11/R15 (Recreation Capacity and Suitability Analysis)
 - R12 (Dispersed Site Inventory)
 - R13 (Recreation Visitor Surveys)
 - R16 (Recreation Needs Analysis)
3. HYDROPS Update
4. Debrief of 6/21 RESOLVE Session
5. Update on R5-5 (Visuals and Aesthetics Study)
6. Review of draft outline of Recreational Management Plan
7. Review FS Road Management EA
8. Lake Shannon Development Feasibility Update
9. A14E Shoreline Erosion Review
10. Set Aug. 25, 2003 Agenda
11. Evaluate Meeting





BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Recreational & Aesthetic Resources Working Group

August 7, 2003
9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.
USFS Office, Mountlake Terrace, WA 98273

FINAL MEETING NOTES

Mission: *“To develop alternative solutions and recommendations addressing recreation, education and aesthetic resources related to the Baker River Project and its operations leading to a settlement agreement.”*

Team Leader: Andy Hatfield (PSE): andrew.hatfield@pse.com, (360) 853-8341.

PRESENT

Chris Lawson (Huckell/Weinman Associates, Inc.), Mark Greenig (EDAW), Brian Adams (Skagit County Parks and Recreation), Ann Dunphy and Ardis Bynum on phone (US Forest Service), Patrick Goldsworthy (North Cascades Conservation Council), Cary Feldmann, and Andy Hatfield (Puget Sound Energy), Lyn Wiltse, facilitator, and Mary Jean Wiltse, notetaker (PDSA Consulting).

2003 SCHEDULE

Aug. 25, Sept. 22, Oct. 27, Nov. 17 (third Monday), December 15 (third Monday). Assume we are meeting at the Forest Service Office in Mountlake Terrace from 9:00 to 2:30 unless otherwise specified.

CONFERENCE CALL LINE: ALL WERE REMINDED, TO CALL IN ON THE CONFERENCE CALL LINE WHEN UNABLE TO ATTEND IN PERSON: 1-866-280-6429 AND ENTER PARTICIPANT CODE: 144995 #.

August 7, 2003 Agenda

9:00am to 3:00pm

NOTE: BRING LUNCH: BE PREPARED TO WORK THROUGH

1. Review Notes/Agenda/Action Items
2. Review Comments on Studies:
 - R9- Electronic Monitoring
 - R 11/15- Capacity Suitability Analysis
 - R 12- Dispersed Site Inventory
 - R13- Recreation Visitor Surveys
 - R16- Recreation Needs Analysis
3. HYDROPS Update- Paul Wetherbee
4. Debrief of RESOLVE Session of 6/23
5. Update on R5- Aesthetics Study Request
6. Review initial draft outline of Recreation Management Plan
7. Update on Forest Service Land Management EA
8. Update on Lake Shannon Development Feasibility
9. A14a- Shoreline Erosion Review
10. Set Agenda for August 25, 2003
11. Evaluate Meeting

INTRODUCTIONS:

We welcomed Mark Greenig (EDAW). Mark is helping us out with the Visual/Aesthetics Study (R5).

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Cary Feldmann reported that we are in the midst of a record return of sockeye with numbers over 18,300. The historic average (1926-1955 was just under 3000). Six of the highest returns ever recorded have been in the last ten years!

New Actions Items

- Andy: Send out CD's with locked R12 database tied to GIS to team members by 6/30/03.
- Chris: Incorporate comments into next versions of draft reports by July 14, 2003 as possible.
- Lauri: Check with Tom Hamer re: additional dispersed sites found by Hamer Environmental during wetland inventory and buttoned up with Andy.
- Ann: Give additional information re: dispersed sites (missing and mis-located) to Chris.
- Andy: Follow up with Lauri re: dispersed sites.
- Chris: Once folks were confident in the accuracy of the database (R12) lock up the fields.
- Cary: Send Andy NAVD-adjusted reservoir level diagram to distribute.
- Andy: Send out updated reservoir level maps to all (NAVD).
- Andy: Get copy of R11/15 to Ardis asap.
- Andy: Send copies of Greta's email to members not physically present today.
- Andy: Ask Tony to get concurrence from the Terrestrial Working Group of ecologically sensitive constraint maps.
- Ann: Email Andy and copy Chris on her comments re: R11/15.
- Chris: Send Ardis electronic version of R12 matrix distributed at this meeting.
- Chris: Follow-up with Alex re: glitches in electronic analysis of R12 matrix attributes and send out edited version of matrix prior to our August 25 meeting.

-
-
- ALL: Review R12 maps and see if they answer the questions we had and consider next steps. We'll discuss this at our August 25 meeting. Note: These are all posted on the FTP website.
 - Andy: Send out instructions for accessing the FTP website to all members.
 - Andy: Send out next draft of Recreation Management Plan by August 13.

REPORT ON OLD ACTION ITEMS

- All: Were asked to send comments to Andy on R-13 (Recreational Visitors Survey), R-16 (Recreation Needs Analysis), and R-9 (Electronic Monitoring) by 6/30/03.
- Andy: Called Saul Weisberg re: 6.5 of Proposed draft action by 6/27/03. Saul suggested that Andy invite colleague Don Burgess to the RESOLVE sessions. Don Burgess will attend the August 11 RESOLVE session.
- Andy: Discussed dispersed recreation attributes with cross resource Working Group by summer 2003. Chris is working on putting together some queries for this.
- Lyn: Discussed virtual cross resource Working Groups with team leaders (checked composition, balance, etc.) by 6/27/03. These were included in the Solution Team Update sent out last month.
- Andy, Ann, and Brian: Met Mark and Rebecca to hammer out a study plan using ideas from May 19th meeting.
- Andy: Revised study plan for the meeting above by 6/30/03.
- All: Sent Andy comments on Aesthetics study and R11/15 (Recreation Capacity and Suitability Analysis) by 6/23/03.
- Andy: Sent absent folks hard copies of PSE's input to Louis-Berger Group for fall version of PDEA by 6/24/03.
- Chris: Checked with Joetta to ensure that all GIS maps are using the 1988 datum.
- Andy: Checked with Carol, of the Louis-Berger Group, to see if it was too late to include what was agreed to at the June 16th RESOLVE session. The agreements were too vague to include.
- Cary: Checked with Rob, of the Louis-Berger Group, to see why they needed percentages and dollars to things not agreed to. Also found out why they were doing the economics analysis at this point for the PDEA (pending collaboration and resolution amongst the parties). Berger informed Cary they needed the economics and a template form which they could fill in all the specifics for the next PDEA. These can be revised during the public comment period.
- Andy: Sent out June 16 RESOLVE meeting notes by June 24, 2003.
- Andy: Buttoned up with Brian and Jim regarding comments on draft reports (R11/15, etc.)
- Andy: Set up teamlet conference call with Ann, Ardis, Chris and Tony to define R12 database queries.
- Andy: Expanded PME #2.1 to include Boating Management Plan.
- Lauri: Sent Andy a copy of outline of Lewis Rivers Recreation Management Plan. It was very helpful.
- Ardis: Sent outline of other Recreation Management Plan to Andy. Also helpful!
- Andy: Put together draft outline of Recreation Management Plan including Shannon vs. Baker and PMEs
- Andy: Talked with Jim re: trail field trip (prior to 8/7 meeting). Unfortunately, Jim was unable to make it.

PDEA Update

Concern was expressed about having to spend time, energy to refute numbers in the fall draft of the PDEA during the formal 90-day public comment period. We'll ask FERC about this with the Solution

Team meeting. We will replace numbers/specifics in the PDEA with numbers/specifics we all agreed to in the meantime. If the system “breaks” and we don’t come to consensus on some issues, would what is already in the initial draft of the PDEA carry more weight.

STUDIES UPDATE

Study #	Title	Notes/Next Steps
R-R5	Visuals and Aesthetics Study Request	<p>Mark Greenig is very familiar with what FERC is looking for in these types of studies. He is currently working with EDAW and is very familiar with the Northwest.</p> <p>Mark has been up at the project taking photos of view points. He is also looking at existing project facilities in accordance with the study plan.</p> <p>He suggests deviating from the initial study plan in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expanding the description of project-related recreation formulas • Adding travel routes • A constituent survey <p>Mark distributed some background information along with a description of the aim of the survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a correlation between specific pool elevations at Baker Project and constituent preference? • What components of a scene that includes the shoreline of Baker Project do constituents find attractive and/or unattractive? • What components of a scene that includes developed and dispersed recreation sites do constituents find attractive and/or unattractive <p>Mark will incorporate feedback for our discussion into the survey process. Ann and Andy will be selecting the approximately 20-25 photos used in the survey. The time frame for conducting these surveys is Mid-August to Mid-September.</p>
R-7	Recreation Use Survey – Literature Review	<i>Subsumed in R14.</i>
R-9	Recreation Use Survey – Electronic Monitoring	<p>Chris reported that he hasn’t yet received feedback on this report. There was a question about including (on p. 42) the median visitor group size of 2.4. It was suggested we add a footnote indicating the source of this (it is important to note that the source of this number is not just from electronic monitoring).</p> <p>Any comments received after September 1 will be responded to and treated as addenda to the report. Between now and</p>

		<p>then we'll get the chance to approve how comments received have been integrated into the report. Comments will be dated. Substantive comments will stay "live" (vs. treated as addenda) until they have been integrated into the report to the mutual satisfaction of all. (This process will be used to "finalize" all reports.)</p> <p>September 2 is the deadline for feedback on this report.</p>
R-11/15	Recreation Capacity and Suitability Analysis	<p>Chris reviewed with the group PSE's response to Lauri's feedback on the initial draft of this report. We look forward to receiving Lauri's comments on the responses to her feedback.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There may be a disconnect with this and the R16 report. We will stay tuned... 2. Re: the objectives statement, the capacity of existing dispersed sites was already defined in the R12 site inventory study. 3. Terrestrial Working Group members were added to the list of folks who met on January 7. 4. How elk and grizzly data will be integrated remained to be determined. We may need to have some separate brief white papers drafted to address issues such as these. This could be used to supplement what is already in the R11/15 and R12 reports. We need white papers in order for these cross-resource issues to be seen as legitimate (posted on the website and used in the integration of results. We agreed we should keep the study as a discreet technical response. The application of the study can appear in other places. We'll get consensus on how to deal with this from the Solution Team. 5. The notes from our January 7 meeting suggest that some ESA data may not be suitable to enclose in the report Proposed measures would be reviewed by the Terrestrial Working Group folks for sensitivity. We are buttoning up with Laura and Tony on this (in progress). 6. We'll handle addressing shoreline erosion on a site-by-site basis. 7. We need to determine what we want to factor in, when, and how? 8. Andy will ask Tony to get concurrence from the Terrestrial Working Group on this. <p>Chris also reviewed PSE responses to Patrick's feedback:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We agreed to acknowledge the roadless area to the east and north of Baker Lake in the report. We will also mention the Noisy Eagle Wilderness area

		<p>proposal.. (This may be also something to include in the PDEA.)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. “Roadless” isn’t an ROS classification. We acknowledged that there are several different maps distinct from figure 2 that serve as constraint layers (e.g., grizzly bear management, roadless areas, and the Northwest Management Plan. We agreed that this will be included in the Land Management section of the PDEA. Do we need to create a separate work product showing these bigger picture types of overlays/ constraints? This could be captured in Task 6 of the Needs Analysis Report. 3. Ann explained “semi-primitive motorized” to Patrick and he is fine with this now. <p>September 2 is the deadline for feedback on this report.</p>
R-12	Dispersed Site Inventory	<p>Chris hasn’t received any written comments since this was discussed at our Working Group meeting in May. At a June conference call, we agreed to put together a summary of selected attributes, and put them in matrix form. Chris distributed an initial version of this matrix. A legend will be added and he will button up with Alex re: some of the data glitches. At that June conference call, we also agreed to request several different GIS Map Overlays:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dispersed Campsite Locations on Baker Lake • Dispersed Campsite Locations on Lake Shannon • Dispersed Campsites and Old Growth on Baker Lake • Dispersed Campsites and Old Growth on Lake Shannon • Dispersed Campsites and Elk Habitat on Baker Lake • Dispersed Campsites and Elk Habitat on Lake Shannon • Large scale maps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dispersed campsites on Baker with wetlands, Survey and Manage species, rare plants, and amphibian breeding habitats • Dispersed campsites on Shannon with wetlands, Survey and Manage species, rare plants, and amphibian breeding habitats <p>We need to consider where these data should be presented. Chris suggests we include these in the R11/15 report, or handle as a separate paper. We’ll make this determination at our next meeting.</p> <p>September 2 is the deadline for feedback on this study.</p>
R-13	Recreation Visitor Surveys	There are concerns over the mixing of Shannon and Baker

		<p>data. Also questionable is the use of percentages when the numbers are low (this is misleading). We need to clarify some of the graphs/tables. We also agreed that we need to show the data from the “Other” category for some of the responses (especially where they were fairly sizeable). We will include these as an appendix to the report. Chris reported that he affinitized these responses to the extent possible. The “unlumpable”, unique responses are the only ones that remain in the “Other” category.</p> <p>We need to develop a key for the breakout groups that are repeated often to facilitate easy review of the results.</p> <p>September 2 is the deadline for feedback on this report.</p>
R-14	Secondary Data Collection	Ongoing.
R-16	Recreation Needs Analysis	<p>Ann suggested that in addition to the SCORP data, we referenced the following reports: NVUM, University of Montana’s Recreation in the Pacific Northwest, Mt. Baker Survey Results, and the Examination of the Northwest Recreation on Fee Program. These can help us to answer questions around unmet/underserved populations in addition to future trends.</p> <p>These could also give us the broader perspective re: what folks want (safety, security, information services, etc.).</p> <p>These reports will also help us address issues such as the changing demographics of populations and urbanization effects.</p> <p>Do we need to create a separate work product showing these bigger picture types of overlays/ constraints? This could be captured in Task 6 of this report.</p> <p>September 2 is the deadline for feedback on this report.</p>

REVIEW OF DRAFT OUTLINE OF RECREATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

Andy reviewed several sample Recreation Management Plans, some of which were provided by Ardis and Lauri. From these, he created an initial draft for our review at this meeting. (He emailed it on August 6.) Andy explained that in this draft the “meat” of this Plan would be covered in numbers 4 and 5. Ardis expressed concern that the way this is broken out would require a lot of repeating and that it may be better to break this out by PM and E.

REVIEW FOREST SERVICE ROAD MANAGEMENT EA

Ann reported that the Public Scoping responses are in. They appreciate PSE’s comments. They are in the process of determining alternatives based on resource concerns, recreation concerns and a synthesis of these. They are thinking about issuing a news release listing things they are considering in order to get a broader response than what they got through the initial mailing. They are also looking forward to getting comments from Working Group members in this process. They meet again in early September.

LAKE SHANNON DEVELOPMENT FEASIBILITY UPDATE

Brian reported that he met with Andy to discuss this. Skagit County is waiting to see what happens with the feasibility studies before determining how to proceed. Andy is working with Jamie V. on this.

A14a: SHORELINE EROSION REVIEW

Andy distributed Greta's email seeking feedback on "next steps" she is suggesting for Shoreline Erosion Management. Results of this study will influence how we manage different recreation sites. (developed, dispersed, trails, and managing uses on the lake). We will identify areas of concern from a recreational viewpoint. We will then get additional feedback/information from folks in the Aquatics Working Group. We will discuss in more detail at our next meeting.

HANDOUTS

- Visual/Aesthetic Resources Survey Approach
- Visual/Aesthetic Questionnaire Baker River Project
- Baker River Relicense Study R11
- Baker River Relicense Study R11/15 Recreation Capacity/Suitability Analysis and Recreational Trail Routing – Draft Study Report Review Comments and Responses
- R12 Supplemental Excel Analysis (Draft Matrix)
- GIS Map Overlays:
 - Dispersed Campsite Locations on Baker Lake
 - Dispersed Campsite Locations on Lake Shannon
 - Dispersed Campsites and Old Growth on Baker Lake
 - Dispersed Campsites and Old Growth on Lake Shannon
 - Dispersed Campsites and Elk Habitat on Baker Lake
 - Dispersed Campsites and Elk Habitat on Lake Shannon
 - Large Scale Maps:
 - Dispersed campsites on Baker with wetlands, Survey and Manage species, rare plants, and amphibian breeding habitats
 - Dispersed campsites on Shannon with wetlands, Survey and Manage species, rare plants, and amphibian breeding habitats

PARKING LOT

- Land Management
- Hold periodic "outreach" meetings for feedback from other groups (hiking, horseback riding, etc.)
- Field trip - summer 2003?
- Review USFS Roads Analysis Report - 2003

STUDIES SUMMARY FOR SOLUTION TEAM

- September 2 is the deadline for feedback on all major studies.

EVALUATION OF MEETING

Things Done Well

- Facilitation was adequate.
- Got to "yank Lyn's chain" a couple of times!

Things To Do Differently Next Time

- Missed Jim, Susan, Lauri, Cindy!
- If not a good time for folks to meet, let's not meet.
- No Bismarks
- Ran late*

* Facilitator Note: Actually we got out 15 minutes early. I thought we were to end by 2:30. I see in the agenda that the meeting was scheduled to go until 3:00. BONUS!!!

What's Hot?

- PDEA – Will what's included in the fall draft be given special weight if we don't agree on an alternative?
- How do we document cross resource issues/data?

August 25, 2003 Agenda

9:00am to 3:00pm

NOTE: BRING LUNCH: BE PREPARED TO WORK THROUGH

1. Review Notes/Agenda/Action Items
 - Announcement re: record sockeye return
 - Debrief of field trips
2. Review Comments on Studies:
 - R5- Visual/Aesthetics Studies
 - R9-Electyronic Monitoring
 - R 11/15 (Capacity Suitability Analysis)
 - R 12 (Dispersed Site Inventory)
 - R13 Recreation Visitor Surveys
 - R16-Recreation Needs Analysis
3. HYDROPS Update-Paul Wetherbee
4. Debrief of RESOLVE Session of 8/11
5. Review draft outline of Recreation Management Plan
6. Review Forest Service Land Management EA
7. Lake Shannon Development Feasibility
8. A14a: Shoreline Erosion Review
9. Set Agenda for September 22, 2003
10. Evaluate Meeting