



BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Aquatic Resources Working Group RESOLVE

September 12, 2003

9:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

U.S. Forest Service

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

21905 64th Avenue West, Mountlake Terrace, WA

AGENDA

Conference Call Number: 1-866-280-6429, participant code: 144995#

1. Review Agenda, Notes, Action Items
2. Review of Prior Agreements (made on 8/25)
3. 3.1.2 Propagation (Steve's white paper)
4. 3.4.3 Erosion Management (Greta's proposed language)
5. 3.4.1 Fluvial Management (Redrafted)
6. 3.1.1 HERC Fund
7. 3.2.3 Downstream Passage (if time)
8. 3.4.4 Habitat Restoration (if time)
9. Review draft agenda for next RESOLVE meeting

September 12, 2003



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

Aquatics Working Group RESOLVE Meeting Draft Notes

September 12, 2003
9:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.
USFS Office
Mountlake Terrace, WA

MEETING NOTES

Team Leader: Arnie Aspelund, PSE

Written by: Dee Endelman, ADI

Attendees	Arnie Aspelund, PSE	Arn Thoreen, SFEG
	Phil Hilgert, R2	Stan Walsh, SSC
	Gary Sprague, WDFW	Lorna Ellestad, SCPW
	Steve Fransen, NMFS	Scott Lentz, USFS (telephone)
	Bob Wright, WDOE	Sue Madsen, R2 (telephone)
	Greta Movassaghi, USFS	Dee Endelman, facilitator
	Dick Raisler, Fidalgo Fly Fishers	

September 12 Agenda

Review agenda, notes, actions
Review prior agreements made (on 8/25)
3.1.2 Propagation
3.4.3 Erosion Management
3.4.1 Fluvial Management (revisited)
3.1.1 HERC Fund

3.2.3 Downstream Passage (if time)

3.4.4 Habitat Restoration (if time)

Develop agenda for next meeting

New Action Items

1. Gene—Re 3.2.1 (page 46, 9/12 draft), write statutory language regarding agency approvals of fish passage facilities.
2. Arnie—Make list of all items we're currently considering coming out of the HERC Fund.
3. All—Think about the possibility of sturgeon supplementation (as part of 3.1.2: Propagation).
4. All—Review 20,000 pound capacity facility (3.1.2: Propagation). It appears sufficient—is it?
5. Bob W.—Regarding 3.4.3 (Erosion Management), send language to Arnie for 3.4.3 a and b (page 64, 9/12 draft).
6. Dee—Ask team leads to give Greta feedback on Erosion Management.
7. Dee—Ask Lyn to include a discussion about erosion management at next Aquatics technical meeting.

Old Action Items

1. Dick—Send draft language regarding alternatives for increasing steelhead salmon (other than supplementation) to Arnie for distribution to working group.
2. Gary—Find out about the Cowlitz settlement agreement provision on fish management plans.
3. Gene—Re 3.2.2 (Connectivity—page 46), write language regarding the test facility per the group's discussion on this matter (contained in the notes below).
4. ~~SuePhil~~—re-write the Summary of Actions in 3.4.1 (Fluvial Geomorphic Management--page 61) to reflect the actions set forth in the PME.

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

- 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.

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.

-
-
- Caucuses are okay.

Review of PME's Discussed To Date

Note: In this meeting, we were working from 3rd draft PME's dated September 12, 2003.

3.4.2: Large Woody Debris: Additional Agreements

- Add a note regarding accounting for wood going over the spillway.
- Add the last paragraph in the LWD Appendix to the Plan (see page 76 of the 9/12/03 draft PME's). Make it # 7 and make sure that the language reflects the agreement regarding actions.

3.2.1: Propagation: Additional Agreements

- Steve reviewed his draft White Paper with the group. He will revise it to complete it.
- Arn suggested we consider sturgeon supplementation as an enhancement. All agreed to consider whether sturgeon should be considered (including thinking about negative interactions with other fish). Any additional species, like sturgeon, would need to fit in with the sub-basin fisheries plan.
- This PME should describe the facility that PSE would support. Co-managers make species-specific decisions.
- The 20,000 pound capacity facility is sufficient. (Note: Since this was the first meeting at which the proposed numbers of fish by species was translated into pounds, the 20,000-pound capacity *appeared* sufficient based on these numbers. Everyone will review this—in light of interests—to make sure).
- We should make some reference to moving toward natural production when possible (in the appendix as a statement of philosophy).
- ✚ Keep the species-specific numbers in an appendix. Keep the number flexible within the 20,000-pound capacity. Note that species-specific changes in supplementation are subject to review by the co-managers with input from the BRCC.

3.4.3: Erosion Management Agreements

- Add the BRCC to this PME. They should be consulted on the Erosion Management Plan.
- The general steps outlined by Greta look good (page 65-66 of 9/12 draft).
- It is important to document what's being remedied and why—we need to get information on this from the working groups, including Aquatics.
- We should have an Erosion Management Plan for areas where this information suggests the need.

3.4.1: Fluvial Geomorphic Management: Additional Agreements

- Plan development and monitoring should go into the PME. A description of the intent, the scope,

and a general outline of the monitoring plan should be included in an appendix. (Sue Madsen to prepare a rough draft of the appendix by the 9/29 RESOLVE meeting).

- Note: There remains disagreement about whether implementation should go into the HERC Fund. We need a discussion of the HERC Fund at the next meeting to make this decision.

Upcoming RESOLVE Sessions

9/19/03—9:00 a.m.-2:00 p.m., USFS Mountlake Terrace
9/29/03—9:00 a.m.-2:00 p.m., PSE Bothell Office
10/16/03—9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m., PSE Bothell Office
10/27/03—9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m., USFS Mountlake Terrace

Agenda for 9/19/03 Meeting

- Review agenda, notes and action items
- Review agreements from 9/12/03 meeting
- 3.1.2: Propagation
 - Agreement regarding 20,000-pound capacity
 - What about sturgeon?
 - What other issues are there?
- 3.4.1: Fluvial Geomorphic Management
 - Review the current draft
 - Where should we include plan implementation and why?
 - Other issues?
- 3.1.1: HERC Fund
 - Initial discussion
 - What are the purposes of the HERC fund?
 - What are the parties' needs regarding how this fund is set up?
 - What should be the balance between what's in the HERC fund and what's specified in PME's?
 - How much money should be in the HERC fund?
 - What are the sources of that fund?
- 3.4.4: Habitat Restoration
 - Initial discussion
- Agenda for next meeting