BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENCE

Cross Resource Workshop

March 4-6, 2003
CottonTree Inn
Mount Vernon, WA

Summary of Proceedings

BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENCE

Cross Resource Workshop

March 4-6, 2003
CottonTree Inn
Mount Vernon, WA

Executive Summary

On March 4-6, 2003, 61 representatives from the five resource-area working groups (Aquatics, Terrestrial, Recreation/Aesthetics, Cultural/Historical, and Economics/ Operations,) the Baker Solution Team, consultants and FERC participated in a Cross Resource Workshop to discuss aspects of the settlement process for the Baker River Project Relicense.

During the half-day session on March 4, representatives from the five working groups presented summaries of the approximately 150 draft PMEs (protection, mitigation and enhancement) options developed by the working group members over the last seven months.

On March 5, PSE presented an overview of the 54 draft proposed actions (derived from the PMEs), prepared at the direction of the Solution Team. Participants met in their respective working groups and discussed those actions that cross all resources, especially the proposed action for Reservoir Management. On March 6, the working groups continued discussion of the draft proposed actions and then all participants met together to discuss the next steps in the process. Working groups reconvened to craft action plans for how they will contribute to a second draft of the proposed actions.

The FERC representative emphasized that the Settlement Agreement must be submitted with the license application by April 30, 2004, and suggested participants begin drafting license article language as soon as actions are agreed upon. Participants acknowledged the many opportunities created by synergies across the different resource areas. The assessment of the initial draft proposed actions was fairly positive. Participants also reported feeling from "cautiously" to "generally" optimistic about coming up with a Settlement Agreement that addresses the needs of the participants.

The timeline for preparing a second draft of the proposed actions is May 1. Participants discussed the possibility of a one-day working meeting to review the second draft proposed actions and discuss how to resolve competing or conflicting actions across resource areas. These second draft proposed actions would be used for evaluation in the Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment, to be prepared for review by September 30, 2003.

Attached for further reference is the *Summary of Proceedings*, which includes the *Flip Chart Notes* taken during the Workshop.

BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENCE

Cross Resource Workshop

March 4-6, 2003
CottonTree Inn
Mount Vernon, WA

Summary of Proceedings
Prepared by the Baker Facilitation Team

On March 4-6, 2003, participants, representing the five resource working groups (Aquatics, Terrestrial, Recreation/Aesthetics, Cultural/Historical and Economics/Operations), the Baker Solution Team, consultants and FERC, met at the CottonTree Inn in Mount Vernon. The purpose of the workshop was to achieve the following outcomes:

- To learn about the draft PME options being considered by all working groups
- To discuss potential synergies and conflicts on key PME issues
- To have interest-based discussions on initial PSE draft proposed actions to resolve key issues
- To develop an action plan to carry the PMEs forward from the workshop

March 4, 2003

Present: See List of Participants (Attachment A).

Agenda

- Welcome and Introduction
  - Purpose of today's meeting
  - Agenda review
- PME Options Process
  - Review of how the draft PME options were developed
- Aquatics Working Group Presentation, Q and A
- Terrestrial Working Group Presentation, Q and A
- Break
- Recreation Working Group Presentation, Q and A
- Cultural Working Group Presentation, Q and A
- Economics and Operations Working Group Presentation, Q and A
- Wrap Up and Preview of March 5 session

The first session commenced at 1:00 p.m. Representatives from each of the five working groups presented a summary of the draft PME options developed by working group members over the previous seven months. (See Attachment B for a copy of the PowerPoint presentation.) They engaged the group in questions and answers designed to clarify the options. At the close of the session, Dee Endelman of the facilitation team reviewed the following next steps:

- Discussion of draft proposed actions based on these PMEs.
- Development of second draft PMEs from these discussions.
- Completion of studies to round out the picture.
- Development of management plans.
- Ongoing interest-based settlement negotiations.

Dee explained that the first step – discussion of draft proposed actions based on the PMEs – would occur over the next two days of the workshop. The first day's session adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

March 5, 2003

Present: See Attachment A.

Agenda

- Introduction
  - Agenda review
  - Ground rules
- Review of RESOLVE
  - Review of interest-based negotiations concepts and tools
  - Using RESOLVE in the Baker Relicensing process
- A "First Look" at Cross Resource Conflicts and Synergies
  - Group review of areas of cross resource conflicts that need to be addressed
- Introduction: Draft Proposed Actions
  - Overview of draft proposed actions, taken from PME options, which appear to have greatest cross resource implications
- Review of Cross Resource Draft Proposed Actions
  - Baker River Coordinating Committee
  - Access Management
- Break
- Creative Moment!
  - The first of a series of creativity breaks
- Review of Cross Resource Draft Proposed Actions
  - Information, Education and Interpretive Services
- Review of Cross Resource Draft Proposed Actions
  - Reservoir Management

- Working Group Discussions of Reservoir Management Draft Proposed Action
    - How would this affect our resource?
    - What conflicts, if any, are there with the interests of my organization/stakeholder group?
    - Are resource needs being balanced?
- Lunch
- Creative Moment!
- Working Group Discussions of Reservoir Management Draft Proposed Action (continued)
- Large Group Report Out of Working Group Discussions
- Break
- Overview of Remaining Draft Proposed Actions
- Working Group Discussions: Remaining Draft Proposed Actions
- Review of Today/Preview of Tomorrow/Wrap Up

The March 5 session commenced at 8:00 a.m. After reviewing agenda, ground rules and tools for interest-based bargaining, the participants were asked to review a list of cross resource potential conflicts and synergies. This list had been developed with the working groups over the previous month and was contained on a pre-workshop worksheet sent out before the workshop.

Conflicts/Barriers/Draft Actions Exercise

The list of conflicts and synergies were hung on flip chart pages around the room. Also hung were the draft proposed actions which PSE developed based on interests expressed as the first draft PMEs were developed.

Participants were asked to:

1. Add their thoughts to the list of conflicts as well as their ideas for solutions
2. Write down any barriers that they saw to settlement, along with ideas for overcoming these barriers
3. Place a colored sticky dot (according to working group) next to any potential conflict that, in their opinion, needs to be discussed across working groups
4. Place a colored sticky dot next to draft proposed actions that, in their opinion, could be important to discuss across working groups

Attachment C is a Pre-Workshop Worksheet updated with the comments and "sticky dots" from this exercise. Attachment D is a table indicating the "sticky dots" placed at various draft proposed actions.

It turned out to be difficult to gauge the level of cross resource interest in discussing specific conflicts, as participants from all working groups placed at least one "dot" on almost every conflict area.

However, based on level of interest indicated by the number of sticky dots, the following potential conflict areas elicited a relatively high level of interest from Terrestrial, Recreation and Cultural working groups:

- Road and Trail Access
- Dispersed Camping
- Developed Sites
- Land Management

Among Aquatics, Recreation, Cultural and Economics/Operations, there also appeared a high level of interest in discussing Large Woody Debris Management. All groups also showed a high level of interest in discussing Reservoir Management.

Draft Proposed Actions

Kris Olin, Baker Relicensing Project Manager, gave an overview of the draft proposed actions developed by PSE. Attachment E is the PowerPoint presentation of these actions. PSE staff members first reviewed "Shared Proposed Actions," i.e., those actions which most markedly cross all resources. These included:

- Adaptive Management
- Baker River Coordinating Committee
- Reservoir Management and Operation
- Access Management
- Informational, Interpretive and Educational Services and Facilities

After these presentations, the group divided into working groups to discuss the Reservoir Management proposal. There was a large group report out at which each working group explained its group's interests with respect to Reservoir Management.

For the balance of the day, working groups met to discuss other draft proposed actions for their resource area.

Attachment F is a copy of the flip chart notes from the March 5 and 6 proceedings.

March 6, 2003

Present: See Attachment A.

Agenda

- Review/Preview
  - Review of yesterday's progress
  - Agenda review for today
- Working Group Discussions (continued)
- Break
- Creative Moment!

- Next Steps: Where do we go from here?
    - Presentation by:
        - Steve Hocking, FERC Representative
        - Kris Olin, Baker Relicensing Project Manager
        - Rob Mohn, Louis Berger Group (PDEA Consultant)
    - Group Discussion
- Lunch
- Creative Moment!
- Group Discussion: Where do we go from here?
- Break
- Final Creative Moment!
- Large Group Report Out: Where do we go from here?
- Wrap Up
- Adjourn

The March 6 session commenced at 8:00 a.m. After a brief review of yesterday's proceedings, the working groups reconvened to continue their discussions of draft proposed actions in their resource areas.

Discussion of Next Steps

At 11:15 a.m., the groups reconvened for a discussion of next steps. Steve Hocking from FERC told participants that there would be no extensions of the April 30, 2004 deadline for License Application and Settlement Agreement. He urged the group to begin drafting license articles as we continue to work on settlement. Rob Mohn reported that the Berger Group looks to June 1, 2003, as a deadline for actions they will evaluate for the Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment (PDEA) to be issued on September 30, 2003. He urged the group to complete discussions on options to be considered for the PDEA by May 1, 2003.

The working groups answered the following questions in small group discussions and reported their action plans to the full group:

1. What can each working group get done by May 1, 2003? How will we do it?
2. What are the barriers to completing 2nd draft PMEs by May 1, 2003? How will we deal with them?
3. What are the cross resource issues? How will we discuss them?

Details of the action plans are contained in Attachment F.

With respect to "2nd draft PMEs," the facilitators suggested the groups use the format established by the Draft Proposed Actions, which contains key sections from the 1st draft PME format but is much simpler to read. The group seemed responsive to this suggestion.

Wrap Up

Following the reports on action plans, the participants engaged in closing remarks. Overall, participants indicated that the workshop had been very beneficial in moving the settlement process forward.

Participants noted that we had not gotten into substantive discussions of cross resource conflicts. There are action plans for at least some of the groups to begin this work over the coming months.

On the other hand, participants complimented PSE's efforts in developing draft proposed actions. They also appreciated the flexibility of the agenda and the facilitation of the workshop.

Attachment A – List of Participants

Cross Resource Workshop
List of Participants

	March 4	March 5	March 6
Adams, Brian – Skagit County	x	x	x
Aspelund, Arnie – PSE	x	x	x
Bivin, Mignonne – NPS	x		
Bruland, Doug – PSE		x	
Bush, Kelly – Equinox		x	
Campbell, Larry – Swinomish Tribe	x	x	
Carey, Bob – The Nature Conservancy	x		
Daily, Marc – Berger			x
Ebel, Chuck – Army Corps of Engineers	x	x	x
Efird, Carol – Berger		x	x
Endelman, Dee – Agreement Dynamics	x	x	x
Eychaner, Jim – Interagency Comm. Outdoor Rec.		x	x
Feldmann, Cary – PSE	x	x	x
Fransen, Steve – NMFS	x	x	x
Freeland, Connie – PSE	x	x	x
Freet, Bruce – Agreement Dynamics	x	x	x
Fritzen, Bob – DOE		x	
Fuchs, Tony – PSE	x	x	x
Galloway, Gene – PSE	x	x	x
Goldsworthy, Patrick – N. Cascades Cons. Council	x	x	x
Green, Brady – USFS	x		
Hatfield, Andy – PSE	x	x	x
Helton, Bob – Citizen	x	x	x
Hilgert, Phil – R2 Consulting	x	x	x
Hocking, Steve – FERC	x	x	x
Hollenbeck, Jan – USFS	x		
Jennison, Steve – DNR	x	x	x
Kuntz,Bob – NPS		x	x
Lawson, Chris – Huckell/Weinman	x	x	x
Lentz, Scott – USFS	x		
Louthain, Jerry – Anacortes, Skagit PUD Concrete	x	x	x
Mace, Rod – USFS	x	x	
Malone, Kevin – Berger	x	x	
Marks, Derek – Upper Skagit Tribe			x
Mathews, Ruth – The Nature Conservancy	x	x	x
Mierendorf, Bob – NPS	x		
Miss, Chris – Northwest Arch. Asso.		x	
Mohn, Rob – Berger	x	x	x
Molander, Joel – PSE	x	x	x
Nelson, Bob – Rocky Mt.Elk Foundation	x	x	x
Oelfke, Jack – NPS	x		

Olin, Kris – PSE	x	x	x
Pernela, Lloyd – PSE	x	x	x
Piper, Jessie – PSE	x	x	x
Reid, Dave - PSE	x	x	x
Rosebrough, Susan – NPS		x	
Schild, Ed – PSE	x	x	x
Schuyler, Scott – Upper Skagit Tribe	x	x	
Smayda, Kathy – Berger	x	x	x
Sprague, Gary – WDFW	x	x	x
Stagner, Gene – USFWS		x	x
Thoreen, Arn – Skagit Fisheries Enhancement Grp.	x	x	x
Vanderheyden, Jon – USFS	x	x	x
Vaughn, Marty – Biota Pacific	x	x	x
Verretto, Nick – PSE	x	x	x
Vigue, Lauri – WDFW		x	x
Walsh, Stan – Skagit System Cooperative	x	x	x
Weisberg, Saul – North Cascades Institute		x	
Wiltse, Lyn – PDSA Consulting	x	x	x
Wright, Bob – DOE			x
Zyskowski, Stan – NPS	x		

Attachment B – PME Option Review

BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENCE

Cross Resource Workshop

March 4-6, 2003
CottonTree Inn
Mount Vernon, WA

Flip Chart Notes from Discussions

March 5, 2003
Large Group and Working Group Discussions

Large Group Discussion of PSE's "Shared Resources" Draft Proposed Actions

Education/Interpretive Services and Facilities

- How do your education plans fit into those of land management agencies? (not fully developed yet)

Reservoir Management

- Did you use HYDROPS model to do this? – No, we imposed it on HYDROPS model based on blending of interests.
- Have you addressed instream flows that would result under this operating program?
- As it relates to flood control storage, suggesting in this proposal that you maintain at current levels (74K)? – Yes.
- On terrestrial study, different species could benefit by different regimes – overall, keep stable (more dry land)

Working Group Discussions of Reservoir Management: Questions to Answer

a. How do we think that this action will affect our resources?
b. Does this action conflict with the interests of my organization or stakeholder group? If so, how?
c. Are there any cross resource conflicts or opportunities for synergy in this action? If so, what? If there's a conflict, how might we resolve it?
d. What's the level of agreement among us regarding this action?

Economics/Operations Working Group: Discussion of Reservoir Management

Existing and PSE Proposal: (PSE ops w/o flood event)

By 11/1: 16,000 acre-feet = elevation 715
By 11/15: 74,000 acre-feet = elevation 707.8
Until 2/28: maximum elevation 707.8

3/1-10/31: no restrictions in elevation
IPP in place, but not in license
PSE compensated for lost power generation

Suggestions:

By 9/1: 16,000 acre-feet
By 10/1: 74,000 acre-feet
Until 3/31: maximum elevation 707.8 = 74,000 acre-feet
4/1-4/30: maximum elevation 715 = 16,000 acre-feet
5/1-8/31: no restrictions

Existing Operation is at elevation 700'-702' instead of a max elevation of 707.8' to ensure that spilling isn't required at the beginning of a flood event.

This added "voluntary" storage of 5-6 feet results in a total storage of nearly 100,000 acre-feet based on ≈ 4,000 acre-feet of storage per foot of elevation.

Lake Shannon

- Need to clarify the rationale for elevation 401 or greater (for recreation) during summertime.
- Is this because of this being the minimum elevation to use the boat ramp? [answer in discussion period: yes.]

Surcharge

- Potential for up to 3 feet of surcharge to the top of the spillgates (up to elevation 727)
- This could provide up to an additional 12,000 acre-feet of storage (based on 4,000 acre-feet /foot elevation).

Dam Safety

- Upper and lower dam are in compliance with Dam Safety (FERC) and spillways can safely pass the probable maximum flood (PMF).

Answers to four questions:

a. Action affect resource?
   (-) Loss of power (flexibility) by lowering of the Baker pool for a longer period each year.

   (+) Longer period of time each year for flood control storage.

b. Action conflict with interests?
   - PSE neutral if compensation is provided.
   - Local governments' support of additional time periods for flood control storage.
   - Local governments still want 26,000 additional acre-feet of storage, up to a max of 100,000 acre-feet in FERC license.

- Additional clarification is needed on exactly what this proposal is as compared to existing operation.

c. Cross resource conflicts or opportunities for synergy?
   - Power generation vs. flood control
   - Interest(s) of other working groups

d. Level of agreement?
   - Proposal is in the right direction (better than existing) with amount of compensation and source of compensation needing to be identified

Aquatics Working Group: Discussion of Reservoir Management

List of Effects
Δ Pool Elevations

- Tributary access
- Delta, alluvial fan spawning
  – Affect function of timing
  – Magnitude, scour
- Smolt migration
- Reservoir rearing
- Benthic productivity
- Turbidity
- Fish passage facilities – operational range
- Impacts on recreational fisheries
- Spill (occurs more/less)
- Downstream fish barrier dam
  – List of effects (seasonal)
  – Δ Pool elevation

<u>Fall</u>

- Fall instream flow
  – Chinook spawning, etc.
  – All aquatic species
- Attraction to Baker River
- Transportation flows in Skagit
- Maintaining ecosystem function
- Opportunity to augment during extreme droughts

<u>Winter</u>

- Low flow augmentation
- Flood/scour protection

Spring

- Smolt migration
- Alevin protection
- Steelhead spawning (+/-)
- Side channel connectivity

Summer

- Side channel connectivity
- TBC

Aquatics Working Group: 4:00 p.m. Extended Meeting

3.1 Aquatic species management plan.

HERC

(a) + good idea
+ could spend to acquire more info in time frame
+ change acronym (consider it)
+ too wide open and vague
+ miscellaneous acct.

(b) [group to revisit]

3.1.2 Fish propagation and enhancement program

(a) + reduces sockeye production
+ captures more of the elements
+ gain for other species
+ preserves management flexibility
+ beach #4 plus

(b&c) - desire only native species
- rainbow trout: native vs. non-native
- chinook?
+/- recreational sport fishery

(d) positive

3.2 Fish passage

3.2.1 Upstream (Lower Baker)

- Action will have + effect
- May work well for analysis of species, but may not satisfy concerns about other fish species (lamprey?)

3.2.2 Connectivity (between dams)

- How do we achieve this most effectively?
- Does it require some type of facility? If so, what?
- It is a step-wise approach to evaluate
- May need a genetic component

(d) Positive

3.2.3 Downstream fish passage (both reservoirs)

- It is a "good thing"
- May be premature to specific sequential development of barge technology
- Acclimation ponds are a plus
- Make for simultaneous implementation at both reservoirs
- Performance criteria?

3.2.4 Downstream migration connectivity between upper and lower Baker

- Placeholder for bull trout, etc.
- Good proposal

Recreation Working Group: Discussion of Reservoir Management

Reservoir management:

- How will it affect our PMEs?
- It will establish minimum pool levels
- Have had several pool level events
- Can be less than 708'
- Giving up flexibility in operations
- Boat launches are operational at 715'
- Could be at 715' all summer – aesthetics an issue
- 3rd week of May – peak people/fishing through October
- Satisfies most of recreational boating needs
- Pool level – takes safety into account
- Dispersed camping increases
- Aesthetics graphed at 2' intervals
- Problem with drawdown during peak season – increases intrusion into drawdown zone
- Some, as per survey, appreciated drawn down
- Access issue overlaps with reservoir level management
- Safe operation of boats – liability issue
- Peak season – last 2 weeks of July, all of August with exception of 4th of July, nice weekends after Labor Day
- Low pool/elevation could affect Spring/Fall school programs
- We need to see HYDROPS/model – % of time 715' or above. Need a "full read"

- Trails not an issue as it relates to reservoir management (with few exceptions)
- Forest Service – issue as per people access onto draw down
- Law enforcement, education needs to increase with draw down
- Recreation – will adapt to proposal but with shift in type of recreation
- New proposal vs. historical operation practices – this is an improvement, i.e., boating access, accessibility to shoreline, etc.
- Shannon – the proposed appears to be a modest recc. for recreation (with HYDROPS model)
- Synergy – Recreation, terrestrial, cultural

Recreation Working Group: 4:00 p.m. Extended Meeting

Trails:

2.4.1 "Construct" trails to "establish" trails

- Mountain bikes are under-served
- Placeholder for possible Shannon Lake trail & possible town of Concrete application
- Cascade Trail connection
- Feasibility – Shannon to Baker
- Watchable wildlife – pond/wetland near (resort – trail panorama point.)
- RAM fund – possible use with later trail connection
- Rail Trail connection to "mountain trail"
- Water trail – support by "managing" of dispersed sites on lakes – route mapping necessary
- Shannon to Baker possible – portage arrangement with PSE to accommodate

Terrestrial Working Group: Discussion of Reservoir Management

How do we operate Upper Baker currently?

1. Full pool 724'
   Minimum operating pool 675'
   Joel's input: Flood control (existing agreement)
   - November 15 – February 28 – 707.8'
   - November 1 – 715'

   Proposal extends targets
   - October 1 – March 31 – 707.8
   - Additional flood control benefit during March to meet November dates, need to start drafting reservoir in August.

2. Average water year – How long to reach full pool (724') from 707.8? And 715' from 707.8'?

3. Support Recreation PME to extend boat ramps for use at lower elevations

Terrestrial constraints for pool operation:

1. Seasonal exposure in fluctuation zone during growing season. Spring/Fall 715'
2. Spring refill regime/fluctuation regime with respect to bird, small mammal and amphibian breeding.
3. Summer elevation to remain relatively constant.
4. Influence on surrounding wetlands.

Resources vary in reliance on reservoir:

Upland species browse (elk, grizzly) – location flexible, facultative

Bird nesting – Habitat facultative, direct mortality can occur – obligate osprey, swallows, shorebirds (ground nesters)

Amphibians – obligate, direct mortality can occur

Low mobility SPP: Mollusks – OBL, direct mortality risk

Wetland habitats (relative to Hydro/continuity with reservoir)

Greatest flexibility in constraints – Fall/Spring forage

Least flexibility in constraints – Amphibians

Questions:

- Can one reservoir be held relatively constant while the other is used for flood control?
- Is there a combination of the two that would allow water surface elevation to be held relatively constant?
- How many acre-feet of storage per foot of elevation at Baker? At Shannon?
- What are the implications of maintaining a constant pool at Shannon? March – June

Optimal operations regimes for wildlife at Baker

- March – May (end of flood control): $\leq$ 715', fluctuation $\leq$ 1'
    - Lets vegetation grow in inundation zone
    - Available for forage
    - Protects amphibians
- June – August: 720' – 724', fluctuation okay
    - Protects wetlands along shore from human disturbance
- September – transition to flood control (October)
- September 15th – 715' elevation preferred
    - Allows vegetation another growth phase
- October – February
    - Flood control mode – no specific wildlife constraint

- Tradeoff of the regime: doesn't allow flooding of reed canary grass whereas a full pool March – October might allow control of the grass.

Question:
- What elevation range supports most amphibian breeding at Baker Reservoir?

Hamer: Determine elevation zone within which fluctuation is used by amphibians during March – May.

Cultural Working Group: Discussion of Reservoir Management

- Assumption that full pool is always good – not always true
- Response to rapid pool fluctuation will vary according to sediment type
- Consider landform with regard to low pool level
- Stable is GOOD!
- Process for notification if rule curve is exceeded either: crisis; violation; unscheduled
- Unknown effect of rule curve on TCPs

Synergies
- Restricting boats in some areas (no wake zones)
- Promoting recreation and cultural values (i.e., canoes vs. jet skis)
- Vegetation management/site stabilization

Conflicts
- Wave action
- More people

March 6, 2003
Morning Working Group Meetings

Aquatics Working Group

3.3.1 Flow Regime
- List flow objectives – flow regimes vs. minimum flows
- Identify HYDROPS potential model "runs"
- Baker River basin hydrology mean and ranges – begin our understanding: study A-24 should be done next week (Phil H)
- Use the initial proposed action as a "place holder" for now until we can gain a better understanding as stated above
- Don't know instantaneous inflow, but know a daylong average inflow
- Look at flow over a wide range – can't look at the protection of fish based on an entire water year: must look instead at variability within water year. For example,

the model is based on 50% exceedance; one cold day at 90% exceedance can cause huge losses of fish
- Classify the water year types as HIGH, MEDIUM, LOW – we need to work details with the definitions
- PSE wants clear objectives for delivering water – when do we make the "call" on the hydrological year? (easily understandable)
- Transferring SCL definitions of protection actions because of basin hydrology isn't applicable – does not appear to be so now – need more info. Don't know.
- Action Item: Need to base flows on Baker River basin hydrology - with intent to integrate with flow events on the Skagit River
- May need some minimum flow for the Little Baker River
- What if the Skagit River flows provided some adaptive management decision thresholds? (Bob W.)
- A concept is to have (need some bounds) some surety numbers with some range or variable numbers
- PSE does not presently have the equipment capability to achieve some of the flow conditions discussed (but can model it)
- Future conditions will not be constrained by current generation equipment.

<u>Ramping</u>
- Proposed a 24-hour cycle
- Action Item: PSE is willing to integrate flows/ramping with what is occurring on the Skagit River – considering cumulative effects
- Ramping rates first look at Skagit River flows and fluctuation – mitigate Skagit increasing hydrograph, but need a rate that provides for the Little Baker River as well.
- How frequently are the downramps additive – or match SCL? Need an analysis of this.
- PSE to explain why Baker would not meet state standards if that is proposal
- Could "buffer" the Skagit River ramping, but the proposal seems to have a 6" downramp (take Baker off line for 6 hours?)
- Should add a critical flow in Skagit because that is where the biological sign is – look at multiple river transects (Phil H.)
- Safety should be a consideration: upramp 6"/hour. Have seen 1 or 2 feet per hour (Steve F.) Possibly 6-9" per hour (Phil H.) White River is 1'/hr, with target control of 6"/1/2 hr
- Where will we measure it? Perhaps on the Skagit River at Concrete, but we need some sample HYDROPS model runs.

<u>Amplitude and cycling</u>
- The lower the ramping rate and the lower the amplitude, the greater the fish survival – nothing was proposed for cycling.
- Action item: Amplitude and bar stranding for data analysis… different colonization rates for macroinvertebrates and fish fry/smolts. Dewatering the same band twice has the same effect as dewatering other bands.

Water quality state standards

- PSE and WDOE are continuing to work on the Baker River Project to address issues regarding state water quality standards – turbidity will be very hard to meet and may require some mitigation (resuspension at extreme low pool is one of the concerns)
- How do state water quality standards apply to this project?

Terrestrial Working Group

1.1 General Habitat Types

Q&A

- How were habitat amounts determined?
  – 22 acres for wet meadow (total 217)
- How do we keep "young deciduous" as it is?
  – look at it in terms of acre-years. We need to figure this out.
  – could get more acres or substitute habitat type.
- Be clear on what we're managing habitat for.

Overall: A thumbs up – a starting point
Concern: number of acres is *really* draft.

What process will we use to deal with concerns?

- Process for details and moving toward next steps
  – there has already been effort to use data (1st draft PMEs & D.P.A.)
  – need to agree on how to use data.
- Have we identified all the "buckets," i.e., all the habitat types we want to address?
- Re: acres of wetlands – WDFW policy interest: wants to see more than 1/1 ratio. More like 3:1 (enhanced:impacted), which is in line with their sensitive area ordinance
  – need to work through disagreement regarding policy application in this project
  – FERC might see this as "E" rather than "M"

Assumption underlying draft proposed action: High quality wetlands protected.

- Examine ratio of each habitat type
- State's interest: full replacement for what could be lost
- Review:
  – Methodology to get to acreage
  – How do we apply it?
  – Implementation strategy – what can we even do? ("buffers" might be part of answer)
- Should say "replace habitat value associated with/of the acres"

- Consider "buffering" as strategy

Have we hit all the habitat types? (based on PSE understanding of T7B)

How do we link analysis of species and habitat studies?

- Look at habitats 1st: right type/amount?
- Look at species: e.g. anything specific to chickadees that will affect the type and amount of habitat?
- **Action: Marty will put together how he got from T7B to D.P.A. (show the math)**

Other major assumption: With ACOE flood control, the "Without PSE" scenario would be for Lower Baker Dam to go away, and for Upper Baker reservoir to be operated at 700' full pool (minimum scenario for current flood control).

Document assumption

– Agree on set of assumptions.

1.1.2 Evaluate potential for vegetation fluctuation zone (may be conflict with Chinook spawning)

- Reservoir elevation management.
- Reservoir surcharge – that needs to be an adaptive management issue from terrestrial perspective.

1.2.1 Elk forage

- same assumptions as above, also from T7B +
  – additional acres for forage
- Need to look at temporary forage
- Need to flesh out assumptions (T7B, etc.)
- Elk study going on – might want to direct our efforts there (may change to "let's support them")
- Need to keep in mind what will be put in E.A. as placeholder.
- March meeting: timeline for how to get to draft E.A.
  – modification
- Think of any other criteria you want and bring it to the next meeting.

1.2.2 Grizzly Bears

- Assumption: this action would only happen if grizzly bear occupancy is documented during the 5 year period of the bear study.
- Some take issues with need for presence to provide forage (number is generous based on requirement for presence)
- USFS is doing enhancements to provide habitat (e.g., road closures)
- Suggestion: Buy on a schedule (e.g., in 10 years)
  – USFS sees this as mitigation
  – Other ways to meet this interest?

– access management
– core spring forage – bump up to optimum
– what else would be needed
– get info regarding how vegetation is being used for bears (could be adaptive management issue)
– do forage study 1st (as part of settlement)

– USFS is okay with study but only with something hard and fast up front
– Marty to redraft based on this discussion
– Access management- USFS work with Lloyd on [?] and evaluating road access/closures for grizzlies, elk, etc.
– Land acquisition, etc., goes through tribal consultation

1.2.3 Mountain Goats

- License can't obligate USFS to do that activity – ways around that?
  – could earmark money for mountain goat
  – USFS likes not [?]

Action: USFS to give ballpark cost.

- Is this a cross-resource issue with recreation group?

Note: We're getting into Mt. Baker Wilderness Area – what impact will this action have on this?

– USFS – Suggestion regarding "no wake" zone – may have some merit for terrestrial group concern.

1.2.4: same issues as 1.1.1
1.3.1: slam dunk?
1.3.2: slam dunk!
1.3.3: need to work with recreation group
1.3.4:
1.4.1: This is taken directly from what Laura and Laurel wrote
1.4.2:
1.5.1:

Overall – thumbs generally fairly "up" with understanding that we need to keep fleshing out, discussing underlying assumptions, etc.

Terrestrial Working Group Action Items from Morning Discussion

- Identify assumptions for land management items
- Show the group how conclusions were reached from first draft PMEs and study data
- Discuss and agree on how to use data to come up with numbers

Recreation Working Group

2.5 Developed Recreation Sites

Bayview: we may not be able to develop this to the point of Horseshoe Cove (LSR issues)

Resort:
Background: Predates UB Project

- Special use permit from USFS
- Interest: lake level control ($)
- Short operating season
- Structures/infrastructure in bad shape
- Capacity issue at developed sites/peak season use
- Resort is currently in Forest Plan (could be modified)

PSE's interest: lake level (goes away with rule curve)
USFS interest: serving that client group - other place; peak season occupancy in lakeside developed campgrounds

Kulshan:

- Reconfigure to make more attractive
- Extend utilities to additional sites (electrical hookups to 30% of sites and extend water and sewer)
  – Do feasibility study/adaptive management approach?
- Occupancy rates at Kulshan are lowest in Basin (not on the water)
- Aim: to modify Kulshan so it can accommodate large percentage of campers
- Jim's note: the only camping growth is in RV-style. This takes into account increased population age!
- Suggestion: Pave the road (approximately 1 mile). Federal funds available? Matching funds?
- Recognize flow (South to North) of more developed to less developed sites.

Dispersed Sites:

- O+M for maintenance.
- Resource protection (controlling [?] impacts associated sites)
- Issues – overflow
  – Elimination of some sites
  – Lower Sandy has elk and wetland and access issues (road drainage)
  – Consider seasonal closure for elk?
- Proposed action: include toilet facility at central sites (Lower Sandy, Lower Noisy and Anderson Point)
- Upper lakeshore roadside sites (Baker N. road)
- Human waste and trash is a problem

Trails:

- USFS concern: no mention specifically for bike trails – opportunity for loop trails? This is an underserved population.
- Maintenance issue on trails: we need to figure out a percentage to use for cost sharing on maintenance.

Swift Creek Trail:

- USFS turned down investment offer (conflict with critical habitats)
- One of the first trails in the Basin.
- We removed Swift Creek from our list.

Lake Shannon:

- Lake Shannon is the largest freshwater lake in Skagit County.
- Concern regarding recreational fishing: Skagit county needs time to study draft proposed actions to see how they might impact the needs of County residents.
- Currently, Lake Shannon is "really busy" only 1-2 days per year.
- Skagit County owns land in drawdown zone (Lake Shannon Scuba Park)

Aesthetics:

- Proposed actions deal mainly with structures plus reservoir bathtub effect.
- USFS interest seems to be the reservoir drawdown effect: they would like to have higher lake levels during peak seasons.
- It looks like the proposed rule curve could satisfy the USFS interest here.

General Comments:

- PSE putting together draft proposed actions was a big risk.
- Appreciation was expressed for PSE taking this step.
- Jim is generally pleased with the scope of what is being proposed.
- It represented a best effort by PSE to meet stakeholder interests.

Recreation Working Group Action Items from Morning Discussion

- Andy: Research formal master planning process to eliminate resort and rehabilitate site.
- Andy: "Talk to the boys" about matching funds to pave road to Kulshan.
- Get base case HYDROPS results out to participants.
- Get out proposal output (HYDROPS)
  – Meet with workgroups for Q&A regarding effects on various resource areas.
- Get out a 2nd draft proposal.

Economics/Operations Working Group

- CZMA consistency: is not a PME. All the items have to be done for the license.
- Submerged Lands: is not a PME, but a FERC requirement that the licensee control all lands within project boundary. DNR may go with blanket easement/lease for use of their lands by Baker Project.

- Low flow augmentation for continual water rights
  - Any augmentation flows have to be included within instream flows required of Baker Project (aquatics workgroup), not in addition to.
  - Requires new DOE regulations (possible use of "trust" program). Linking consumable water right to non-consumable water rights is a problem. Jerry Louthain will review with sponsors and DOE.
- Flood control
  - Congress set project's current flood control program since 1977: 74,000 acre-feet
  - Corps announced they are doing study of Baker Project flood control. Need to get scope, timing.

Economics/Operations Working Group Action Items from Morning Discussion

- May 1: Flood control: meet with Corps to define scope, timing.
- Legal team to research level of freedom.
- Barriers: Corps timing and scope.
- DOE needs to examine regulations (water rights).

March 6, 2003
Afternoon Discussions

Large Group Discussion: Where do we go from here?

Comments from FERC, PSE and Louis Berger (Steve Hocking, Kris Olin, Rob Mohn)

- Get a group to draft License articles based on 2nd draft PMEs
- Maybe 1 more round to PME doc – pull out PMEs substantially agreed upon and start writing draft 1st draft license articles
- Settlement Agreement – want it done by 4/04
  - There won't be extensions
- Some PMEs won't be fully ready – place in a post licensing plan (outline plan in License Articles)
- PDEA- September draft for public
  - Between now and then, go through several reviews
- Some PMEs become License Articles themselves
- Some PMEs become management plans
- PSE will put together plan for integrating writing of license articles and settlement language and present to Solution Team at its March meeting
- **Action: Steve Hocking will send Connie Freeland information on how license articles should be written, including an example, within the next two weeks.**

Facilitators' thoughts: next steps

- Workshop documentation within 1 week
- 2nd draft PMEs—use format started in Draft Proposed Actions
- Check-ins with stakeholder groups—April, May
- Solution team settlement process—March/April

Where Do We Go From Here? Based on FERC's timeline:

1. What can each working group get done by May 1, 2003? How will we do it?
2. What are the barriers to completing 2nd draft PMEs by May 1, 2003? How will we deal with them?
3. What are the cross resource issues? How will we discuss them?

Working Group Responses To These Questions

Recreation Working Group

Recreation Action Plan:

- Andy: By 3/14, expand table comparing "Draft Proposed Actions" with first draft PMEs.
- Andy: By 3/17, get feedback from all workgroup members.
- At March 24th meeting, review expanded table, walk through draft of Draft Proposed Actions
  - – Flag areas of low consensus.
  - – Setup 1 or 2 special workgroup meetings to resolve outstanding issues.
- By April 14, get out second drafts of Draft Proposed Actions
- At April 28th workgroup meeting, finalize, as much as possible, (may need to specify ranges) the 2nd Draft Proposed Actions
- By May 1st, Prepare 2nd draft of Proposed Actions, incorporating workgroup members' feedback (according to their interests.)

Recreation perceived barriers to completion:

- Not going to have full agreement by 5/1
  - – Document agreement and areas not agreed upon
- If added actions, cross resource implications may not have time to be addressed

Recreation cross-resource issues:

- Access
- Sensitive areas
- Education/info
- Suggest Recreation/Terrestrial meeting with cultural representative

Aquatics Working Group

Aquatics Action Plan (May 1):

1. Ramping
2. Amplitude
3. Cycling
   - for actions 1-3: Modeling a range, identify assumptions
   - 6"/hr and WDFW guidelines

- Email suggestions to PSE
- PSE runs model and shares results by the week of 3/24

4. WQ in stream
5. WQ in reservoir
   - For actions 4-5: How do state standards apply?
   - Bob and Nick to finish by first week of April
6. Fish propagation (questionably possible by 5/1)
7. Connectivity
8. Refine and provide a range of options for downstream fish passage (questionable/impossible by 5/1)
9. HERC
10. Augment/restore LWD & sediment
11. Upstream fish passage
12. Instream flows (impossible by 5/1)

Aquatics perceived barriers to completion:

- Work load
- Need info: e.g. HYDROPS & IFIM, understand flows
- Time - we need more for meetings
- Reservoir pool vs. instream flows

Aquatics cross-resource issues:

- Fish passage
- Law enforcement
- Reservoir pool vs. instream flows

Terrestrial Working Group

Terrestrial Action Plan:
The players with 4e authority need to be present in order for the working group to make these decisions. Our thoughts are that we can get done at least the first three of four tiers by May 1 (and, hopefully, all four tiers):

1. Agreement on issues to address
2. Commit to certain issues to be addressed through management plans developed after license issuance
3. Agreement on ranges of actions on land issues
4. Develop 2nd draft PMEs (detailed)

Terrestrial perceived barriers to completion:

- Time
  Possible solutions:
  - More frequent meetings
  - Need all TRWG participants involved
  - Use plant Teamlet to revise special status plant and weed PMEs offline. Bring revised drafts back to TRWG

Terrestrial cross-resource issues:

- Recreation/terrestrial group meeting with cultural reps:
  - access meeting
  - sensitive areas
- Reservoir management: keep telling what our optimum is

Economics/Operations Working Group

Econ/Ops Action Plan:

By 5/1:

- Baseline hydrology set
- Across workgroups: review 3 baseline precipitation levels: low, medium, high
- Review proposal changes in hydrology, e.g., flood control, ramping, instream flows
- Legal teamlet: Keith Brooks (FERC), Pamela Krueger (PSE), Siri Nelson (COE), and Sonja Wolfmann (WDFW AG) to review flood control

Econ/Ops perceived barriers to completion:

- Aquatics group sign-off on baseline
- Flood control: Corps timeline vs. relicensing schedule
- Low water flows and continued water rights:
  - Issue will be driven by instream flows (Aquatics WG)
  - Jerry to meet with sponsors [possible solution to not seek?]
  - Lack of regulations. DOE regulations need changing.

Econ/Ops cross-resource issues:

- Aquatics workgroup needs to review HYDROPS hydrology output for adequacy.
- Flood-control: all workgroups find this important.

Cultural Working Group

Cultural Action Plan:

- Follow-up information memo to group members.
- Pre-workgroup meeting work on Historic Properties Management Plan (Jessie & Chris) – annotated HPMP outline.
- April 8 workgroup meeting:
  - Review of HPMP and impact for next draft
  - Review of proposed cultural actions
  - Review of "missing" PMEs
  - Discussion of other resource proposed actions
- Tribal Liaison (Kelly) – work with tribe to get input on specific proposed actions
- After April 8th meeting – cross resource discussions with other team leaders to identify and schedule TWG meeting/discussion/classifications.

- (By May 1) Follow-up work on HPMP and proposed actions – 2nd draft.
- (By May 1) PDEA info.