



BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Terrestrial Resources Working Group RESOLVE Session

**September 17, 2003
8:30 am until 2pm**

**U.S. Forest Service Office
21905 64th Avenue West
Mountlake Terrace, WA**

AGENDA

Review Agenda, Notes, Action Items
Review agreements from 8/21/03 meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Language changes on 1.3.2, 1.3.4, and 1.3.6• Updates on others (1.4.2 teamlet meeting)
Acreage <ul style="list-style-type: none">• BAWG priorities and needs• PSE proposal costs• How far apart are we? How should we proceed to get agreement?
1.2.5—Provide connectivity habitat for low mobility species (time allowing)
1.2.4—Provide breeding habitat for amphibians (time allowing)
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

September 17, 2003

USFS Offices
Mountlake Terrace, WA

FINAL MEETING NOTES

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

PRESENT

Don Gay (USFS), Gene Stagner (USFWS), Marty Vaughn (Biota Pacific), Carl Corey *by phone* (USFS), Lauri Vigue (WDFW), Bob Nelson (Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation), Bob Carey (The Nature Conservancy), Dee Endelman (facilitator)

Agenda

- Review notes, agenda, action items
- Review notes from 8/21/03 meeting (1.3.2, 1.3.4, 1.3.6)
- Acreage
 - BAWG priorities and needs
 - PSE proposed costs
 - How far apart are we? How should we proceed?
- 1.2.5 Connectivity
- 1.2.4 Amphibians
- Next Agenda

New Action Items

- Gene—Send Marcot snag model to group
- Lauri—Get Julie Stoeffel a copy of Bald Eagle PME & get her opinion of how to administer \$10K provision
- All—think about night roosting surveys
- Tony—E-mail group with results of hydrops run re: amphibians

Old Action Items

- Tony—button up with Laura re: special plants cost estimate
- 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)

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.
- For each PME, we will begin by identifying the goal and measurable objectives
- 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.

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

Discussion re: Document Distribution

- We'll be consistent about what will be sent via e-mail and what will be given out as hard copy. At the end of each meeting, we'll decide what will go out in each type of format. If e-mail, we'll each be responsible for making copies.

1.3.2: Loons

- Okay as written in 9/3/03 draft except:
 - Who secures legal access for platforms outside the project? We intend that appropriate parties secure legal access.
 - Lawyers can work on refining this language.

1.3.4: Bald Eagles—Non-Project Lands

- Okay as written in 9/3/03 draft except:
 - We need to add some detail regarding the \$10,000 provision to assure that it's used as we intend (not to cover actions required anyway)
 - 2nd paragraph of "Description of Actions"—Say annual ground surveys and add a reference to PME 1.3.6.

1.3.6: Bald Eagle Monitoring

- Okay as written in 9/3/03 draft except
 - We need to think about periodic winter night roosting surveys (reasonable? Cost effective? Tied to project effect?)
 - Add a sentence regarding PSE's noting incidental observations
 - Add agencies back in as people to report to

Acreeage Discussion

What are the variables?

1. Land costs
 - a. How did PSE make its assumptions?
 - i. PSE looked at the City Light settlement—they bought 8000 acres at \$2600/acre
 1. Assumed that this is a low estimate since the acres were bought years ago, "easy land"
 - ii. The last 2 timberland sales shocked the industry (Snoqualmie Tree Farm and White River Tree Farm)
 - iii. PSE used \$3000/acre as estimate (average)—not a lot of confidence in this number—it may still be low

group rules, if group members were expected to attempt agreement on those materials.

-
-
2. Types of land
 - a. Developable timber land
 - b. Undevelopable timber land
 - c. Agricultural land (higher price)
 - d. Wetland/flood plain areas
 - e. Developable lowland
 3. BAWG priorities
 - a. Lands under threat of development v. less threatened—how important of a criterion is that to BAWG priorities? *It could be more or less of a priority depending on habitat protection—habitat protection goals are what is important.*
 4. Land to buy versus acquiring rights—for costing purposes, assume buying the land (although we'll look for less expensive ways to protect habitat)

Discussion of Options

1. Sharing the risk (balancing the certainty) between the resource and the Company—ways to do that:
 - a. Early implementation for some habitat coupled with late implementation for others
 - b. Put money into a fund for later use
2. What does “certainty” mean?
 - a. PSE: a dollar amount (for acquisition and management)
 - b. BAWG: X amount of habitat of Y quality—the quality may vary and may occur naturally or involve a mechanism to achieve needed quality
 - c. Restoration and O & M needs to be called out in the PME

1.2.4: Amphibians

1. Issue: Which combination of three approaches should be used?
 - o Reservoir at or below certain elevations between March and May so that amphibians can breed;
 - o Three acres of pond-breeding habitat as indicated in T7B analysis (different locations possible)
 - o Buying wetland acreage
 - o Fund wetland restoration or enhancement (connected to pond-breeding habitat approach)
2. If the reservoir level can be held to levels where amphibians can breed, this would be the preferred option of the group.
3. Wetland restoration/enhancement is a secondary preference.

Agenda for September 30, 2003 Meeting

- o Review agenda, notes, action items
- o Review of agreements from 9/17 meeting (1.2.4)
- o Acreage

-
- Amphibians
 - Connectivity
 - Rare Plants
 - Noxious Weeds
 - Breeding Birds