



---

## BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

### Aquatic Resources Working Group

March 11, 2004

8:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Puget Sound Energy

Summit Ridge Conference Room (next to PSE Building)

10885 NE 4<sup>th</sup> St., Bellevue, WA

### AGENDA

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

1. Review Agenda, Minutes, Schedule	8:30 – 9:00
2. Fish Passage Technical Working Group Report	9:00 – 9:15
3. Instream Flow Technical Working Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Summarize 2/27 IFTWG Meeting &amp; 3/5 Conference Call</li><li>• Status of New/Revised HYDROPS Runs</li><li>• Summarize Action/Decision Items</li></ul> <i>Break at 10:30</i>	9:15 – 12:00
<i>Lunch (meeting snacks or bring your own)</i>	12:00 – 12:20
4. RESOLVE : Draft Proposed Actions <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 3.1.1 Provide Fish Propagation &amp; Enhancement</li><li>• 3.4.1 Implement Fluvial Geomorphic Management</li><li>• 3.4.3 Shoreline Erosion Management</li><li>• 3.4.4 Aquatic Habitat Restoration</li></ul>	12:20 – 2:00
5. Study Updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A01a/b/A26b: Reservoir Tributary Study: <i>Draft Report</i></li><li>• A16: Lower Baker River Alluvial Fan Assessment</li><li>• A25: Project Influenced Predation Study: <i>Draft Report</i></li><li>• A26a: Reservoir Production Potential: <i>Draft Report</i></li></ul>	2:00 – 2:55
6. Set Agenda for April 8, 2004 (8:30-3 PSE-Bellevue)	2:55 - 3:00

March 11, 2004

**Park in the Puget Sound Energy Building Parking Garage:**



---

**(Summit Ridge Conference Room is actually in next building to the west of the PSE Building-  
opposite Café Pogacha, but parking is free in the PSE Building Garage with stamp validation)**

---

---

## **BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE**

### **AQUATIC RESOURCES/INSTREAM FLOWS/RESOLVE MEETING**

**March 11, 2004  
8:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.  
Puget Sound Energy  
Summit Ridge Conference Room (next to PSE Building)  
100885 NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Bellevue, WA**

### **FINAL MEETING NOTES**

**Team Leader: Arnie Aspelund, PSE** ([arnie.aspelund@pse.com](mailto:arnie.aspelund@pse.com))

#### **ATTENDEES**

Arnie Aspelund, Paul Wetherbee, Cary Feldmann, (PSE), Steve Fransen, (NMFS), Stan Walsh, (Skagit River System Cooperative), Ruth Mathews, (TNC), Arn Thoreen, (SFEG), Greta Movassaghi, Margaret Beilharz, Dean Grover and Scott Lentz, by phone (USFS), Jeff McGowan and Mike Stansbury (Skagit County Public Works), Gene Stagner (USFWS), Bill Reinard (Wildcat Steelhead Club), Gary Sprague (WDFW), Bob Wright and Jim Pacheco (DOE), Chuck Ebel (USACE), Phil Hilgert (R2), Carl Hadley, by phone (Cedarock Consultants, Inc.), Lyn Wiltse, (PDSA Consulting Inc.), facilitator.

**2004 Baker Aquatic Meetings:** April 8, May 13, June 10, July 8, August 12, September 9, October 14, November 11, December 9.

***NOTE: THE APRIL MEETING WILL BE AT THE PSE OFFICE IN BELLEVUE!***

#### **March 11, 2004 Tentative Agenda**

1. Review agenda, notes, actions
2. Fish Passage Technical Working Group Report
3. Instream Flow Technical Working Group
  - Summarize 2/27 IFTWG Meeting & 3/5 Conference Call
  - Status of New/Revised HYDROPS Runs

- Summarize Action/Decision Items
- 4. RESOLVE: Draft Proposed Actions
  - 3.1.1 Provide Fish Propagation & Enhancement
  - 3.4.1 Implement Fluvial Geomorphic Management
  - 3.4.3 Shoreline Erosion Management
  - 3.4.4 Aquatic Habitat Restoration
- 5. Study Updates:
  - A01a/b/A26b: Reservoir Tributary Study: *Draft Report*
  - A16: Lower Baker River Alluvial Fan Assessment
  - A25: Project Influenced Predation Study: *Draft Report*
  - A26a: Reservoir Production Potential: *Draft Report*
- 6. Set Agenda for April 8, 2004 (8:30-3 PSE-Bellevue)

#### NEW ACTION ITEMS

- Steve: Check with Ed M. re: height requirement for barrier dam.
- ALL: Get comments on license article language to Arnie by March 16 so they can be passed on to the Legal Team.
- Lyn: Talk with Dee re: Legal Working Group meetings conflicting with other meetings, so that Solution Team members can attend.
- Cary: Re-visit the widest operating range possible (with new runners etc.) with Joel.
- Gary: Work on “back of the envelope” costs of proposed 3.1 PME by March 19<sup>th</sup>.
- Stan: Review 3.4.1 and suggest wording changes and send to Arnie to distribute by March 15.
- Margaret: Put together purpose statement and detail of new HYDROPS run. Get to Paul by Tuesday, March 16.
- Arnie: Post A25 on website.
- Paul: Email out L1, L2 and L3 and summary by Friday, March 19.

#### OLD ACTION ITEMS

- Phil: Posted Level 1, 2 analyses of HYDROPS output on the eRoom by February 13.
- Phil: Completed comparison table, including edits as discussed.
- Paul: Coordinated teamlet conference call on Feb. 18 from 2:00 to 3:00 to put together a couple of additional HYDROPS runs for discussion at Feb. 26 Instream Flows Technical Working Group Meeting. Also sent out the dial-in number so other interested folks could also participate.
- Arnie: Investigated current Large Woody Debris PME wording and found that it hadn’t changed since February of 2003.
- Scott L.: Re-sent comments on Tributary Study Report to Arnie to distribute.
- Stan and Gary: Emailed 3.1.1 revision proposal to Arnie to distribute.
- Stan: Developed language between amount and trigger for 3.4.1 and sent to Arnie
- Arnie: Checked definition of BRCC and saw that it included appropriate “teamlet” reference. Also checked “consultation” language.
- ALL: Sent comments on 3.4.4 to Arnie by February 20.
- Arnie: Sent out electronic version of A25.
- ALL: Were to have sent comments on A25 to Arnie by February 28.

## **FISH PASSAGE TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP REPORT**

The Fish Passage Technical Working Group met at the Lodge March 8 and 9<sup>th</sup>. They discussed the deployment of the Net Transition Structure for the Floating Surface Collector. The net is being assembled currently. Implementation should be complete by the end of March. They also reviewed a 30% design memo from MWH (March 2004). A 60 day comment period for the 30 % design starts March 8<sup>th</sup>. The hydraulic modeling plan is due out shortly. They also discussed performance standards and testing standards. They talked about various contingencies/compensation package in the event that performance standards are not immediately met. They discussed repeating portions of the behavioral migration study conducted in the spring of 2002. They meet again April 13 and 14.

## **INSTREAM FLOWS REPORT**

Cary reported on progress made at the last Instream Flows meetings (February 27, March 5). So far, the economics of *SRC.26/DFW.07/NMF.03* are not viable from PSE's perspective. On March 5<sup>th</sup>, PSE "floated" a proposal calling for a 9 - 19 year delay in implementing any of the alternatives on the table. They suggested continuing to operate according to the IPP during this period, and then (after comprehensive flood control studies had been complete), being able to pursue a variety of options.

Agencies responded that this scenario was unacceptable. Skagit County had no comment.

Since there is an interim period, we would need to agree on what flows would look like during that period.

Dependable capacity was also discussed. This occurs approximately once every 7 years. We might address some of the economic issues here by prescribing a regime that relaxes drought conditions (like 2001). Cary reported that this might work if coupled with a delay option. PSE needs to be able to release water during peak hours in drought conditions. If PSE were unable to generate enough power, it would have to buy power elsewhere to feed the depleted grid.

Mike reported that Skagit County will comment on the recent PSE proposal for instream flows at the Policy Meeting, March 15. They don't find 80 cfs minimum instream flows to be acceptable. Neither the standard nor a special re-opener clause would meet their interests. They will, on March 15, discuss how long they estimate it will take to study the environmental impact associated with increased levels of flood control.

The Forest Service said they would support doing additional analysis through HYDROPS runs, using *inflow to the Project* as an indicator of drought conditions. Margaret will write up a brief description and get it to Arnie by March 12.

Steve suggested that PSE redefine dependable capacity costs to internalize them rather than externalize them to the environment (NMFS jurisdictional fish species).

Bill reminded us how the pressures on private businesses in the State of Washington are great and that we need to work for a favorable atmosphere for private enterprise.

Brainstorm/Discussion:

- It would be helpful to know the widest range of operating conditions if we changed out the runner and made other modifications at the current power house. Arnie answered that steady state, that range would be 2,700 – 4,000 cfs. Is this really the case? Cary will confirm with Joel.
- Can we figure out how to minimize capital costs and costs associated with dependable capacity?
- Can we get additional clarity around the environmental effects of various regimes?
- Can we build an air tight escape hatch, to get us through the dependable capacity issue?
- Can we be prepared to address this issue if it happens more than once every seven years?
- Could we set up an escrow account for the good years to get us through the bad? This would allow us to use the escape hatch...be an option to explore.
- Habitat improvement initiative to compensate for violating MIFs?
- Provide escape hatches on MIFs? Also maximum flows (chum)?
- Consider relaxing MIFs to inflow during low water years?
- Consider inflow to the project as an escape hatch trigger?
- Develop a new HYDROPS run with MIF trigger/relief based on inflow and assess impact on dependable capacity and impact on environmental variables. This could be combined with Margaret's suggested new run. We would need to identify when the trigger would kick in.
- In drought conditions, revert to flows described in PSE02R3? Could we live with this, if the environmental impact was similar to natural drought conditions?
- Set up check points throughout the terms of the license. There are many unknowns (global warming, etc.) to consider and adapt to.
- Flesh out the concept where flows are based on water years? There are hydrologic control issues with this.

## **RESOLVE: DRAFT PROPOSED ACTIONS**

### **3.1.1 Provide Fish Propagation & Enhancement**

In reviewing the proposed edits sent out by Gary on behalf of SRSC and the agencies, Arn expressed concern that we would be putting "all our eggs in the sockeye basket" and doing too much above the project and not enough below. Cary expressed a desire to see either a programmatic or a dollar cap to provide PSE economic certainty around this.

Dean said the Forest Service is interested in a balanced program that addresses fish passage, hatcheries and habitat restoration. We might be able to do this whole program if costs were shared.

Data needed:

- Costs associated with proposed new action. Gary will attempt to come up with a high level cost estimate of this by March 19<sup>th</sup>. This is an issue for the Policy team to decide.
- Additional supporting rationale.

### **3.4.1 Implement Fluvial Geomorphic Management**

SRCC would like to add wording describing how a trigger for substrate augmentation would be defined (through the BRCC). Stan will draft some edits to this effect and send to Arnie to distribute by March 15.

### **3.4.3 Shoreline Erosion Management**

Greta walked us through the clarified wording she provided for this. She also supplied some cost estimate (\$1.2 – 2.4 M). After some discussion, it was apparent that this is not yet ready to be sent to the Louis Berger Group to be translated into license article language. PSE had concerns with the costs.

### **3.4.2 Large Woody Debris**

After some discussion, we agreed to remove the second sentence under Rationale. The license article for this is currently being drafted.

### **3.4.4 Aquatic Habitat Restoration**

This needs to be resolved at the Policy level. There is a tie to the Terrestrial Working Group in terms of riparian habitat enhancement. Ruth and Arn stated that they join the Forest Service in seeing this as “an important piece of the pie.” PSE said that the cost of this, if mandatory, will probably cause some non-mandatory enhancement- type PME's to fall out. It might even lead PSE to declare the project to be uneconomical.

## **STUDY UPDATES**

### **A01/a/b/A26b: Reservoir Tributary Study: *Draft Report***

Phil walked us through his response to Dean and Scott Lentz's comments on this draft report. Scott said he felt that this study over estimated the production potential. He and Phil will continue discussions of his comments off line. They'll consider doing an addendum to the report.

### **A16: Lower Baker River Alluvial Fan Assessment**

No additional progress has been made. Note re: the Little Baker Project: Arn and Chuck reported that they will be monitoring ground water levels on the Little Baker this summer.

### **A25: Project Influenced Predation Study: *Draft Report***

What is the influence of cutthroat predation on sockeye? Carl reported that in Lake Washington 5% of cutthroats had sockeye in their stomachs, *but they did not catch many cutthroat at the fry release sites*. We agreed to call this study draft final and post it on the website. Any additional comments will be appended to the report.

### **A26a: Reservoir Production Potential *Draft Report***

We agreed to call this study draft final and post it on the website. Any additional comments will be appended to the report.

## **HANDOUTS**

- Meeting notes, Aquatic Resources Working Group, March 11, 2004
- Meeting notes, Aquatic Resources Working Group- Technical Sub-committee on Instream Flows, March 5, 2004
- Aquatic Resources Draft Proposed Actions
- Aquatic Appendices A-1 through A-8
- PME 3.4.3 Shoreline Erosion Management
- Gary Sprague WDFW (Draft language represents discussions between WDFW, SRSC, NOAA Fisheries, USFWS, and USFS Dated March 04, 2004 –(3.0, 3.1, 3.1.1)
- USFS Comments on the September 2003 Draft of Tributary Production Potential study report, submitted by Scott Lentz and Dean Grover, December 11, 2003
- Study A-24 Part 1 of 2, Addendum 1: Hydrology Draft report prepared by R2 Resource Consultants

- *Study A-24 Part 2 of 2: Sediment Transport and Channel Response, Draft Final*

## **MEETING EVALUATION**

### **Things that went well:**

- Phone participants
- Arn's quotable quote!!
- Received more reports from PSE and R2
- We have a next step on instream flow
- Jim's perceptive questions

### **Things that need to be changed:**

- Finished late

### **Tentative Agenda for April 8, 2004 at the PSE Summit Building in Bellevue (Start at 9:00 a.m.)**

1. Review agenda, notes, actions
2. Fish Passage Technical Working Group Report
3. Policy Team Meeting(s) Report
  - Instream Flows
  - Flood Control
  - Aquatic Habitat Restoration
  - Other decisions?
4. Draft Proposed Actions (?)
  - 3.1.1 Provide Fish Propagation & Enhancement
  - 3.4.1 Implement Fluvial Geomorphic Management
  - 3.4.3 Shoreline Erosion Management
  - 3.4.4 Aquatic Habitat Restoration
5. Study Updates (?)
  - A16: Lower Baker River Alluvial Fan Assessment
  - Others to be decided
7. **Set Agenda for May 13, 2004 (9:00-3:00 – USFS-Mountlake Terrace)**