



---

## BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

### Wildlife and Terrestrial Resources Working Group PM&E Development Teamlet

July 30, 2002  
10:00 am – 3:00 pm

Natural Resources Building  
Olympia, WA

### FINAL MEETING MINUTES

**Mission:** *“To develop alternative solutions and recommendations, addressing terrestrial and wildlife resource interests for the Baker River Project and its operations, leading to a settlement agreement that:*

- 1. accurately defines and describes the existing environment in relationship to the previous environment;*
- 2. identifies project effects (existing and proposed) leading to development of protection, mitigation, and enhancement options.”*

**Team Leader:** Tony Fuchs, (Phone) 425-462-3553, tfuchs@puget.com

### ATTENDEES

Tony Fuchs and Cary Feldmann (Puget Sound Energy), Lauri Vigue (Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife), Ann Risvold (U. S. Forest Service), Patrick Goldsworthy (North Cascades Conservation Council), Dee Endelman (Agreement Dynamics), Martin Vaughn (Biota Pacific)

### SCHEDULE FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

The PM&E Teamlet has not scheduled another meeting at this time. The Teamlet will report to the full Terrestrial Resources Working Group on August 21, 2002.

### AGENDA

1. Review agenda and goals for the meeting
2. Issue Review
3. Lunch
4. Issue Review (cont.)
5. Filling out the Issue Matrix
6. Next Steps

---

## NEW ACTION ITEMS

- Marty will revise the PM&E Options Matrix and e-mail it to Lauri by August 12. He will include in the matrix potential PM&E measures for the various issues.
- The BAWG (and Patrick) will meet on August 19 to review the matrix.
- The full TRWG will discuss the matrix for 90 minutes on August 21.

## ISSUES REVIEW

Dee began the meeting by asking if anyone had any initial comments on the PM&E Options Matrix she had e-mailed to everyone on July 25. Lauri suggested the following addition to the list:

*“What external land management activities may impact PSE’s contributions to PM&Es over the term of the new license, and what should we do about them?”*

This will be added to the matrix as Issue No. 14. It will address limiting factors as well as synergies that may arise as a result of external land management activities. Examples of activities that might be examined are timber harvesting on non-federal lands, and human population growth in the basin. Lauri suggested a relevant study would be to forecast land use and land management in the Baker River basin over the term of the new license.

The group discussed the format and content of the matrix. Marty offered to fill in the Relevant Studies column outside the meeting to save time. He also suggested adding a column titled “Action Items” to identify the next steps in addressing each of the issues. Patrick stressed the importance of using a process like the matrix to raise, discuss and document all issues and interests of the parties in the collaborative process, including those that don’t result in PM&E. He said his experience has shown that the written record of the process is important. Marty said that he would document the discussion in this meeting directly in the matrix, and send all participants in the meeting copies of the revised matrix.

Patrick raised the issue of the potential effects of climate change on PSE’s operation the Project, and any resulting impacts to associated wetlands. Cary noted that flows in the Baker River are sufficient in most years to refill the reservoirs several times. He said that even the most extreme reductions in flows that might result from changes in the regional climate would not be sufficient to prevent PSE from filling the reservoir and maintaining associated wetlands, if that were an objective of operation. The group decided not to include this issue in the matrix at this time.

Lauri and Tony discussed whether interactions between recreation and wildlife in the Baker Basin should be addressed by the Terrestrial Resources Working Group. Those present at the meeting agreed to add the following to the matrix as Issue No. 15:

*“How should we address any negative effects of recreation on wildlife and their habitats in the Baker River basin?”*

The last new issue to be raised by the group was that of undesirable wildlife. The discussion resulted in the development of a new Issue No. 13:

---

---

*“How should we address any Project contributions to the introduction and spread of undesirable wildlife?”*

The group discussed the process of defining issues and interests. Dee and Ann stressed the importance of following the process that has been established by the Solution Team. Everyone agreed that it is important to clearly define issues and interests, and that the issues stated in the Draft Interest Statements dated March 27, 2002 (see handout) are sufficient for now. Individuals may want to review and revise their stated interests and issues later (when we all have a clearer picture of Project effects and opportunities), but continued discussions of the interests at this time are not productive. For now, the group will focus its attention on completing studies and developing draft PM&E.

### **FILLING OUT THE ISSUES MATRIX**

The group worked through the draft matrix, clarifying and editing (as needed) the statements of the issues and the “Clarification” column. All edits to the Issue Statements are included in the revised draft prepared by Marty, and will not be repeated in these meeting notes.

The group selected an issue (Issue No. 2) and discussed possible PM&E as an example of how the process might work. The issue, as revised by the group, is *“How should we address any negative effects of the Baker River Project on the total amount of plant and wildlife habitat and the total sizes of populations?”* Initially we identified the following “possible” PM&E:

1. Remove the Project
2. Operate the Project as run-of-river
3. Acquire land
4. Acquire easements/rights to manage land
5. Manage the Project lands in the fluctuation zone
6. Provide money to one or more of the collaborators to purchase and/or manage habitat
7. Assist other landowners to manage habitat on their lands
8. Support or contribute to activities that benefit wildlife outside the Baker Basin
9. Support or contribute to activities that benefit other resources of interest to the collaborators
10. Calculate the target amount of mitigation and/or land acquisition by comparing the Baker Project to other projects for which mitigation/enhancement plans have already been prepared.
11. Support legislative actions that benefit wildlife and/or habitat

Dee then handed out the criteria for developing preliminary PM&E options. She pointed out that potential PM&E that don’t meet one or more of the criteria will not get further consideration. Patrick suggested finding an alternative to the words “area” and “areas” in the last two bullets of the criteria handout. We then applied the criteria to the list of possible PM&E for Issue No. 2, and all remained on the list.

---

---

## **HANDOUTS**

- Baker Re-licensing Project: PME Options Matrix: Terrestrial Working Group
- Baker Solution Team Members Draft Interest Statements (As of March 27, 2002)
- Criteria: Preliminary PME Options, PSE Baker River Project

## **MEETING EVALUATION**

There was no formal evaluation.