



---

## **BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE**

### **Recreation Resources Working Group**

**November 24, 2003**

**9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.**

**Mt. Baker Ranger District Office**

**810 State Route 20, Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284**

### **AGENDA**

<b>Topics</b>
Welcome and agenda review
Review of assignment for today <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Prioritization of all PME's</li><li>• Recommendations on a \$15M package and a \$10M package</li><li>• Recommendations on timing and sequencing of PME's</li></ul>
USFS Proposed Prioritization and Breakdown <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Walk through of this draft prioritization</li><li>• Clarifying questions</li></ul>
Discussion of Priorities <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Using this prioritization scheme, what would a \$15M package look like? A \$10M package?</li><li>• How does the draft prioritization address the interests of various stakeholder groups?<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ If there are interests not appropriately addressed, which are they?</li><li>○ What possible solutions are there to address such interests?</li><li>○ Agreement on recommended solutions?</li></ul></li></ul>
Sequencing and Timing <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Walk through suggested timing of actions<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Reasons for timing of actions</li><li>○ How does timing impact costs?</li></ul></li><li>• Clarifying questions</li></ul>
Discussion of Timing <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What issues do people have regarding suggested timing of actions?</li></ul>



- 
- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Are there interests not appropriately addressed with the suggested timing?</li><li>• Solutions?</li></ul>                              |
| Sequencing   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Are there actions which need to be re-sequenced (i.e., actions which logically should come before other actions?)</li></ul>            |
| Review of Recommendations  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What do we want to say to Ed and Jon for their next meeting?</li><li>• Are we in consensus on the prioritization and timing?</li></ul> |
| Next Steps   |
| Adjourn  |

Sequencing

- Are there actions which need to be re-sequenced (i.e., actions which logically should come before other actions?)

Review of Recommendations

- What do we want to say to Ed and Jon for their next meeting?
- Are we in consensus on the prioritization and timing?

Next Steps

Adjourn

---

---

## BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

### Recreational & Aesthetic Resources Working Group RESOLVE Meeting *Final Notes*

November 24, 2003  
9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.  
USFS Office, Sedro-Wooley WA

### *FINAL MEETING NOTES*

**Team Leader:** Andy Hatfield (PSE): email is [andrew.hatfield@pse.com](mailto:andrew.hatfield@pse.com) and phone number is (360) 853-8341.

### **PRESENT**

Ann Dunphy (USFS), Ardis Bynum (USFS), Jim Eychaner (*IAC*), Andy Hatfield (PSE), Cindy Bjorkland (NPS), Cary Feldmann (PSE), Don Burgess (NCI), Tracie Johannessen (NCI), Saul Weisberg (NCI), Brian Adams (Skagit County), *Patrick Goldsworthy (NCCC)*, Dee Endelman (facilitator)

### **November 24 Agenda**

1. Welcome and Agenda Review
2. Review of assignment for today
  - Prioritize all PME's
  - \$15Million and \$10Million package
  - Recommendations on timing and sequencing
3. USFS Prioritization Draft
  - Walk Through
  - Clarifying Questions
4. \$15 Million and \$10 Million Packages
  - Are interests addressed?
  - If not, what are possible solutions?

- 
- 
5. Sequencing and timing
  6. Review of recommendations
  7. Next Steps
  8. Adjourn

**Action Items: Note**—because of the large assignment and special nature of this meeting, we did not review action items.

### **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.<sup>1</sup>
- Document our agreements.
- Caucuses are okay.

### **American Whitewater**

*Susan reminded that group of an email that had recently been distributed by Thomas O’Keefe requesting PMEs for lost white water opportunities. The group discussed how to handle this issue. No decision was agreed upon.*

### **USFS Draft Prioritization**

Ann walked us through the four summary sheets which the Forest Service had put together as a discussion draft: a base cost prioritization; a \$30 million; \$15 million; and \$10 million prioritization.<sup>2</sup> We studied the \$15 million page and asked questions to clarify our understanding of the basic information on the sheet. Several folks thanked Ann for her extensive work on the cost analysis.

### **Interests Discussion**

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> The USFS looked at each of the levels as the cost of the licensee’s contribution as opposed to total costs.

---

---

---

---

Following this clarification and a brief caucus, we identified our individual stakeholder interests (needs, concerns versus “wishes”) regarding the USFS draft prioritization at the \$15 million level:

National Park Service (Cindy): Wildlife Viewing, Conservation Education, RAM Fund are all under the level we could reach with a \$15 million package. The NPS wants to see the project preserved protected and enhanced for visitors and the public.

USFS: O & M and safety are the USFS’ core interests. However, we recognize the importance of Lake Shannon and of investing in the future. We feel pushed by the timeline. We have an interest in finding other ways of accomplishing things; we need to look at what can be leveraged.

NCI: We want to see the funding level for education increased. Shouldn’t funding for education come from all areas (Aquatics, Terrestrial, Cultural and Recreation)?

Skagit County: I am concerned that we don’t know what the numbers really represent. The County Comp Plan calls for Lake Shannon needs to be met so that’s a major interest of ours. We also want Shannon to be managed in a way that County residents have been used to.

IAC: We have an interest in a fair deal for recreation and a way to prioritize proposals consistent with federal and state standards (SCORP, CFR, Power Act)

PSE (Andy): We have an interest in seeing that others’ interests are met; we are also concerned about financial costs; we would like to get creative with costs.

NPS (Susan): We have an interest in diverse recreation being provided for (e.g., trails, education, boaters); I’d like to see some access to Lake Shannon.

NCCC: We want to preserve the North Cascade’s scenic, scientific, recreational, educational, wildlife and wilderness values. We want to make sure that natural values are considered in the recreation package and consider education essential.

PSE (Cary): I’m concerned about the discrepancy between cost estimates. We are not all on the same page. PSE wants to see the broader interests met. I am concerned about what items are flexible and which would be part of the USFS 4e terms and conditions.

We concluded that there were several “themes” that went across many of these statements: the concern that a diverse set of interests be met; and concern about Lake Shannon and education, specifically.

**Idea Generation: How can we get interests met within an amount that can be lived with (how can we get more for less)?**

- Move actions out into the future
- Put the RAM fund above the line and make it a bucket for matching funds (e.g., matching funds for trails)

- 
- 
- Make RAM a percentage of the total costs (10% was volunteered)
  - Horse trade—agree on an action (PSE and USFS) and compare ways to getting it done for less money
  - Change the percentage cost shares
  - Take a look at the \$15 million and see where we can save money within items
  - Investigate where money can come in from other groups (external parties or other working groups in this process)
  - Assure that shared resources are looked at by a shared Teamlet
  - Address and resolve the cost differences between PSE and USFS
  - How can we get from \$58 million to \$30 million in base costs?
  - Re-prioritize within this number system
  - Allocate some money for each PME
  - Institute cost caps
  - Look at what will continue without funding (we're doing it whether or not we get funding from Baker project) versus what requires new funding.

### **What do we want to go up on the list of priorities?**

- Lake Shannon
- Conservation education
- RAM Fund
- ADA fishing platform

### **Discussion of Lake Shannon PME**

Andy's estimate for the Lake Shannon PME was \$4.8 Million over 30 years. USFS' estimate was \$6.5 Million. Ardis suggested putting that PME at \$2.4 Million with the intention of getting matching funds. In response to a question, Brian noted that boating access and day use were probably the most important parts of the Lake Shannon PME, based on his recollection of the Comprehensive Plan. He noted, however, that people camp there anyway so legal camping would be of great benefit.

### **Discussion of Education PME**

Saul reported that the costs related to providing Baker Basin education which are at risk total \$189,000 per year. (One program actually takes place in the Park, some in the Concrete schools and the rest in the project area). The \$189,000 figure includes agency in-kind contributions so he estimates that \$110,000 per year in cash is at risk.

### **Prioritization Discussion**

We decided to use a dot exercise to prioritize the PME's, first into high, medium and low priority and then into a complete ranking. We attempted this by first "voting" with dots *where each participant placed a dot next to each PME in columns which were labeled high, medium and low. We then scored them using the weighting method . Because there were varying numbers of participant representing the*

---

---

*different agencies and NGOs and some participants did not vote for all items, the outcome of the exercise was considered significantly flawed and should not be included in the meeting notes.* The group discussed this prioritization and came to the conclusion that there was not agreement among all present that these were, indeed, the priorities.

### **Cost Containment Ideas**

Although we could not agree that we would all support the ranking above, the group began to engage in a conversation about how to reduce costs within some of the PME's. For example, Ann noted that, under 2.1.3 (Law Enforcement), coordination is the key part of the PME and there might be savings by looking at funding that key component. However, we ran out of time for discussion before the group could get deeply into cost containment measures.

### **Action Plan**

The group reviewed the recommendations they could make to John Vanderheyden and Ed Schild at this point:

1. We agree that we want to see some funding for items that appear low on the USFS draft prioritization, including Lake Shannon, Conservation Education, the RAM Fund and ADA Fishing pier (low cost item).
2. We put together initial thoughts on strategies to contain costs.
3. To address one of those strategies (address and resolve cost differences), ask EDAW to review the USFS staff's detailed cost analysis. EDAW should call Ann with questions.
4. Andy will send the full analysis to all working group members as well as EDAW and will coordinate EDAW's review.
5. Everyone will think of specific ideas for cost containment and creative funding.

The working group will devote its December 15 meeting to deal with cost containment and creative funding.