



---

## **BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE**

### **Recreational & Aesthetic Resources Working Group**

January 26th, 2004  
9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.  
Working Group meeting

USFS Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest Headquarters  
21905 64<sup>th</sup> Ave. West  
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043

### **AGENDA**

1. Review Notes/Agenda/Action Items
2. Report and discussion of USFS / PSE Policy meeting held on 1/9/4 as it relates to Rec. PME package
3. Study progress update
4. Review of R5, Aesthetic / Visual Resource Study Draft Report
5. Discuss next steps for Working Group
6. Set agenda for February Meeting
7. Evaluate Meeting

---

---

**BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE**

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

January 26, 2004  
9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.  
USFS Office, Mountlake Terrace, 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: Andy Hatfield (PSE), Dee Endelman (facilitator), Eli Asher (note taker), Dave Reid (PSE), Cary Feldmann (PSE), Patrick Goldsworthy (NCCC), Brian Adams (Skagit County), Ann Dunphy (U.S. Forest Service), Ardis Bynum (USFS- telephone), Susan Rosebrough (NPS), Jim Eychaner (IAC), Saul Weisberg (NCI- telephone)

**January 26 Agenda:**

1. Review notes, agenda and action items
2. Report and discussion of USFS/PSE policy meeting held on 1/9/04
  - PME's
3. Study progress update
4. Review of R5, Aesthetics/Visual Resource Study Draft Report
5. Discuss next steps for working group
6. Set agenda for February meeting
7. Evaluate meeting

**New Actions**

1. All—Comments on R5 to Andy Hatfield by 2/9/04. Andy will forward all comments to Mark

- 
- 
- Greenig. If possible, Mark will incorporate comments by 2/23/04.
  2. Cary—Add clarification to RMP language.
  3. Ann—Research minimum summer lake elevation for Baker and Shannon Lakes and place the number in 2.1.1.
  4. All—read PME’s and send comments to Andy by Friday, January 30 to be forwarded to the entire working group.
  5. Andy—organize and convene meeting between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> of February with Teamlet (Ann, Brian, Andy, Ardis) and Carol Efrid of the Louis Berger group.

### Report on Old Actions

1. Andy—E-mailed to working group members times and dates for IAC grant workshops by 1/12/04.
2. Andy—talked to Jim Eyechaner about the rationale for New Trails Phase II O & M (Does it come out of the RAM Fund?)—The number was in proportion- there is a number for capital as well as O&M.
3. Andy and Ann—Still need to review campground O&M formula to assure PSE understands it.
4. Dee—Still needs to talk to Solution Team Adaptive Management Teamlet: when will the PME re Discretionary Funds be ready for working group to look at?
5. Andy and Ann—Talked to Policy people and revise PME’s for discussion at 1/26/04 meeting.
6. Andy—Called Joan Nichols to start Aesthetics part of the PDEA.
7. Ann and Saul—Still need to write a piece on Recreation PME’s that are shared resources.
8. (Moved to Recreation Group parking lot) Andy—ask tribes about tribal enforcement policies (for 2.1.3—Law Enforcement)

### USFS/PSE Policy Meeting

Andy reported that he put together a PSE proposal for the PMEs that *dealt with USFS interests only*. This proposal was based on the working group’s work on *the text of the PME’s but included PSE’s cost share and implementation timing interests*. The proposal also calculated the net present value of the subset of PME based on a proposed implementation schedule. This proposal was distributed to USFS staff at the Ed/Jon meeting. *USFS* had put together a “bottom line” proposal from the USFS based on the agency’s basic interests to protect national forest recreation resources. When Ed/Jon met, they exchanged ideas. *The USFS* was subsequently asked by *PSE* to translated the USFS proposal into net present value. *This was presented to Andy at our 1/22/04 teamlet meeting*. There is a difference of over \$2 million in NPV between *PSE’s (6.4 mil)* and *USFS (8.5 mil) proposals*. It was acknowledged that this additional cost in NPV does not meet PSE’s economic interest. *The FS* proposal looked at *deleting items where the PSE cost share percentage was not very high, removing items where we could likely get grant monies or partner assistance and (Ann Dunphy clarification comments 1/28/04) delaying timing to improve the NPV*. There may be opportunities to *adjust the timing of actions to reduce the NPV a bit but this would not make a big change to the current estimate..* Ann noted that the package is only for the USFS-related PME’s. *Ann said that she understood that PSE goal for a total recreation package was 10 mil NPV. Cary replied that the original 10 mil recreation package figure was incorrect and that the current goal for the total recreation package was now 8.5 mil.*

We discussed how other interests, primarily Lake Shannon, will be discussed with primary sponsors. We

---

---

also discussed how the recreation package will be reviewed in the context of the whole package.

### **Working Group Review of Cost Spreadsheets**

We decided to look at some of the spreadsheets that Andy and Ann had put together with the intention of giving input to the USFS/PSE discussions and to weigh in other interests.

Ann first walked us through her work on NPV calculations with both USFS proposal and other items not part of the “bottom line” interests of the USFS. The group asked clarifying questions. She then showed a spreadsheet where she removed those other items (Kulshan, Wildlife Observation, ADA Fishing opportunity, New Trails, Phase 2 and Decommissioning of certain campgrounds). This spreadsheet represents the Forest Service minimum presented to Ed and Jon at their meeting.

As we reviewed these sheets, Andy noted that timing and cost share are significant regarding their impact to the NPV of the package and neither of those seem to be this group’s work. *[The cost share percentages in the FS minimum proposal are consistent with the working groups 12/19 teamlet proposal and in the case of trail maintenance and law enforcement even less. Costs were rebalanced in individual PME’s based on the need to shift priorities in an overall lower package or differences that arise when costs are spread to individual years vs. 5-10 year periods. The timing is consistent with the 12/19 package or shifted out to lower NPV costs which benefits PSE. (Ann Dunphy 1/28/04 clarification comments)]* Jim suggested we might advise Jon/Ed to think in terms of performance measures that PSE could live up to and take over certain actions entirely to reduce costs. Ann said the Forest Service has “meaningful measures” which are performance measures. Under the Forest service proposal, the Forest Service would implement the PME’s.

We then reviewed the spreadsheet Andy put together that compares the FS proposal with the Teamlet work. We discussed areas (like monitoring and education) where stewards could assist. We also discussed how stewards meet *cultural*, terrestrial and aquatic needs for public contact/monitoring/education regarding *T&E and other resource protection*. Cary asked how much the stewardship program should “go above the line” (of items FS need to see included). Ann responded that the Forest Service *anticipated a* stewardship (*volunteer*) program would exist in it’s “above the line” estimates (and this would increase the cost of FS proposal) *and that this is a shared PME*.

We agreed that stewardship and Lake Shannon access should be addressed in addition to Forest Service-identified “above-the-line” items. However, we disagreed over whether that stewardship should be an additional program (PME) or would be able to be addressed within the scope of related PMEs.

Brian noted that the County’s interests go beyond access to Lake Shannon. They also include safety and some camping development to meet what County people need.

We discussed and agreed that the Teamlet recommendation be one analysis point in the PDEA, with a no-action alternative and PSE proposal of some sort at the other end.

### **Review of PME’s**

---

---

We began a review of the latest version of PME's that Ardis revised and forwarded to Andy on Friday, January 23, 2004. This was the first time that members of the group had reviewed this draft.

**General observations:**

- We want RMP to be comprised of pieces that can be modified in a way that whole plan doesn't have to be modified.
- Cost caps vs. estimates—PSE will want to cap items for which they are not in control of implementing. PSE would feel more comfortable with cost estimates when PSE is in charge of implementing the action.
- License issuance vs. acceptance—consistent with other PME's, PSE is initiating other PME actions on acceptance (unless otherwise specified). Policy-level will resolve this.
- We need to note specifically when PME's apply off as well as on Forest Service lands.

**Comprehensive Recreation Management Plan:**

- Basically, we're okay with this PME. We'll send it to Berger once Cary adds clarification language (if it's okay with the group).

**Next Steps**

We decided that Carol Efrid from Louis Berger should be called in to meet with a Teamlet and walk through the PME's with an eye to developing draft license articles from them. To do this, all team members are asked to review and make comments on the latest version of the PME's by Friday, January 30, 2004. All comments will be sent to Andy who will share them with the entire group. Andy will convene a meeting between Carol and the Teamlet (Ann, Ardis, Brian and Andy). The December 19 Teamlet scope recommendations, as discussed at the Working Group's January 9 meeting *will be used as the base for revising the PME's into License articles in the upcoming teamlet and will provide a basis by which to judge whether comments are inadvertently expanding scope (i.e., comments cannot take the PME's beyond the scope of these recommendations).*

The draft license articles are to be prepared for the February 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting. If they are not ready by then, we may choose to cancel the meeting.

**Agenda for February 23 Meeting**

1. Review notes, agenda, action items
2. Review R5
3. Study Progress Update
4. Review License Articles