



## BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

### Terrestrial Resources Implementation Group Technical Meeting for Botanical Resources

May 2, 2007 (9:00 am -12:00 noon)

U.S. Forest Service Office - Library  
21905 64th Avenue West  
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043  
425-744-3236 (office # 425-775-9702)

### FINAL MEETING NOTES

**Team Leader:** Anna Kopitov (PSE), 425-462-3773, [anna.kopitov@pse.com](mailto:anna.kopitov@pse.com)

**Present at Meeting:** Laura Potash Martin (USFS), Brock Applegate (WDFW), Laurel Baldwin (Whatcom County NWCB), Tony Fuchs (PSE), Kathy Smayda (Smayda Environmental Associates)

Review notes/action items from September 23, 2005 meeting; review agenda

Review draft management chapters of TRMP:

- Chapter 8, Noxious Weeds
- Chapter 9, Special Status Plants
- Chapter 10, *Carex flava*

Set date and agenda for next meeting

#### New Action Items:

- Kathy will send the CD with botanical documents to Joe Arnett at WNHP.
- Anna will contact Tribes regarding the next botanical teamlet meeting.
- Laura will contact Mignonne Bivin, Todd Neel, Cathy Baker, and Joe Arnett regarding comments on chapters 8, 9, and 10, and the next botanical teamlet meeting.



- Laura will schedule a meeting between herself, Rod Mace or John Vanderhayden, her supervisor, and PSE to discuss native plant policy and propagation program for Baker Lake.
- Laura will send a copy of the Nooksack elk report to Anna. Anna to distribute to Tony, Kathy, Brock and Laurel, for information regarding preferred forage species.
- Laurel will email Kathy the 2007 weed list for Whatcom County.
- Marty will add objectives and Settlement Agreement language to the License Article Language at the beginning of each chapter; highlight any differences between the agreements *and the license articles*.
- Kathy will include these items in the next update of the draft Chapter 8:
  1. Cite the Region 6 EIS on invasive non-natives in addition to the MBSNF EA, wherever the EA is cited in Chapter 8.
  2. Add a new paragraph on weed prevention, following the section on Individual Site Management Plans, to address use of BMPs and to emphasize revegetation of disturbed sites resulting from ANY Project-related activities, not solely weed treatment. Reference MBSNF EA and the R6 EIS standards and guidelines, which include use of locally derived native plants.

#### **Report on old Action Items:**

- Handouts from 9/23/2005 meeting were provided to Laurel Baldwin.
- Laura provided suggestions for the *C. flava* RFP text.
- Tony prepared the *C. flava* RFP, selected a contractor, and completed the study in 2006.

#### **Ongoing Action Items:**

- Tony will check on a Project Initiation form for the Floating Surface Collector site.
- Laura will provide copies of data sheets for 2005 visits to the *Peltigera pacifica* site and for original and 2005 visits to the *Platanthera sparsiflora* site.
- Kathy has updated the weed database to the agreed-upon date format; will check with Joetta that GIS is updated to same.
- Once the weed coverage is modified to lump individual sites (points) into groups (polygons) for management purposes, Laura and Kathy will work to create a crosswalk between the PSE and USFS codes.
- Kathy and Anna will work with Joetta to add the proposed treatment year, or species/site ranking, to the points and polygons, so that they can be displayed graphically.

#### **Meeting Discussion**

Tony provided an update on the expected license issuance date (June) and the status of the Biological Opinions (draft review form).

#### **Chapter 8: Noxious Weeds**



## Baker River Project Relicense

Laura noted that she is currently working to get the NEPA process started to approve the use of a second herbicide on NFS lands, specifically to control hawkweeds. This process will take some time, but she wanted the group to be aware of it.

Accuracy of recording plant sightings was discussed. Laura noted that it is important to record the GPS accuracy info (no. satellites, accuracy in feet/meters) for each point recorded. Then, if there is a choice between using a GPS point and using a known feature (e.g., road intersection), one can make an informed decision regarding which is most accurate.

Laura noted that the FS ID team for the Baker River Project met yesterday. One item they requested is advanced information on weed sites to be treated. They would like to know which sites are scheduled to be treated first, so that other resource issues can be addressed as needed (e.g. cultural resources). This information is available in draft form in the text; Kathy, Anna and Joetta will coordinate making it available graphically via GIS.

Laura described the steps in a native plant propagation program, from initial seed collection, cleaning, and testing, to growing seed up over consecutive years to build a supply of seed, to propagation and outplanting. The FS uses the J. Herbert Stone Nursery in Oregon; there may be more local nurseries that can provide these services. Tony, Anna and Laura agreed that both PSE and the FS will have native plant materials needs at Baker; Laura will set up a meeting to discuss. Brock expressed interest in being involved in the propagation program and species selection process.

The group discussed the procedures for adding new species to the list of target weeds, and for surveying areas not previously infested or not previously surveyed. Per the Settlement Agreement, monitoring is defined for treated areas (effectiveness monitoring). Addition of new species and new sites are intended to be addressed by the TRIG in the annual and five-year plan reviews.

Laura asked what procedures are in place for monitoring of restored areas as opposed to weed treatment areas. This would be handled under the specific action plan for the project (e.g., spawning bed rehabilitation), not via the weed management plan.

There is a need for a list of ground-disturbing projects that PSE expects to undertake. Many of the PME's involve funding provided to the FS, and PSE would not manage those activities. Anticipated PSE activities include the improvements at the spawning beach and fish hatchery sites.

The group discussed the need to provide FERC the outline and required elements of the plan, but not details that might be subject to change on a frequent basis, such as managed species, treatment methods, etc. The group agreed to consider pulling Tables 8-1 and 8-2 out of the chapter text and putting them into an appendix in the Procedures section. Tables from the Settlement agreement could possibly be substituted in the text.

Chapters 9 and 10 were not reviewed.

**Next Meeting: June 4, 2007 - 10:00 am to 2:00 pm, USFS Office, Mountlake Terrace**