



BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Wildlife and Terrestrial Resources Working Group Meeting

**April 17, 2001 (8:30 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.)
(Bring Sack Lunch)**

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

AGENDA

Review notes/revise agenda
Status report: Action items <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review mission statement
Report from Recreation/Cultural Working Group
Operational Definitions (Tony)
Report from TWG on R-T4 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Criteria/framework and a draft list of analysis species and habitats
Review study designs for R-T2, 4, 5, 7, 15, 17
Discuss study requests R-T9-13
Review/discuss Continuing Impacts Analysis (as time permits)
Set agenda for next meeting (May 15 th , USFS office in Mountlake Terrace, same time)
Evaluate meeting



BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Wildlife and Terrestrial Resources Working Group

April 17, 2001

8:30 am – 2:00 pm

US Forest Service Office
Mountlake Terrace

MEETING NOTES

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 (Puget Sound Energy), Patrick Goldsworthy (North Cascades Conservation Council), Lauri Vigue (WA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife), Stan Walsh (Skagit System Cooperative), Chris Madsen (N.W. Indian Fisheries Council), Fred Seavey (U.S. Fish & Wildlife), Martin Vaughn (Biota Pacific), Robert Kuntz (Nat'l Park Service), Don Gay (U.S. Forest Service), Cary Feldmann (PSE), Lyn Wiltse, facilitator (PDSA Consulting)

The meeting started at 8:40 a.m. and ended at 2:00 p.m.

NOTE: Lyn's cell phone is 425-444-8156. She will have the phone with her and turned on until the meeting begins. Please call her if you need to prior to any meeting. She'll turn the phone off when the meeting begins and she will check for messages at the break.

AGENDA

April 17, 2001, **8:30 a.m. –2:00 p.m.** (U.S. Forest Office, Mountlake Terrace, WA)

Bring a sack lunch and we'll work through!

1. Review notes/agenda
2. Status report: Action items
 - Review mission statement
3. Reports from Recreation/Cultural Working Groups
4. Operational definitions (Tony)
5. Report from Technical Working Group
 - Criteria/framework and a draft list of species and habitats to study
6. Review Study Designs
 - R-T2, 4, 5, 7, 15, 17
7. Set next agenda (5/15) at U.S. Forest Office, Mountlake Terrace, WA. 8:30 to 2:00 p.m.
8. Evaluate meeting

NEW ACTION ITEMS

- ALL: Send Tony a list of documents that consultants can use to expedite their review of species (T-4)
- Tony: Bring those Mint Milanos!
- All: Review draft study plans and requests prior to next meeting (see discussion below on reviewing documents).
- Bob: Send Tony link to Oregon and Washington Partners in Flight for PSE Baker Relicensing website also BBS (Breeding Bird Survey) website.
- Lauri: Draft study request for BBS
- Bob: Bring Park Landbird Inventory Monitoring Data.
- Lauri: Will check with Kelly McAllister to see if PSE could use State experts to assist with this study (R-T11)
- Don: Will flesh out the methodology for the grizzly survey for discussion at our May meeting
- Chris: Let Fred know about conference room availability and send Tony directions.
- Tony: Touch base with/Jessie (Team Leaders of Cultural Working Group) re: vegetation and wildlife interests.
- Tony: Update contact list and send it to team members.
- Ann: Provide to group information from Watershed Analysis when available. Will it be available electronically? (Team Leader note: Ann suggests that Tony gets the info from Kathy Anderson in July, and that she probably will not be attending many future meetings due to workload and funding).
- Tony: Contact Shari Brewer re: Sauk-Suiattle presentation on cultural significance of mountain goats and other terrestrial resources from 9:00 to 9:30 at our May meeting. (Team Leader note: we may want to allow 15 minutes or so for questions/discussion after her presentation).
- Tony: Get statement of qualifications from proposed contractors and send to team members
- Tony and Ann: Status of RT-16
- Tony, Don, Chris Lawson discuss recreational study synergies in relation to R-T9 and 10.

REPORT ON PAST ACTION ITEMS

- Tony: Emailed Bob's list of vertebrate species and vascular plant species to all members.

-
-
- Tony: Contacted Shari Brewer re: Sauk-Suiattle presentation on cultural significance of mountain goats and other terrestrial resources. Her presentation will be at our May 15th meeting
 - Lauri: Sent Tony dates of digital DNR ortho photos (latest are 1998).
 - R-T2 Preliminary Study Design still pending
 - R-T4 Ready for discussion
 - R-T5,7 Preliminary Study Design still pending
 - R-T15,17 Ready for discussion
 - Tony discussed the roles of various Hamer environmental staff who are working on our proposed studies, and distributed brief SOQs of each staff person. Associated Earth Sciences will be doing the wetlands study. These consultants (Fred Houston and Judith Light), formerly of Beak consultants, will be working on preparation of a Preliminary Study Plan for R-T5. Tony will be getting more detailed SOQ information together including references.
 - Bob brought a list of species from multiple habitat types for bird species that are not well covered by monitoring systems by BBS (from Partners in Flight). He thinks this list will be of limited use to this group. He also brought Conservation Strategy for Landbirds in Coniferous Forests of Western Oregon and Washington. This may be useful to this group. We may possibly (as part of an adaptive management process or PM&E) want to establish a BBS route. Lauri will look into putting together a study request for this.

INTERESTS

Tony distributed copies of final “draft” interest statements from the Solution Team to members of this team. Interest lists/statements are still missing from five entities that are represented at the Solution Team. We will keep these interests in mind as we continue to employ the collaborative process. At our May meeting, we will consider how the list drafted by the caucus fits.

UPDATE FROM RECREATION/CULTURAL WORKING GROUPS

We want to be sure the Cultural Working Group reviews this team’s vegetation studies and the results that come from these studies. Tony may attend the cultural Working Group to discuss how we can help the tribes in identification of culturally significant wildlife and vegetation. Stan will also try to help behind the scenes. (Team Leader Note: As was discussed in the meeting, it was my understanding that Stan (and Chris) will forward study documents and results onto appropriate tribal members for their review, and would be the representative(s) for the tribes on their comments and issues).

TIMELY REVIEW OF DOCUMENTS (Study plans and other technical documents)

Tony will continue to pass on technical documents to team members as soon as they become available, and will try to give people an adequate amount of time for review. We will continue to revise the agenda at the start of each meeting based on how prepared participants are to discuss each item. We will supplement these reviews with Technical Working Groups as needed.

HOW TO INCORPORATE COMMENTS

Members will provide comments on any technical documents to Tony who will forward them to all members, and the consultant who authored the document. Tony will contact team members to resolve any comments that appear to be in conflict. Edits will be made in a Word document with edit features. All members were

encouraged to provide comments. They may also contact consultants directly with questions. An updated version of the contact list for this Working Group was distributed.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

“Project vicinity” will vary on a case by case basis (species or issue specific). Project vicinity includes the “Project Area” plus the surrounding habitats and species that may impact or be impacted by project operations. This will be our current working definition.

R-T4 TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP REPORT

Marty distributed notes from the Technical Working Group that met on April 10, 2001 from 10:00 to 2:00 to discuss R-T4. Tony, Lia Krueger (consultant from Hamer Environmental), Fred, Don, Lauri, and Marty participated in the meeting. Marty reminded everyone that this would only develop a preliminary list, and that some species may need to be added later. R-T4 is being broken into four phases: (1) select analysis species; (2) compile known information about the species and their habitats; (3) review and discuss the existing information (Working Group); (4) conduct any new studies determined to be necessary.

Lia is working on the first two phases. The other two phases are still more conceptual in nature and will be fleshed out by this team based, in part, on the results of the first two phases. This is a high priority study plan because analysis species set the tone for our other studies. PSE Team Leaders would like to have an idea of studies (study request forms and potential budget) for the 2002 field season by sometime in August, 2001. Our aim is for contractors to use an objective screening process to identify species.

DISCUSSION OF STUDY REQUESTS

R-T9: Recreation Use Study

This should be included in a larger recreation use study. This study would identify what percentage of users are coming to high areas (mountain goat territory) because of the reservoir. The R-T9 survey would be conducted at trail heads. Tony, Don and Chris (Team Leader of Recreation Working Group) will get together to look at the Recreation Use Study. We may review the Recreation Working Group recreation use study at our meeting in May. R-T9 might need to be discussed at a future Solution Team Meeting.

Patrick is interested in including Winter use.

R-T10: Recreational Effects on Mountain Goat Habitat Use

Consideration of this study would happen if a use study determined that a significant amount of recreation use in goat habitat was due to the Baker Project.

R-T11: Oregon Spotted Frog Inventory

There were three historically identified populations of Oregon Spotted frog in the Project Vicinity. The idea behind this study is to determine if they are still present in the Baker River Basin.

Use of aerial photos and the National Wetland Inventory maps would be sufficient to identify potential habitat. Don's sense is that the habitat we're talking about isn't very large and needs to be done comprehensively. Lauri will check to see if PSE can use State experts to assist with this study. Perhaps we could tie this into the

amphibian study which is looking for spotted frogs in the project area and contiguous wetlands. We'll look at moving to the Study Plan phase at our May meeting.

R-T12: Grizzly Bear Spring Foraging Habitat Value

This would provide us different opportunities for PME measures than just one-for-one mitigation. The premise is that the reservoir is continually impacting grizzly bear habitat. The Forest Service, Park Service and U. S. Department Fish and Wildlife have all signed off on a recovery plan that includes the Baker River Basin. Don said that spring foraging habitat is a limiting factor. Don will flesh out the methodology for the grizzly survey for discussion at our May meeting.

R-T13: Survey and Manage Terrestrial Mollusk Survey

This is a presence survey looking for species within a 100 ft. buffer from the reservoir edge (edge of the area that may be inundated by rising and falling reservoir levels). This could be tied to Wetlands Study (T-5). It could also be related to the amphibian study (T-17). You can do mollusk surveys usually through mid July. There is another window in the fall. The group agreed to go to Preliminary Study Plan with initial presence phase.

Ortho Photos:

Don reported that most of the Forest Service ortho photos are from 1993; one set is from 1989. (Team Leader Note: Lauri has found that the most recent set of DNR ortho photos is from 1998).

HANDOUTS

- Hydro Relicensing Forum: Relicensing Strategies (section on definitions)
- Acronyms and Abbreviations (Project Information Package, Puget Sound Energy, Baker River Relicense)
- Baker Solution Team Members' Draft Interest Statements (as of March 27, 2001)
- Analysis Species Assessment for the Baker River Relicensing Project (Preliminary Study Proposal), prepared by Hamer Environmental
- R-T4 April 10, meeting notes, Wildlife and Terrestrial Technical Working Group Meeting

PARKING LOT

- Will PSE compensate key players to attend these meetings?
- Length of period of license (30 years? 50 years?)
- Review time frame/goals of working groups/milestones
- Definitions of "project boundary", "project effects", "previous environment", "project area", NEPA definitions
- How do we handle "latecomers" to this process?
- Land Management
- Conceptual Mitigation Approach
- Consider multiple meeting locations
- Make list of all available relevant data. Create a subset of those data for Tony to always bring to meetings for group to continually reference.
- Are transmission lines in or out of FERC boundary?

MEETING PROCESS REVIEW

Well Dones:

- Don – provided facility, adjusted room temp, made copies, checked out ortho map situation
- Facilitator caffeinated
- Chris' being here
- Bob's timeout
- Stan helped facilitate
- This group is helping develop a road map to use in the relicensing process

Need for Improvement:

- Inconsistent room temp.
- Took long time to get through Action Items
- Facilitator caffeinated
- Need to be nice to facilitator
- In our excitement, we interrupted each other a little too much. Need to review ground rules.

TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

May 15, 2001, **8:30 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.** (U.S. Forest Office, Mountlake Terrace, WA)

Bring a sack lunch and we'll work through!

1. Review notes/agenda
2. Review/revise mission statement and Terrestrial WG Interest List
 - Feedback from Solution Team
3. Shari Brewer's Presentation (perspective from Sauk-Suiattle tribe re: terrestrial issues)
4. Status report: Action items
4. Reports from Recreation (Recreation Use Study)
5. Review Study Designs
 - R-T2, 4, 15, 17
6. Review Study Requests
 - R-T12, 11
7. Set next agenda (6/19) in **Lacey**, WA from 8:30 to 2:00 p.m.
8. Evaluate meeting

OTHER SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

- Process/policy presentation of how to approach impacts due to inundation
- WUTC to give "process" presentation