



---

## **BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE**

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

December 15th, 2003  
9:00 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.  
Regular Working Group

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. Update on Study Reports:
3. Report on 12/3 USFS cost estimate meeting with EDAW.
4. Report on 12/4 PSE / USFS policy meeting.
5. PME Prioritization Exercise
6. Discussion of next steps
7. Set agenda for November Meeting
8. Evaluate Meeting



---

## **BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE**

### **Recreation Resources Working Group**

**December 15, 2003**

**9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.**

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

### **AGENDA**

<b>Topics</b>
Review notes/agenda/action items
Review of assignment for today <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Prioritization of all PME's</li><li>• Recommendations on a \$30M, \$15M package and a \$10M package</li><li>• Ideas on how to cover PME interests within budget constraints</li></ul>
Update on Study Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Aesthetics</li><li>• Others</li></ul>
Reports on meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• EDAW Meeting with USFS re cost estimates</li><li>• USFS/PSE policy team meeting</li></ul>
PME Prioritization Exercise, Part 1—Raw Prioritization <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Post each organization's priorities</li><li>• Review a raw prioritization based on total scores to determine:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Where there is agreement on the priority of certain PME's</li><li>○ Which core interests score, overall, as low priority (with the intent to collaborate to address these in some way)</li></ul></li></ul>
PME Prioritization Exercise, Part 2—Funding at Different Levels <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Review—what are all the ways we can attempt to cover everyone's core interests? (Review of ideas from 11/24/03 brainstorm)</li><li>• If you had a total of \$30 Million to spend, how would you do it?<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ How many PME's could we cover fully?</li><li>○ Which PME's would be left out?</li><li>○ What could we do to include core interests if some organization's high priority PME</li></ul></li></ul>



is being left out? <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>If you had a total of \$15 Million? \$10 Million?</li></ul>
Lunch
Prioritization Exercise, Continued
Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Where are we in agreement on priorities?</li><li>How close are we to agreement on ideas for including everyone's core interests?</li><li>How much would we benefit from continued discussion?</li><li>What are logical next steps based on the above?</li></ul>
Adjourn

---

---

**BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE****Recreational & Aesthetic Resources Working Group  
RESOLVE Meeting  
FINAL Notes**

December 15, 2003  
9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.  
USFS Office, Montlake 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: Brian Adams (Skagit County), Cindy Bjorkland (NPS), Ann Dunphy (USFS), Ardis Bynum (USFS), Jim Eychaner (IAC), Jeff Giesen (NCI), Tracie Johannessen (NCI), Andy Hatfield (PSE), Patrick Goldsworthy (NCCC), Kris Olin (PSE), Dave Reed (PSE), Susan Rosbrough (NPS), Saul Weisberg (NCI), Dee Endelman (facilitator), Ginny Ratliff (notetaker)

**December 15 Agenda:**

1. Review notes/agenda/action items
2. Review of assignment for today
  - Prioritization of all PME's
  - Recommendations on a \$30M, \$15M package and a \$10M package
  - Ideas on how to cover PME interests within budget constraints
3. Update on Study Reports
  - Aesthetics
  - Others
4. Reports on meetings
  - EDAW Meeting with USFS re cost estimates
  - USFS/PSE policy team meeting

---

---

5. PME Prioritization Exercise, Part 1—Raw Prioritization

- Post each organization's priorities
- Review a raw prioritization based on total scores to determine:
  - Where there is agreement on the priority of certain PME's
  - Which core interests score, overall, as low priority (with the intent to collaborate to address these in some way)

6. PME Prioritization Exercise, Part 2—Funding at Different Levels

- Review—what are all the ways we can attempt to cover everyone's core interests? (Review of ideas from 11/24/03 brainstorm)
- If you had a total of \$30 Million to spend, how would you do it?
  - How many PME's could we cover fully?
  - Which PME's would be left out?
  - What could we do to include core interests if some organization's high priority PME is being left out?
- If you had a total of \$15 Million? \$10 Million?
  1. Where are we in agreement on priorities?
  2. How close are we to agreement on ideas for including everyone's core interests?
  3. How much would we benefit from continued discussion?
  4. What are logical next steps based on the above?

**New Action Items**

1. Andy, Jim, Ann, Saul (or NCI rep)—meet on Friday, 12/20, to develop a revised funding priority sheet based on information from EDAW and notes from today's meetings (as understood based on the conversation).
2. Andy—Call EDAW about getting information in time for 12/20 meeting.
3. Andy—Send out revised funding priority sheet to group by year-end.
4. All—Review revised funding priority sheet before next meeting (on 1/9/04).

**Old Action Items:**

1. All—Put together initial thoughts on strategies to contain costs.
2. Andy—Call Marguerite Austin re IAC policy and how we should draft PME's to potentially leverage IAC grant funding.
3. Ardis—Re-write 6.5 to reflect our discussion of the goals (for Information, Interpretation and Education)
4. Ann—Give Andy the number of miles on Rainbow Ridge Trail.
5. Andy—Check on tribal enforcement policies (for 2.1.3—Law Enforcement)
6. Ann and Andy—Re, 2.5.7 (Wildlife Observation), calculate distances for each type of loop, cost out.
7. Ann—re-write trigger language in 2.5.1 (Bayview) to reflect USFS interest in timing certainty.
8. Ann and Andy—Discuss Interpretive PME and draft language changes

**Introductory Discussion and Remarks:**

The facilitator (Dee Endelman) reviewed the agenda and the assignment for the day:

- 
- 
- To prioritize the PME's into a package that meets everyone's interests. If that package can't be developed, examine each stakeholder group's priorities if the recreation budget were \$10, \$15, or \$30 million.
  - To discuss ideas for doing more with less: efficiencies, cost sharing, timing, changes in scope, RAM fund.

Other housekeeping items included:

- Due to the heavy agenda, we deferred reviewing action items until our next meeting.
- For purposes of today's deliberations, we agreed that the cost estimates we will work from are the ones that Ann Dunphy developed.
- Ginny Ratliff (Agreement Dynamics) is taking notes today. Notes from the meeting will be distributed to the group for review and revision.

Dee provided an update on the status of the other Working Groups:

- Cultural and Terrestrial Working Groups are in tentative agreement;
- Aquatics Working Group is in tentative agreement on all aspects of the PME's, except for in-stream flows (their Technical Group is testing flow regimes and will finish their work in 3-4 weeks).

Kris Olin, Project Manager for the Baker Relicensing effort, sat in on the meeting for Cary Feldmann. He explained that due to impending FERC submittal deadlines, the Solution Team has requested that this group either develop a PME package as soon as possible or outline their spending priorities and the Solution Team would finalize the package for them. He also stated that the Solution Team would prefer that Working Groups reach resolution since they are more involved in the details of the projects, and he encouraged the group to focus on ways to meet their joint interests.

Susan Rosbrough observed that the nearly \$30 million difference between PSE's and USFS' estimate of costs makes it difficult to analyze cost cutting measures. We discussed that part of these cost differences results from replacement costs but that there are also other differences. We also agreed that we would use the USFS estimates for this discussion so that we would not be trying to deal with two sets of numbers.

Andy Hatfield reported that EDAW has reviewed the proposed projects and cost figures for the Recreation Working Group, and will have their final analysis submitted by Thursday, December 18, 2003. EDAW's report will analyze the reasons for the cost discrepancies and will have a column labeled "opportunities" which could have some ideas for resolution. Andy stressed, and all agreed, that EDAW's report is not a "silver bullet" but a source of information.

Ann noted that she had revised her original estimate downward, primarily based on a campground concessionaire-funding model which would allow local recovery of some funds.

Patrick Goldsworthy reviewed some of the concerns of the Terrestrial Working Group, especially those related to the Recreation Working Group budget being high.

Cindy Bjorklund commented that some of the shared PME's have been addressed by the Recreation

---

---

Working Group and that the size of the budget should be viewed in that context. Others agreed with this observation.

### **Studies Update**

Andy Hatfield indicated that the Aesthetics Draft Study Plan will be released on Friday, December 16, 2003. Much of the study revolves around project structures like screening and facilities.

### **Prioritization of Recreation PME's:**

Each organization had rank ordered the 24 PME's. From this organizational ranking, Andy created an Excel spread sheet which added these rankings together into a raw prioritization of the PME's. (See Attachment A.)

We agreed that we would prefer to include everyone's core interests under a reduced budget scenario, if possible, rather than draw a random line based on the prioritization. With this principle in mind, the group reviewed the raw prioritization and attempted to identify core aspects of each PME.

### **2.1.3: Law Enforcement**

We agreed that the coordination plan is a core aspect. Law Enforcement considers both Whatcom and Skagit Counties and additional funding for officers would be helpful. Several participants noted that the addition of a Stewardship program might decrease the need for as much law enforcement presence.

### **2.2.1: Dispersed site improvement/O & M**

This is a priority of SCORP. The core of this PME is the maintenance of basic facilities and the people who will perform both stewardship and maintenance. Maintenance should be included in this PME. We agreed to rename it "Dispersed Site Maintenance."

### **2.5.3: Lake Shannon Access and Development**

The core aspect of this PME is the public's ability to access the water legally. This is a priority of SCORP. The extent of development is secondary and can be phased in over time. Brian Adams noted that Skagit County's concern regarding development is that if camping is not available, it will happen anyway. Already, garbage is left in the area that needs to be cleaned up. We talked about the possibility of obtaining matching funds for the development portion of this PME.

### **2.4.1A: New Trail Creation**

There are three potential trail routes in the current PME, all connecting developed sites. Jim noted that the State has a key interest in meeting the public need for additional opportunities to walk and bicycle. Skagit County surveys also show trails are at the top of people's concerns. We discussed ways of reducing the cost of these trails, including closing roads and putting up signs. We noted that part of the expense of the Panorama Point trail is the need to address the wetland in that area. A two-mile loop trail connecting Concrete is an eventual SCORP priority.

---

---

### **2.5.2a: Campground O & M**

In this PME, including a concessionaire aspect creates revenue offsets. The costs in this PME assume replacements over 30 years.

#### **2.1.1: Water Recreation Safety Program and Boating Hazard Plan**

The core aspect of this PME is information to boaters. Although stump removal is also a key part, stump removal could be done sparingly and in gradations. We noted that stump removal could also have some cross resource implications—for example, the Terrestrial group wants to have snags for habitat. This PME also includes items such as safety bouys and tear sheet maps.

#### **6.5.1: Visitor Information**

The core aspects of this PME are the visitor information at Sedro-Wooley; maps and brochures; and a station at the head of Baker Lake. There is an annual O & M and staffing component. Under the \$30 million proposal (discussed at the 11/24 working group meeting), USFS would contribute 50% of the costs.

#### **2.6.1: RAM Fund**

We agreed that this fund is important because of all of the unknowns involved in a 30 year license. We discussed the possibility of making the amount in the fund a percentage of total costs (e.g., 10%). We agreed that, if the item already has a cost assigned to it and is called out in the PME's, it should not also be included in the RAM Fund. We realized that we should go back through the PME's and "unpack" those items noted as part of the RAM Fund and also discussed in individual PME's. The RAM fund should be focused on the adaptive management aspects of Recreation—issues that we don't know about yet or have only a partial idea of what should be done.

We agreed that it makes sense to identify the types of items we might use the fund for to give people in the future an idea of what we were thinking about as we put together this fund. Ann went through some examples of items they used to build the RAM fund number: emergency communications, dispersed site permits; trail monitoring counters; new trails, phase 2; vegetation management. Patrick noted that there might be natural resource impacts of a recreation activity that might have to be dealt with out of the RAM fund.

#### **6.5.2: Interpretive Services**

The core of this PME is personnel, a program with field people and coordinators (USFS rangers, for example). Another key aspect are displays. The emphasis for the interpretive services should be on resources and connection to the basin is important. An Interpretive Plan is a core element of this PME.

Patrick noted that the interpretive services should include information on the National Park. Ardis responded that the USFS works in cooperation with the Park on matters such as this. The interpretation



---

---

will be at or near the lake—the connection to the basin from a holistic standpoint

#### **2.4.2a: Existing Trailhead O & M**

This PME is very similar to 2.4.2b, “Trail O & M” and they should be placed together. PSE funding for Baker Lake and Baker River trails would be core to the USFS’ interests. Saul mentioned that the stewardship program could be a way of doing some of the trailhead O & M.

#### **6.5.3: Conservation Education**

Saul noted that, at last meeting we had put conversation, education, interpretation together. He said that, when they’re separated, they tend to cost more. In this regard, NCI proposes a stewardship model to address natural resource protection and visitor management.

#### **2.4.2b: Existing Trail O & M**

This PME funds trail O & M at the most basic level. The core of this PME is Baker River and Baker Lake trails.

#### **2.5.7: ADA Fishing Opportunity**

This provides a benefit at a modest cost. Its location may change, however. Jim noted that IAC sees that a greater need exists for riverbank fishing opportunities than lakefront and accessible fishing should be located where fish are! This ADA opportunity is not mandatory for USFS; however, it is desirable.

#### **2.2.2: Manage dispersed Site Impact**

After discussing that the following factors, we agreed that this PME should be dropped as a separate item:

- Some of its is included under 2.2.1, Dispersed site improvement/O & M;
- It initially was oriented towards erosion control and this is being handled by an Aquatics PME now;
- It has not ended up being as much of a problem as we had originally thought, based on data gathered in the field.

#### **2.4.2c: New Trails O & M**

This needs to be closer in priority to new trails creation. If we build a trail, we need to maintain it—this is the core aspect of this PME. We may be able to contain costs with respect to trail maintenance through the use of volunteers but we cannot ignore it.

#### **6.4.0: Access Management**

This is an important PME from the USFS’ perspective. It implements the Forest’s Road Plan. The core sections of this PME involve access roads that go to developed recreation sites; secondary are those that

---

---

go to dispersed sites. This is also a high priority for Terrestrial working group, seeking to avoid human interference with wildlife. There may be ways to share the costs of road paving, for example, with Federal Highways.

### **2.5.1: Bayview**

This is one of the top three priorities for USFS. The core aspect of this PME is reconstructing Bayview from its primitive existence to a campground comparable to Horseshoe Cove. There do not need to be showers at this site but it is a high priority of USFS to have showers somewhere in the Basin. It could be co-managed with Horseshoe Cove. The current vision is to have 22 single sites that could be converted into group sites if a need were identified.

### **2.5.6: Wildlife Observation Opportunities**

The core of this PME is a viewing area at Panorama Point, one which is off the highway and universally accessible.

### **2.4.1b: New Trails, Phase 2**

The funding for this appears to be double counted, once here and once in the RAM Fund. We should look at ways to do trails for less money, for example, seeking easements related to wildlife habitat could be dovetailed with trail creation, thus reducing the costs of land purchase for trails.

### **2.5.4: Kulshan Campground Improvement**

The core of this PME is adding showers and, potentially, RV hookups. Although showers could happen in other places, Kulshan might be the most cost effective alternative. Jim noted that this is the one area of camping that seems to be growing, RV camping. Thus, RV hookups in future might be a good addition. This could create the potential for concessionaire operations, although the property is currently owned by PSE.

### **2.5.5: Baker Lake Resort Redevelopment**

The USFS sees this as a higher priority than this ranking shows. The core of this PME is to have funds available to re-develop this into a campground that is up to standards. If PSE gives up the special use permit for the resort, under one scenario it would be restored to its natural state and it is a prime piece of recreation property.

Jim noted that, from SCORP analysis, camping should be de-emphasized because the data show that its popularity has gone from # 3 to #20 in public priority over the past 20 years. Brian noted that, although camping per se may have declined, he wondered if camping combined with other activities (e.g., camping for the purpose of hunting or fishing or boating) has likewise declined. We discuss the fact that interrelations would make a difference; however, Jim counseled being conservative on camping investments. Because the area is desirable, USFS has not seen decrease in camping; they are turning away people now.

---

---

### **2.3.1: Aesthetics Management**

An Aesthetics Management Plan will be part of the license application. However, there are cost effective ways of making things better around the project (e.g., how one paints the buildings to match surroundings).

### **6.5x: Park & Boulder Campground Decommission**

This PME is in response to a desire to improve riparian habitat in Park Creek and, in both Park and Boulder, to improve elk habitat. It's wildlife and aesthetics-driven. It is not a big cost issue and USFS would trade it for more important PME's, such as Baker Lake Resort Redevelopment.

#### **PME Costs**

Dee had asked the group to complete the assignment from the policy team, i.e., to look at what could be done for \$30 million, \$15 million and \$10 million based on the discussion today. The group reviewed costs of each PME and the share which had been assigned to PSE in the USFS' cost estimates (Attachment B). We discussed whether we could, from a broad brush point of view, begin to see what we might do if we had \$30 million to spend, then \$15, then \$10. Jim voiced his belief that the group needed to see EDAW's projections alongside cost revisions from the morning's discussions in order to thoroughly analyze overall costs. He also suggested the group meet once more with that information.

Ann and Ardis provided a draft of what their idea of PSE's contributions at the \$10, \$15, and \$30 million level. Ardis and Ann indicated that the \$30 million budget funds every PME, but inadequately and the USFS wouldn't want to see PSE's contribution to be any less than \$30 million. Ardis also stated that this budget doesn't reflect the group's priorities they had just developed. Finally, Ann noted that costs should not be "set in stone" because they were based on assumptions like concessionaire funding sources.

#### **Group Concerns**

When Dee asked the group why it could not come to agreement at this point, Susan indicated she had not known there was a recreation budget and if the group is going to adequately evaluate keeping certain things and cutting others, they need an individual cost breakdown for each element of a PME.

Saul noted the tremendous diversity of projects on the list, that the group didn't have experts on the various elements and how conditional and interrelated various elements were. He cited how stewardship programs could save money, but that it would be difficult for the Forest Service to base budget decisions on voluntary efforts. He did state that Stewardship and Shannon are areas where the group could probably have that detailed discussion. He provided the group with information on NCI Stewardship programs.

Jim asked whether the budget has already been negotiated at the policy level of the USFS and PSE. It has not; however, the current costs are a problem from the point of view of PSE's interests. This is why the Policy team had asked the group to prioritize and begin discussing costs.

Tracie Johannson recalled that the group had agreed to consolidate information, education and

---

---

interpretation and wondered why that had not been done. She also stated that the group has made progress but that their work is not yet concluded.

Andy also indicated that the group hasn't had an opportunity to discuss Ardis's redrafted PME's.

### **Group Needs**

Dee reminded the group that if their work isn't completed, it might not be included in the PDEA draft that requires input by late January 2004. She asked the group to identify their informational needs and timeframe to complete their discussions.

The group discussed what they needed to reach resolution:

- EDAW's report (that includes potential areas for cost sharing)
- Lake Shannon line itemed out
- Unpack the RAM fund
- Consolidate Section 6.5 and look at the Stewardship proposal as part of it
- Re-look at stewardship PME and discuss it, look at what the continuum would be in information, education and interpretation. (Some group members noted that they'd asked for it to be done prior to this meeting, but it wasn't presented at this meeting)
- Discuss PME draft done by Ardis.

A number of group members noted that they needed more time to review the additional information presented and cited the fact that they really didn't have any cost data until their November 24 meeting.

### **Timeline/Work Plan**

We decided to charge a teamlet with the work of producing a redraft of the prioritized list which would "clean up" some of the dollar elements (e.g., unpack the RAM fund) and work with the EDAW report to come up with possible "slimmed down" versions of the PME's and related costs. (See action items at the beginning of these notes). Ann will recalculate PME budget numbers and bring that to the Friday meeting. Andy will contact EDAW and make sure that they have a report by Thursday for the group's use on Friday. The Teamlet will provide written information to the Working Group prior to their newly scheduled January 9 meeting. At the January 9 meeting, the working group will do its best to come up with a recommendation to the policy team on a package. The group also agreed to reschedule their January 19 meeting to January 26.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.