



BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Wildlife and Terrestrial Resources Working Group Meeting

September 19, 2000

8:45 a.m. - 11:45 a.m.

U.S. Forest Service Office
21905 64th Avenue West
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043
425-775-9702

AGENDA

Review/revise agenda
Status report: Action items
Issues/Interests: Ed Schild, Director, and Joel Molander, Asset Manager, to give presentation about Hydro Economics, Collaboration, Interests, and Expectations.
Interest Sheets – Assignment of interests and issues to each Agency/Group.
Evaluate if Biota Pacific and Hamer can meet the needs of this working group- Discuss access team members will have to the consultants.
Other available information?
Other issues – Clarify inundation issue/conceptual mitigation approach, PIP map handout and instructions, and Web Site meeting posting process.
Set agenda for next meeting
Evaluate meeting



BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Wildlife and Terrestrial Resources Working Group

September 19, 2000

8:45 am – 11:45 am

US Forest Service Office
Mountlake Terrace, WA

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 (E-mail) tfuchs@puget.com

ATTENDEES

Tony Fuchs (Puget Sound Energy), Robert Kuntz (National Park Service), Patrick Goldsworthy (North Cascades Conservation Council), Fred Seavey (US Fish & Wildlife Service), Ann Risvold (US Forest Service), Stan Walsh (Skagit Systems Cooperative), Lauri Vigue (WA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife), Carl Corey, (Forest Service), Don Gay (US Forest Service), Joel Molander(PSE), Ed Schild(PSE), Lloyd Pernela (PSE), Lyn Wiltse, facilitator (PDSA Consulting).

The meeting started at 8:45 a.m. and ended at 11:45 a.m.

NEW ACTION ITEMS

- Ed Schild to invite WUTC to give “process” presentation to working groups and possibly join Economics Working Group.
- Bob will check with Bruce Freet re: making copies of “Collaborate Process” article for working group members.
- All groups will review issues/interests generated from perspective of agency.

-
-
- Don will reserve conference room at Mountlake Terrace location for first few months of 2001.

SEPTEMBER 19 AGENDA

(8:45 a.m. - 11:45 p.m.) – Forest Service Office in Mountlake Terrace

1. Review agenda
2. Status report: Action items; Project Information Package update
3. Issues/Interests (Ed Schild, Director PSE's Energy Production and Storage to speak?)
 - Clarify inundation issue/conceptual mitigation approach
4. Evaluate if Biota Pacific and Hamer can meet the needs of this working group- Discuss access team members will have to the consultants
5. Other available information?
6. Other issues?
7. Set agenda for next meeting, October 17, 2000

INTRODUCTIONS

Team members introduced themselves to visitors: Ed Schild, Director of Energy Production and Storage, Joel Molander, Asset Manager for Hydro Generation, and Lloyd Pernela, newly hired PSE Licensing Manager.

REPORT ON OLD ACTION ITEMS

- Tony reported he talked with Connie and that it appears that Skagit County doesn't want to participate until there is land use activity. PSE is keeping them informed of public meetings in the mean time.
- Lauri reported that the Mountlake Terrace location is available through the end of the year. She also found that the Mill Creek office is available as a backup. Tony reported that the PSE Mt. Vernon office is also available as a backup meeting location.
- Laurel sent to Tony the state and county definitions of "noxious weed" and species list. Tony has distributed to team members by e-mail (Patrick received paper copy).
- Tony distributed CDs of the Project Information Package (background information on the Baker River Project). He also distributed hard copies of maps. He also distributed CDs of the Fish History document. The question was raised re: how working group members can secure black and white hard copies of documents such as the Project Information Package and the Fish History. PSE reported that it will provide these copies by request. Color copies are available at cost.
- All things considered PSE would prefer a 50-year license, however, the length of the license is highly dependent on the process determined by FERC. (this answer removes Parking Lot issue)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The RESOLVE Training addresses issues and interests and decision making styles within the collaborative process. This training is suggested for all working group members and IS REQUIRED for Solution Team Members. Dates for the training are Friday, October 13th at the U.S. Forest Service Office at Mountlake Terrace and on Saturday, October 21st at Cottontree Inn, Mount Vernon, WA. Team leaders will be calling all interested parties and asking them which date works best for them to attend the training. There is a limit of 40 participants in each training. The sessions will run from 9:00 to 4:00 and lunch will

be provided. In the meantime, the team leader distributed a sign-up sheet for those who were ready to sign up.

TERRESTRIAL RESOURCES FIELD TRIP

The team leader distributed a sign-up sheet for those who were unable to attend the tour. A make-up tour will be put together to accommodate everyone. No one signed up for a second tour, however, another tour will be set up if needed in the future.

PSE PRESENTATION

Ed thanked the group for their energy and participation over the last few months. Joel gave an overview of how investor owned utilities operate. Ed concluded the presentation by discussing the idea of collaboration. He recommended the following article:

“Collaborative Processes for Improving Land Stewardship and Sustainability. I ---III. Editors : N.C. Johnson, A.J. Malk, W.T. Sexton, R.C. Szaro. Publisher: Elsevier Science Ltd., Netherlands, 1999.

Pending copyright issues, PSE will make copies of the article to distribute at the October meeting. Ed also shared PSE’s interests. He stressed his support of the collaborative process and asked team members to give him a call at any time if they have questions. His direct number is 425.462-3022. The question was raised re: PSE’s plans for potential structural modifications to increase power production at the Baker River Project. The only thing that may be on the horizon is possibly adding another turbine at Lower Baker (The new turbine would likely tap off the existing penstock). Handouts of the presentation were distributed and will be available on the website.

ISSUES/INTERESTS

	Wildlife & Terrestrial Resources Working Group
1.	Noxious (non-native) Species – characterize problem (need more information on what and where) Interest (1) – Non-native species can outcompete/displace native species and change processes in the ecosystem or habitat. Issue (2) – Fear of extinction of certain plant/animal species. Interest (3) – Non-native species/potential for non-native species exists in the vicinity of the Baker River Project. Issue – Determine Baker River Project contribution to the invasion of non-native species in the area. Issue (2) – Controlling/eliminating non-native species in the vicinity of the Baker River Project.
2.	Loss of rare plant habitat Issue (1) - Maintaining and restoring rare plants and their habitats in the Basin Interest (2) - We may have lost rare plants/have lost rare plant habitats or we may lose them in the future
3.	Wetland, riparian habitats (ecosystem process) Issue (1) – Reservoir (rather than river) disrupts plant dispersal and plant community dynamics Interest (2) – Protecting, maintaining and enhancing wetland and riparian functions (plant & animal)
4.	Inundation habitat loss – wetlands, riparian, deer & elk winter range (e.g. Oregon spotted frog) Issue (1) – Project operation/fluctuation of reservoir Issue (2) – Continued loss of habitats inundated by reservoirs. Direct loss of previous habitat Issue (3) – Importance of low gradient/low elevation riparian habitat inundated by continued existence of hydro-power project: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Effects to low elevation grizzly bear spring foraging habitat.• Effects on forest carnivore habitat (e.g. fisher, wolverine, cougar, lynx).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects on resident and neo tropical migrant songbirds habitat (specifically species dependent on cottonwood overstory and willow shrub habitats). <p>Issue (4) – Deer and elk winter range forage</p> <p>Interest (1) – Addressing habitat loss</p> <p>Interest (2) – Evaluating impacts on species of concern/interest</p> <p>Interest (3) – May have lost connectivity to habitats within the park itself</p> <p>Issue (4) – Possibility that loss of continuity between upstream and downstream habits adversely affects populations. (reservoir creates recruitment barrier)</p>
5.	Issue: Fluctuating water levels —botanical aspects, wildlife aspects
6.	<p>Issue: Project impacts on the LSR impacts</p> <p>Size of contiguous habitat patches is limited by the reservoir—could affect # of species supported.</p> <p>Connectivity and reservoir edge effect on habitat quality.</p> <p># species that can be supported (due to reservoir)</p> <p>Connectivity and edge effect on habitat quality</p>
7.	<p>Recreation impacts – Direct impacts from Project –induced recreation disturbance to nesting birds, etc.</p> <p>Indirect impacts from Project induced recreation. (e.g., providing more campground services; more people taking day hikes—disturbing mountain goats, etc.)</p>
8.	<p>Issue: Want more fish biomass into the ecosystem (watershed)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nutrients and forage
9.	Potential project induced recreational impacts to rare plants, habitats, and species
10.	<p>Issue: Are there increased impacts from the Project (now/future) on collection of plant species that the public would want to harvest? What amount of increased recreational impacts can be attributed to the Project? Versus no Project</p> <p>Issue: Current/future project impact on ability to administer DNR’s HCP.</p>
11.	Issue:Public Environmental Education & Outreach—Terrestrial issues
12.	Issue:What amount of increased recreation impacts can be attributed to the project vs. no project
13.	Issue: Current/future project impact on ability to administer DNR’s HCP

PARKING LOT

- Alteration of Solution Team Mission Statement (once the team is formed)
- *Operational definition: in reference to team mission statement: “previous environment” is defined as “environment prior to Baker River Project construction.”
- Review time frame/goals of working groups/milestones
- Definitions of “Project Boundary” and “Project Effects”
- How do we handle “latecomers” to this process?

POTENTIAL STUDIES

- Baseline study re: present conditions and future trends of harvestable plant species

MEETING DATES THROUGH END OF THE YEAR

The team discussed the meeting schedule through the end of the year. They agreed on the following dates and locations:

October 17 at Mountlake Terrace location, beginning at 8:45

November 21 at Mountlake Terrace location, beginning at 8:45
December (no meeting)

MEETING PROCESS REVIEW

Well-Dones:

Location
Half & half
PSE presentation, especially the economic portion
Having Ed here

Need for Improvement:

No new stuff in the collaboration portion of the presentation

Create an achievable agenda

TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Note: Stakeholders will get together to work on issues and interests in the form of INTERESTS/ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH THEM/POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS from 8:45 to 9:45 prior to the next meeting.

October 17, 2000 9:45 a.m. - 11:45 a.m. at Mountlake Terrace Forest Service Office

1. Review agenda
2. Status report: Action items
3. Issues/Interests
4. Other available information?
5. Other issues?
6. Set agenda for next meeting (November 21)

SUGGESTIONS FOR NOVEMBER MEETING

- Process/policy presentation of how to approach impacts due to inundation
- PSE's constraints in operating the project ("Hydro" presentation by Bob Barnes)
- What happens if the process breaks down?
- Evaluate if Biota Pacific and Hamer can meet the needs of this working group- Discuss access team members will have to the consultants