



BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE

Aquatic Resources Working Group RESOLVE

August 12, 2003

8:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

U.S. Forest Service

Conference Room A/B (425-775-9702)

21905 64th Avenue West, Mountlake Terrace, WA

AGENDA

- | |
|--|
| 1. Review of Prior Agreements (from 30 day review) |
| 2. 3.1.2 Propagation (circumstances/scope for use) |
| 3. 3.2.2 Connectivity (Baker Lake and Lake Shannon) |
| 4. 3.4.3 Erosion Management (move discussion to August 25 th ?) |
| 5. Draft agenda for next RESOLVE meeting |

August 12, 2003

Driving Directions to US Forest Service Office:

- 1) Driving North from Seattle (or South from Everett) on I-5, take the 220th St. SW exit (exit 179).**
 - 2) Turn west (right if from southbound I-5, left if from northbound I-5) onto 220th St. SW.**
 - 3) Drive west about a block and turn right onto 64th Ave W.**
 - 4) The office building is about ¼ block down the street on the right side of the road.**
-

BAKER RIVER PROJECT RELICENSE**Aquatics Working Group
RESOLVE Meeting**

August 12, 2003
8:30 a.m. – 1:45 p.m.
USFS Office, Mountlake Terrace, WA

MEETING NOTES

Team Leader: Arnie Aspelund, PSE

Written by: Dee Endelman, ADI

Attendees	Arnie Aspelund, PSE	Cary Feldmann, PSE
	Phil Hilgert, R2	Arn Thoreen, SFEG
	Gary Sprague, WDFW	Stan Walsh, SSC
	Steve Fransen, NMFS	Lorna Ellestad, SCPW
	Ruth Mathews, TNC	Gene Stagner, USFWS
		Dee Endelman, facilitator

August 12 Agenda

Review agenda, notes, actions
Review last meetings agreements
3.1.2 Propagation (page 42 of 2nd Draft PME's, May 9, 2003)
3.2.2 Connectivity (page 46)
Erosion Management (move to 8/25/03 meeting)
Meeting Review
Develop agenda for next meeting

Action Items

-
-
1. Nick—take O & M elements (of upstream fish passage PME) to the next fish passage meeting.
 2. Nick—Bring revised emergency response plan to fish passage meeting of 9/9/03.
 3. Stan—Regarding “Rationale” section of 3.2.1 (Upstream Fish Passage), add a sentence regarding sorting and send it to Nick.
 4. Scott—Regarding 3.4.2 (Large Woody Debris), re-write paragraph 4) under “Description of Actions” and send it to Arnie before the next meeting.
 5. All—review draft notes from 7/29/03 meeting and give Arnie comments by 8/15/03.
 6. Arnie—Revise all PME’s reviewed to date to reflect changes from the 7/29 and 8/12 meetings. Send this 3rd draft of the PME’s out to the group before the 8/25/03 meeting.
 7. Gary—Find out about the Cowlitz settlement agreement provision on fish management plans.
 8. Steve—Write a white paper on fish goals/propagation. Bring a “drafty draft” of this paper to the 8/25 meeting.
 9. Gene—Re 3.2.2 (Connectivity—page 46), write language regarding the test facility per the group’s discussion on this matter (contained in the notes below).
 10. Arnie—Seek alternate meeting place for 8/25 meeting (it is currently in the PSE Bothell office).
 11. **All—If you are going to be late for a meeting, please call Dee’s cell on the morning of the meeting (206-271-9750).**

Old Action Items

1. Arnie—send out draft agendas for remaining RESOLVE sessions.
2. Gary—Regarding “Rationale” section of 3.2.1 (Upstream Fish Passage), add a sentence regarding agency authorities and send it to Nick.
3. Phil—talk to Sue and Stuart regarding triggers for implementing gravel augmentation and what would the gravel look like (3.4.1, page 63). Also ask for their views on the following questions:
 - a. What are the triggers for selective actions?
 - b. Are 3 transects enough if we’re talking about site specific actions?
 - c. Is site-specific action part of the plan?
 - d. Is 1000 tons a reasonable start since, if we do 1000 tons/year, it would take 12 years to get up to the right amount?
 - e. Composition of sediment transported on a time period.
4. Phil—re-write the Summary of Actions in 3.4.1 (Fluvial Geomorphic Management--page 61) to reflect the actions set forth in the PME.

Notes from RESOLVE Meetings

To permit the greatest degree of open dialogue, the group agreed that notes for the RESOLVE sessions will be less formal than regular working group meetings. We will primarily document agreements and action items.

RESOLVE Groundrules

- Work at understanding one another.
- Use airtime wisely.
- Speak honestly and respectfully.

-
-
- Examine assumptions.
 - Make tentative agreements, then look at the whole package together.
 - One meeting review rule: we have one meeting to review and change the tentative agreements of the previous RESOLVE session.¹
 - Document our agreements.
 - Caucuses are okay.

3.1.2: Provide Fish Propagation and Enhancement Programs and Facilities (page 42)

Issues

- Why are we considering fish propagation?
- When is propagation appropriate?
- When do we make the change from improving habitat to stock supplementation?
- What methods would we consider?
- What species would we propagate?
- How will this program fit in with existing management plans?
- Do we need a Baker Fisheries white paper to get us on the same page to inform decision making?
Such a paper might cover:
 - The potential for fish given existence of the project;
 - Methods;
 - Alternatives to propagation.
- What numbers of fish should we be shooting for?
- Are is the scope of operations? (Beaches 2, 3, Sulphur Creek)
- What are the goals we are trying to accomplish? By what methods? What's the protocol? What are the priorities?
- The specific production values named in the current draft PME—why are they as they are? Are they the ones we want?
- Is the 20,000 pound production capacity about right?

Why are we considering propagation?

- It is one tool to mitigate some project effects and can take advantage of some opportunities that the project presents.
- The project is an artificial system. Some level of propagation is appropriate because habitat restoration alone ~~would be a without project scenario~~ may not accomplish the goals for a species in an adequate time frame [comment from Ruth Mathews, TNC].
- Propagation can improve the size of the resource as an enhancement (in desirable species) and provide harvest opportunities.
- Propagation best fits in a “make up” capacity rather than as a primary means for fish production.

¹ All agreements are tentative even after the “one meeting review rule”. However, the one meeting rule gives regular participants an opportunity to bring an agreement back to the table while assuring that tentative agreements are not forever reopened. It also accommodates regular participants who must miss a meeting and may want to weigh in on a decision.

Agreements

1. Propagation is one tool to achieve goals for various species.
2. We need to identify these goals somehow.
3. Generally, propagation should not be the only—or necessarily the primary—tool for species production.
4. There are different (and maybe competing) interests regarding propagation's use:
 - Recreation interests
 - Harvest interests
 - Concerns about Natural diversity
 - Concerns about genetic impacts
 - Concerns about interspecies impacts
 - Wildlife interests (fish for critters)
5. We need to know if the 20,000 pound capacity is sufficient.
6. we need to have some sort of Project Fisheries Plan: Species/goal/methods for meeting goal

Interests regarding Fish Goals

- PSE: We need to know what we're signing up for. We want it to be a balanced, reasonable program. We prefer incremental steps to make sure we're making good decisions.
- Stan: Large scale increase in sockeye production. With a project in place, from an aquatics standpoint, this makes the most sense. Also interested in some sort of program for Coho.
- NMFS: Agency is interested in practicable protection measures; mitigation of project effects on fish; enhancement opportunities that are consistent with protection and mitigation (e.g., the resident trout program can't interfere). Agency's interest include goals, first for listed species but also for all jurisdictional species.
- WDFW: Agency is interested in healthy fish populations, harvest opportunities and ecosystem needs (e.g., fish carcasses for other species, wildlife). Agency's interests include a program that is flexible and includes evaluation and monitoring.
- Skagit County: County wants to see measurable goals that are balanced and flexible and with good justification (so that people will understand and support them). County is interested in seeing a broad spectrum of fish with an emphasis on ESA. Interests also include a healthy ecosystem for residents' quality of life, balanced with public safety and a strong economy.
- The Nature Conservancy: TNC's interests include conserving native biodiversity and maintaining ecological integrity of ecosystems they depend upon. Interests recognize the need to balance human uses with ecosystem needs.
- Skagit Fisheries Enhancement Group: Skagit Fisheries wants to see a vibrant, self sustaining fish resource, using what we have now to its highest potential.
- USFWS: This agency's interested in historical assemblages of fish in historical habitat given constraints of project in place and its operations, past management practices and effects on listed species.

Agreement

Steve Fransen volunteered to begin drafting a fisheries white paper that would treat fish goals, potential for production, methods, alternatives to propagation. Steve will write this from his perspective, of course, and will keep in mind the interests he has heard around the table. The group can use the paper to further develop their ideas about fish goals and methods to meet those goals, including the role of propagation.

3.2.2 Address Connectivity Between Baker Lake and Lake Shannon

Issues

- What is the scope of the test facility?
- USFWS needs the understanding that the primary test for the facility will be its ability to capture bull trout, although helping other fish would also be wished.
- The facility needs to be designed in consultation with the BRCC (this is already in the PME) and approved by the two federal agencies with authority (this should be included in the boilerplate settlement language).
- We need to make sure that this PME supports the bull trout recovery plan.
- Under “Description of Action” (page 47), the second sentence under the second bullet should read: “...PSE will propose an alternative plan to the BRCC to achieve continuity...”

Agreements

The group agreed with all points raised by USFWS. Gene Stagner will write language regarding the test facility that will reflect the agreements which are important to document, from USFWS’ perspective.

Agenda for August 25 RESOLVE Session

- Review agenda, notes, action items
- Review agreements made on 7/29 and 8/11
- 3.1.2: Propagation (Steve’s white paper)
- 3.4.3: Erosion Management (Greta’s proposed language)
- 3.4.1: Fluvial Management (Phil’s report on conversation with Sue and Stuart)
- 3.1.1: HERC Fund
- Other PME’s that people want to raise for consideration

The next meeting is scheduled to be held at PSE’s Bothell Office. Arnie will try to find a more convenient location and will e-mail the group if he is successful.