

Item 1

DATE: August 25, 2004
TO: Jorge Carrasco
FROM: Nancy Glaser, Barbara Greene
SUBJECT: Trip Report – Boundary Relicensing Stakeholder Meetings

The first stakeholder outreach meetings to prepare for Boundary relicensing occurred with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the WA Department of Ecology (WDOE) on Thursday, August 19 and Friday, August 20 in Spokane, WA. Additional meetings with relicensing staff at Avista, a briefing on Boundary relicensing for Judy Olson, U.S. Senator Patty Murray's Eastern Washington Director, and a discussion on water quality issues with Peter Scott of Preston, Gates & Ellis were also conducted.

SCL Message: These meetings were SCL's first effort to establish relationships with the key stakeholders in relicensing. Both USFWS and WDOE have the authority to prescribe conditions on a new license to operate Boundary Dam, and both have parallel processes underway that will establish guidelines for these prescriptions. While SCL staff are engaged in these processes at a technical level, the intent of these meetings was to put the issues in the context of Boundary relicensing and identify methods to work more collaboratively with the agencies. All of the meetings focused on the use of FERC's Integrated Licensing Process (ILP), identification of the significant milestones SCL faces on that timeline, and exploration of the agencies' internal timelines. SCL also invited the agencies to participate in the upcoming workshop with FERC in November (date TBD) to discuss the ILP as it will apply to Boundary relicensing.

I. USFWS

Participants: Rick Donaldson, Hydropower Coordinator; Dan Trochta, Fish and Wildlife Biologist.

Issues:

1. USFWS expressed a desire for a separate document for the biological opinion required pursuant to the Endangered Species Act Section 7 consultation requirements.
2. Discussion of USFWS experience working with Canadian stakeholders.

Follow Up:

1. SCL will provide USFWS with a description of the project features for Boundary Dam.
2. SCL will schedule a tour for USFWS and other interested agency officials for September or October 2004.
3. USFWS will provide SCL with contacts at the agency that are involved with WDOE's Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) processes.

Boundary Relicensing Stakeholder Outreach Briefing

Stakeholder	II. US Fish & Wildlife Service
MCA	<u>Yes, FPA Section 18 - Mandatory fishway prescriptions</u>
Participants	Rick Donaldson, Hydro Coordinator
Date	Friday, August 20, 2004
Time	8:30 am – 9:30 am
Location	11103 E. Montgomery
Phone #	509.893.3009

Background

The Secretaries of Commerce and Interior have authority to “prescribe” fishways. These are mandatory requirements that FERC must include in any new license. This authority is usually referred to as Section 18 (from the Federal Power Act) or Fishway Authority. Currently there is no agreed to formal definition of what is a “fishway”. Typical prescriptions go far beyond the design of fishway structures to include flows, operating schedules and evaluation programs.

The USFWS will also be the agency that will conduct Section 7 Endangered Species Act (ESA) consultation with the FERC over their licensing decision. Under ESA, FERC must consult with the Fish & Wildlife Service or National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA Fisheries) to determine whether the agency action is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species or result in critical habitat destruction. When endangered or threatened species are present in the area of a hydroelectric project proposed for licensing, FERC may be required to prepare a biological assessment for the purpose of identifying any endangered or threatened species likely to be affected by licensing. This biological assessment may be undertaken as an integral part of NEPA compliance.

Issues

The Section 7 consultation will take into account the various species that are listed on the endangered species list at Boundary, i.e. bull trout, bald eagles, grizzly bear, etc. ALP and ILP both have significant opportunities for the licensee to prepare the biological assessment, which will be the main document used for FERC/USFWS consultation. The biological opinion will review all potential impacts of the licensing decision and address methods to avoid, mitigate or minimize negative impacts on listed species. FERC must include conditions to adequately protect, mitigate damage to, and enhance fish and wildlife (and their habitats) based on recommendations of state and federal fish and wildlife agencies.

USFWS Section 18 requirements at Box Canyon Dam include prescriptions for temporary, interim and permanent fish passage facilities for both upstream and downstream fish passage. These facilities are directed at providing fish passage for bull trout and westslope cutthroat trout.

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. SCL Relicensing Update
3. Identify potential level of involvement from USFWS in Boundary relicensing
4. Identify USFWS staff who might be involved in Boundary relicensing

Item 2

DATE: August 25, 2004
TO: Jorge Carrasco
FROM: Nancy Glaser, Barbara Greene
SUBJECT: Trip Report – Boundary Relicensing Stakeholder Meetings

The first stakeholder outreach meetings to prepare for Boundary relicensing occurred with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the WA Department of Ecology (WDOE) on Thursday, August 19 and Friday, August 20 in Spokane, WA. Additional meetings with relicensing staff at Avista, a briefing on Boundary relicensing for Judy Olson, U.S. Senator Patty Murray's Eastern Washington Director, and a discussion on water quality issues with Peter Scott of Preston, Gates & Ellis were also conducted.

SCL Message: These meetings were SCL's first effort to establish relationships with the key stakeholders in relicensing. Both USFWS and WDOE have the authority to prescribe conditions on a new license to operate Boundary Dam, and both have parallel processes underway that will establish guidelines for these prescriptions. While SCL staff are engaged in these processes at a technical level, the intent of these meetings was to put the issues in the context of Boundary relicensing and identify methods to work more collaboratively with the agencies. All of the meetings focused on the use of FERC's Integrated Licensing Process (ILP), identification of the significant milestones SCL faces on that timeline, and exploration of the agencies' internal timelines. SCL also invited the agencies to participate in the upcoming workshop with FERC in November (date TBD) to discuss the ILP as it will apply to Boundary relicensing.

III. WDOE

Participants: Jim Ballatt, Section Manager for WDOE Water Quality Program; Jean Parodi, Lead on Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) processes for the Pend Oreille River.

Issues:

1. The timelines for several WDOE parallel processes are intersecting but not consistent, presenting many challenges for SCL and other participants. The agency's water quality process timelines occur between January - June 2005. In order to meet these deadlines, SCL will need to determine policy on a number of water quality issues this fall. SCL staff are fully engaged in the necessary technical analysis and will present the information to the FERC Oversight Committee in November and the Superintendent in December 2004.
2. WDOE found the ILP information educational, and realized that involvement of other WDOE program staff would provide a more coordinated approach on the part of the agency. They also raised the option of SCL assisting in the funding of staff to support Boundary relicensing efforts at WDOE.
3. Identification of other stakeholders and tribes with an interest in water quality resources to be addressed in relicensing include the Kalispel Tribe, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Pend Oreille PUD, Army Corps of Engineers (operates Albeni Falls upstream of Boundary).

What we learned:

1. WDOE has a cooperative agreement in the form of an MOU with the BC Ministry that offers the opportunity to participate in WDOE's TMDLs.
2. WDOE expects EPA to approve Washington State water quality standards under review in the next 4 – 6 months.
3. The temperature standard for the Pend Oreille River that will be established by the Temperature TMDL will be driven by the natural condition in Lake Pend Oreille.

Follow Up:

1. WDOE and SCL will meet again in October to compare the relicensing timeline and WDOE timelines in attempt to better coordinate.
2. WDOE agreed to review their various programs to identify staff who should be in discussion with SCL about Boundary relicensing.

Boundary Relicensing Stakeholder Outreach Briefing

Stakeholder	IV. WA Dept of Ecology, Spokane Office
MCA	Yes, 401 water quality certificate
Participants	Jim Ballatty, Section Manager, Water Quality Program Jean Parodi Paul Turner, Pend Oreille River TMDL Lead
Date	Friday, August 20, 2004
Time	10:00 am – 11:00 am
Location	4601 N. Monroe
Phone #	Jim: 509.329.3534; Jean: 509.329.3517

Background

Section 401 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) states that a license applicant must obtain certification from the state or interstate pollution control agency verifying compliance with the CWA, which requires: restore and maintain chemical, physical and biological integrity; protect water quality and beneficial uses. CWA describes numeric standards for conventional and selected chemical pollutants, and narrative standards for others. FERC requires an applicant to consult with the “certifying agency”, which is the State Department of Ecology in Washington state. Documented evidence of compliance with the certification requirement must be provided to FERC. FERC must include all water quality certification requirements as conditions in the new license.

A 401 water quality certificate, issued by the Department of Ecology, is required before FERC can issue the new license. The process to obtain this certificate assures that the proposed project will be in compliance with applicable water quality standards. The 401 certification process can involve physical, chemical and biological standards. In addition to water quality parameters that one normally considers part of water quality (i.e. water temperature, dissolved gas, etc.) 401 certification can involve such things as flow, ramping rates and changes to aquatic habitat.

Boundary Project (FERC No. 2144), Pre-Application Document
Appendix 6-1: Documentation of Contacts

Issues

1. The following processes are underway that will affect the 401 certificate for Boundary Dam:
 - ◆ Temperature TMDL – The short timeline for this process needs to be lengthened to include two seasons for data collection and review.
 - ◆ UAA Guidance Document – Our recent comments recommended a more strategic approach to the various water quality planning processes, i.e. UAA process should be consistent with EPA guidelines coming out this fall.
 - ◆ TDG TMDL
2. The Trans-Boundary Gas Group is a loose organization of U.S. and Canadian interests, public and private, who monitor TDG levels in waterbodies in Washington and British Columbia. SCL staff typically attend the 2c/yearly meetings.

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. SCL Relicensing Update
3. How various water quality processes fit together, and the impact on 401 certification

Item 3

DATE: October 13, 2004

TO: Jorge Carrasco

FROM: Nancy Glaser, Barbara Greene

SUBJECT: Trip Report – Boundary Relicensing Stakeholder Meetings

Stakeholder outreach meetings to prepare for Boundary relicensing continued with a joint meeting of the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) Licensing Coordinator and the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW) Licensing Coordinator in Spokane on Wednesday, September 29, 2004. The USFS has the authority to prescribe conditions on a new license to operate Boundary Dam; WDFW will make recommendations in the area of fisheries, wildlife habitat, etc.

SCL Message: These meetings were in support of SCL's efforts to establish relationships with the key stakeholders in relicensing. The meeting focused on the use of FERC's Integrated Licensing Process (ILP), identification of the significant milestones SCL faces on that timeline, exploration of the agencies' internal timelines, and discussion of the agencies experience with other northwest relicensing projects. SCL invited the agencies to participate in the upcoming meetings with FERC November 1 and to participate in a tour of Boundary Dam November 2.

Participants: Glenn Koehn, Lands and Hydropower Coordinator, USFS
Doug Robison, Licensing Coordinator, WDFW

Issues:

1. Forest Service Management Plan – the National Forest Management Act (NFMA, 1976) requires each national forest to have a Forest Plan, and it must be consistent with environmental laws and regulations such as the Endangered Species Act and the Clean Water Act. The Colville, Okanogan and Wenatchee Forest Plan is under revision, and will likely result in greater emphasis on water quality, fisheries, wildlife and recreational resources. FERC must ensure the terms and conditions of a new license to operate a hydropower project are consistent with the current Forest Management Plan that is impacted by the project.
2. Staffing issues: SCL staff are currently engaged in cooperative efforts with USFS and WDFW staff in the area of fisheries and water quality.

USFS: A Hydropower Team comprised of scientists with the USFS from the Colville National Forest are assigned 50% time to relicensing activities. These staff

report to Glen Koehn and have been involved in the relicensing of the
Pend Oreille PUD's Box Canyon Dam and the Sullivan Creek hydropower
project.

They are also involved in the Pend Oreille Watershed planning process.

Given other responsibilities, the USFS staff anticipate participating in Boundary
relicensing, but are interested in combining as many issues as possible
into the various work groups to reduce the number of work group meetings.

WDFW: The agency has a number resource staff in the region participating in the
Pend Oreille PUD's relicensing efforts and the watershed planning
processes.

Follow Up:

1. SCL will provide more information on the FERC workshop and meeting scheduled
for Monday November 1.
2. Provide a copy of the Boundary relicensing timeline.

What we learned:

The experiences of the USFS and WDFW in relicensing activities led to some
suggestions for SCL to consider, including:

- provide agencies with an opportunity for input into consultants that SCL plans to
hire;
- ensure that SCL staff assigned to relicensing have the appropriate technical and
communication skills;
- ensure good coordination among the consultants, facilitator, SCL and
stakeholders;
- have the appropriate technical, communication and defined authority to make
decisions.

Item 4

Boundary Relicensing Stakeholder Outreach Briefing

Stakeholder	V. U.S. Forest Service
MCA	Yes
Participants	Glenn Koehn, Licensing Coordinator
Date	Wednesday, September 29, 2004
Time	2:00 pm – 3:30 pm
Location	Offices of Preston, Gates & Ellis, 601 W. Riverside, Spokane
Phone #	Glenn Koehn, 509.684.7189, PG&E: Peter Scott , 509.624.2100

Background

USFS has 4(e) authority in relicensing under the Federal Power Act. This requires equal consideration to developmental and environmental values, including: hydroelectric development; fish and wildlife resources, including their spawning grounds and habitat; visual resources; cultural resources; recreational opportunities and other aspects of environmental quality; irrigation; flood control; and water supply. The majority of land bordering the Boundary reservoir belongs to USFS, and therefore, the agency can file terms and conditions on a new license that become mandatory.

USFS is one of the most important agencies we'll be dealing with because of their 4(e) authority and the fact that most of our reservoir borders are adjacent to the Colville National Forest. They have staff involved in fisheries, water quality, recreation, wildlife, roads, forestry, etc.

USFS has been very involved in relicensing activities with Pend Oreille PUD and Avista, and may have expectations about the process. Exploring their expectations may help us identify options for how we proceed with potential issue-related work groups and the roles and responsibilities of BRT members.

Issues

1. USFS Colville, Okanogan and Wenatchee Forest Plan Revision (see attached)

The issues outlined in the attached description of the Forest Plan Revision include recreation, visual resource management, trails, wild and scenic rivers, cultural resources, wildlife, fisheries, range, timber. They may prioritize the lack of recreational facilities in the project area. There are USFS roads in the project area (not associated with the Boundary Project), that people are likely using because there is very limited access to the reservoir for camping, fishing, etc. This results in additional stress to the roads such as run off, road kill, maintenance of culverts, etc. It isn't clear what impact they are having on the land, something USFS may want to address through the construction of campsites, boating ramps, etc. In the PO PUD relicensing, the USFS requested a joint study of similar impacts both in the PUD's project area and in the broader regional context. The PUD did not agree to participate.

2. Aquatics

USFS has participated in the USFWS Bull Trout Critical Habitat Plan and Recovery Plan. USFS has demonstrated a desire to pursue recovery of bull trout in the Pend Oreille River.

USFS has shown concern about minimum flows, ramping rates, peaking, TDG.

Boundary Project (FERC No. 2144), Pre-Application Document
Appendix 6-1: Documentation of Contacts

Agenda

- 1 - Introductions
- 2 - City Light Relicensing Update and ILP Schedule
- 3 - USFS participation in Boundary relicensing
- 4 - Boundary Relicensing workshops with FERC, November 1 – 2, 2004
- 5 - City Light staff assigned to relicensing

USFS Colville, Okanogan and Wenatchee Forest Plan Revision

Timeline

October 2002	Describe the current management situation, analyze the existing Forest Plan direction, and summarize the topics for consideration in a Forest Plan Revision along with the information relevant to those topics. This is presented in the "Report on the Need for Change in the Forest Plans."
January 2003	Begin the public involvement effort.
January 2004	Publish the Notice of Intent in the Federal Register. Continue with the public involvement efforts related to the Notice of Intent and the proposed action.
Autumn 2004	Release the "Report on the Need for Change in the Forest Plans." Begin work on the Notice of Intent to Revise the Forest Plans and the proposed action.
June 2005	Analyze the issues raised surrounding the proposed action and develop alternatives as necessary. Prepare the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and release for public comment.
March 2006	Prepare the Final Environmental Impact Statement and the Revised Forest Plans and release to the public.
September 2006	Approve the Revised Forest Plans with a Record of Decision.

Revision Topics

Forest Plan revisions are warranted in light of the combined effects of multiple needs for change. Preliminary Revision topics will be developed around the ecological, economic, and social components of sustainability. Revision topics/issues may be divided into two categories.

1. This category includes topics for which resource conditions, technical knowledge, or public perception of resource management have created a "need for change" in the Forest Plans. These topics generally would be significant amendments because their resolution could result in changes to management direction over large areas of the Forests, changes in the mix of goods and services that the Forests provide, and changes to other decisions made in the Forest Plans. They involve choices in management direction where there is no clear public consensus on the best course of action. These topics identify areas in which current management direction may not be sufficient to sustain desired conditions for:
 - Vegetation
 - Wildlife
 - Watersheds and Aquatic Species
 - Recreation
 - Fire Risk
 - Inventoried Roadless Areas and Proposed Wilderness Areas

2. Other Revision Topics:

A number of items were identified that need to be addressed in the Forest Plans, but do not meet the above criteria for Revision Topics. In general, these items represent inadequate or out-of-date Forest Plan direction and addressing these items would not require a significant amendment to the Forest Plans. These are likely to include:

- Heritage
- Updating Forest Plan maps for consistency between Forests

Forestwide Standards and Guidelines:

Standards and guidelines apply to the National Forest System lands within the Colville National Forest. They are intended to be used with national and regional policies, standards and guidelines contained in Forest Service manuals and handbooks, and the Pacific Northwest Regional Guide. These standards and guidelines, when used in conjunction with the management prescriptions for the management areas, set the overall management direction for the Colville National Forest. They apply Forestwide and are in addition to the management prescriptions. The standards and guidelines are identified within the following categories: recreation, visual resource management, trails, wild and scenic rivers, cultural resources, wildlife, fisheries, range, timber.

Revision Background

A Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) is a comprehensive, broad set of direction that instructs the Forest Service how to manage the resources of a national forest. These long-range goals and objectives attempt to strike a balance between the public's often conflicting need for values, services, products, and uses and the physical and biological capability of the land.

The [National Forest Management Act of 1976](#) (NFMA) requires each national forest to have a Forest Plan. A Forest Plan must be consistent with environmental laws and regulations such as the Endangered Species Act and the Clean Water Act.

Forest Plans are programmatic in nature. That is, the direction is broad in scope, meaning it is generally long-term and covers a large geographic area such as an entire forest rather than a small watershed. This is different than most of the "site-specific" or project-level planning the Forest Service conducts for such management activities as trail construction or harvesting timber.

Programmatic planning is similar to the concept of zoning a city for certain uses such as residential, light commercial business, or heavy industry.

Forest Plans contain six types of decisions. These are:

- Goals and Objectives
- Standards and Guidelines
- Management Area Direction
- Special Area Designations
- Designation of Suitable Land Uses; and

- Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy

Why Revise the Current Plans?

- The existing Forest Plans are near the end of their intended 15-year life.
- There have been substantial resource and social changes since the mid-1980's.
- Gains in scientific knowledge need to be considered in developing the new Plans.
- Revision is required by law (NFMA).

The new forest plans will be based on principles of sustainability. The term sustainability has many definitions but this one seems to sum it up best... "Meeting the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs."

Item 5

Boundary Relicensing Stakeholder Outreach Briefing

Stakeholder	VI. WA Dept Fish & Wildlife
MCA	No
Participants	Doug Robison, Licensing Coordinator
Date	Wednesday, September 29, 2004
Time	12:00 pm – 1:30 pm
Location	N. 8702 Division St., Spokane
Phone #	509.536.2012

Background

FERC must evaluate and consider Section 10(j) recommendations that originate from state fish and wildlife agencies. Section 10(j) recommendations address the protection and mitigation of fish and wildlife affected by the project. These recommendations are not mandatory for FERC to include in the new license, but FERC must assess the validity and appropriateness of the recommendations and provide justification when they do not include recommended conditions.

WDFW may be more concerned about the agency's long term plans to assist in hatcheries, fish propagation, expansion of fishing opportunities, and similar local programs. They may be looking for partnering opportunities to enhance their program abilities.

WDFW staff involved in watershed planning activities (Kurt Vail, Sande Lembke) are not the same staff that participate directly in relicensing. We'll need to identify which staff (and how many) WDFW will involve in Boundary relicensing.

Issues

1. Wildlife management, i.e. habitat
2. Fish and fish management programs, i.e. hatcheries

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. SCL Relicensing Update
3. Determine level of involvement from WDFW in Boundary relicensing
4. Identify WDFW staff who might be involved in Boundary relicensing

Item 6

DATE: October 18, 2004

TO: Jorge Carrasco

FROM: Nancy Glaser, Barbara Greene

SUBJECT: Trip Report – Follow up Boundary Relicensing Meeting with Washington State Department of Ecology (WDOE)

This meeting took place Friday, October 15, 2004 with three supervisory level WDOE officials and the Section Manager of the WDOE Water Quality Program. Jim Bellatty, Section Manager of the Water Quality Program, will be the signator to SCL's 401-water quality certificate, a requirement for a new FERC license to operate Boundary Dam. The purpose was to further explore the many WDOE parallel planning process deadlines and how they intercept with the Integrated Licensing Process (ILP) deadlines SCL faces in relicensing. The three supervisors oversee two key planning processes that SCL staff are participating in, and each process has a different timeline.

Participants: Jim Bellatty, Section Manager, Water Quality Program
Jean Parodi, Relicensing and 401-water quality certificate
Dave Knight, Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL¹)Unit Supervisor
Paul Turner, Pend Oreille River TMDL Lead

Issues:

1. Intersecting Timelines: SCL staff prepared a timeline showing key ILP submittal dates and WDOE deadlines to enable a detailed discussion about coordination. Many of the WDOE deadlines occur in 2005, before any SCL sponsored relicensing work groups are significantly under way. These WDOE processes are key to Boundary relicensing because the outcomes/recommendations addressing water quality in terms of temperature and total dissolved gas will become the basis for WDOE's 401 water quality certificate. This certificate must be issued before FERC can approve a new license to operate Boundary Dam.

WDOE staff were receptive to our first major issue – the timeline for gathering data and making recommendations on water temperature. SCL will request a 4 – 6 month extension of the timeline to allow for the necessary 2 years of data collection (already underway) and analysis, to be completed by Fall 2006.

Staffing issues: WDOE is limited in how much staff time they can devote to Boundary relicensing. The key person who participates in relicensing – Jean Parodi - is currently involved in Avista's Spokane River Project; she also plays a key role in the 401-water quality certificate program. WDOE suggested a way to assist their participation may be to consider funding a 1½ time FTE at WDOE and 1½ time FTE

¹ TMDL – Total Maximum Daily Load

at Washington State Department of Fish & Wildlife, the two key state agencies that participate in relicensing activities. This FTE would be dedicated to Boundary relicensing on behalf of both state agencies. Both Grant and Chelan PUDs provided funding of this nature during their relicensing efforts. We clarified that the City Council is currently reviewing our budget and we would have a better understanding of our own resources in early January. Requests for assistance will be reviewed on a case by case basis.

2. WDOE Permits: WDOE recently issued a permit for water discharges from the newly opened Tech Cominco mine located on the eastern side of the Boundary reservoir. SCL staff have reviewed the permits, but have additional questions about specific water treatment methods. WDOE offered the assistance of the Section Manager for Permits, Len Bramble. SCL staff will contact Mr. Bramble and discuss the permit in more detail. WDOE has also issued a permit to the Ponderay Newsprint Company, which staff will also review. The terms of these permits may provide insights into WDOE's compliance requirements.

Follow Up:

3. WDOE will continue to revise the timeline prepared by SCL staff to identify additional key dates in WDOE processes and to try to better coordinate them with the Boundary re-licensing process. They will complete this in time for the FERC workshop in Metaline Falls on November 1.
4. SCL staff (Christine Pratt) will conduct follow up conversations with WDOE permitting staff.
5. SCL staff will reserve some time on November 2 after the tour of Boundary Dam for further discussion with WDOE staff in attendance.
6. SCL staff (Michele Lynn, Barbara Greene) will contact Brian Farmer, Section Manager for terrestrial and wildlife issues, to begin discussions of habitat and wetlands work that WDOE is engaged in.

What we learned:

1. WDOE is open to discussions of timelines in their Temperature TMDL to more closely coincide with good data collection and the Boundary Relicensing ILP process.
2. We came away from the meeting with a much greater understanding of the wide range of WDOE programs affecting relicensing such as the Permit Section and Wildlife program.

Boundary Project (FERC No. 2144), Pre-Application Document
Appendix 6-1: Documentation of Contacts

3. WDOE is facing serious resource issues that will affect their ability to participate in Boundary relicensing. This agency is the key state agency for relicensing because it is charged with issuing SCL a water quality permit, a FERC requirement. SCL senior management should discuss the pros and cons of funding a full time FTE to be split between WDOE and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife to be dedicated to Boundary relicensing.

Item 7

Boundary Relicensing Stakeholder Outreach Briefing

Stakeholder	VII. Ponderay Newsprint
MCA	No
Participants	Paul Machtolf – Technical Services Manager Allen Sanders – General Manager Steve Skeels – Controller
Date	Wednesday, October 27, 2004
Time	11:00 am – 12:00 pm
Location	Ponderay Newsprint Offices, Hwy. 20/Hwy. 211
Phone #	Paul – 509.445.2146 Main line – 509.445.1511

Item 8

Boundary Relicensing Stakeholder Outreach Briefing

Stakeholder	VIII. Tech Cominco American
MCA	No
Participants	David Godluwski Environmental Manager
Date	Thursday, October 28, 2004
Time	8:00 am – 9:00 am
Location	Spokane Club
Phone #	David – 509.993.4676

Item 9

Learn more about Boundary Dam Relicensing

Seattle City Light and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) invite you to attend an evening community meeting on Monday, November 1, 2004. The Boundary Hydroelectric Project operates on a FERC license that expires in 2011. We want to share information with the community about the relicensing process and how it will proceed, including key dates and opportunities for involvement. We will also present information about Boundary Dam and what's being done to prepare for relicensing. Finally, we want hear from you and answer any questions you might have about this important process. Please plan to attend on Monday, November 1.

Community Meeting
Monday November 1, 2004,
The Cutter Theatre
302 Park Avenue, Metaline Falls
7:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

Item 10

Boundary Relicensing Stakeholder Outreach Briefing

Stakeholder	IX. WA Dept of Ecology, Spokane Office
MCA	Yes, 401 water quality certificate
Participants	Jim Ballatty, Section Manager, Water Quality Program Jean Parodi Paul Turner, Pend Oreille River TMDL Lead David Knight, TMDL Unit Supervisor
Date	Friday, October 15, 2004
Time	12:00 pm – 2:00 pm
Location	4601 N. Monroe
Phone #	Jim: 509.329.3534; Jean: 509.329.3517

Background

Section 401 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) states that a license applicant must obtain certification from the state or interstate pollution control agency verifying compliance with the CWA, which has objectives to: restore and maintain chemical, physical and biological integrity; protect water quality and beneficial uses. CWA describes numeric standards for conventional and selected chemical pollutants, and narrative standards for others. FERC requires an applicant to consult with the “certifying agency”, which is the State Department of Ecology in Washington state. Documented evidence of compliance with the certification requirement must be provided to FERC. FERC must include all water quality certification requirements as conditions in the new license.

A 401 water quality certificate, issued by the Department of Ecology, is required before FERC can issue the new license. The process to obtain this certificate assures that the proposed project will be in compliance with applicable water quality standards. The 401 certification process can involve physical, chemical and biological standards. In addition to water quality parameters that one normally considers part of water quality (i.e. water temperature, dissolved gas, etc.) 401 certification can involve such things as flow, ramping rates and possibly changes to aquatic habitat.

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. SCL Relicensing Update
3. ILP and SCL timelines (attached diagrams)
 - WDOE role in relicensing?
4. Status of parallel processes that will affect the 401 certificate for Boundary Dam
 - Temperature TMDL
 - ➔ SCL filed comments 7/22/04 requesting a longer timeline for the process – 2 years data collection (2004-2005) with results available Fall 2006;

Boundary Project (FERC No. 2144), Pre-Application Document
Appendix 6-1: Documentation of Contacts

- The newest version – Sept 2004 – of WDOE’s QAPP implies this schedule may be acceptable to WDOE;
 - SCL needs clarification that allocations will not be identified before SCL data collection and analysis is completed (2006).
 - What is role of EPA in this process?
- 401 and UAA Guidance Documents – Our recent comments recommended a more strategic approach to the various water quality planning processes, i.e. UAA process should be coordinated with TMDL and 401 processes. EPA’s Oregon UAA guidance may be instructive.
 - TDG TMDL
 - SCL willing to assist in development of the Implementation Plan for the TMDL report;
 - Key points SCL ready to discuss with WDOE staff (early November, after FOC 10.26)
 - i. TDG compliance point downstream of Boundary should be at USGS gage or determined later
 - ii. TDG compliance area extend from this compliance point to Canadian border (1\2 mile)
 - iii. Boundary’s TDG standard @ USGS gage not exceed upstream (forebay) level what that level exceeds 110%, i.e. not responsible for tdg coming in to prooject
 - iv. SCL willing to draft Implementation plan
 - What is EPA role in this process?

Item 11

Seattle City Light | Boundary Project Relicensing- Event Details

Page 1 of 1

[Back to the event list](#)

Event Date: Monday November 1, 2004 01:30 PM PST

Duration: 3 Hours

Title: Boundary Relicensing Workshop #1

Location: Cutter Theater 302 Park Ave. Metaline falls, WA

Interests: Aesthetic, Cultural, Fish-Aquatics, Land Use, Recreation, Socio-Economic, Terrestrial, Water Quality

Description: City Light held its first Workshop with stakeholders and tribes on November 1, 2004 at the Cutter Theater in Metaline Falls, Washington. The main purpose of the Workshop was to introduce stakeholders and tribes to the FERC's new Integrated Licensing Process. It was also an opportunity to share some background information on the Boundary Project, and allowed stakeholders, tribes, City Light, and FERC staff to meet each other and get acquainted.

Attachments: [Meeting Attendees](#)
[Presentation Materials - FERC ILP Presentation](#)
[Presentation Materials - Timeline](#)

Boundary Project (FERC No. 2144), Pre-Application Document
Appendix 6-1: Documentation of Contacts

Item 12

[Back to the event list](#)

Event Date: Monday November 1, 2004 07:00 PM PST

Duration: 1 Hour 30 Minutes

Title: Boundary Relicensing Public Meeting #1

Location: Cutter Theater 302 Park Ave. Metaline falls, WA

Interests: Public

Description: City Light held its first meeting with the general public. The main purpose of the meeting was to introduce the public to the FERC's new Integrated Licensing Process. It was also an opportunity to share some background information on the Boundary Project, and allowed City Light staff to interact with interested members of the public.

Attachments: [Meeting Agenda](#)
[Meeting Attendees](#)
[Presentation Materials - FERC ILP Presentation](#)
[Presentation Materials - Timeline](#)



Item 13

Telephone Contact Log

Tracking Number: XXX

Person Contacted: Warren Chen Contacted By: Dong
Affiliation: ACTC (Transmission Corporation) Affiliation:
Title: Sr. Operations Planning Engineer
Discipline:
Phone Number: 604-293-5806 Date of Contact: 2/8
Email: Phone number:
Email:

Reason for Contact: Initial contact

Information Provided: BR info needed.

Information Obtained: ACTC may have some info, BC Hydro other info
will provide contact at BC Hydro in Power Supply

Follow-up Actions Needed: Call again if nec.

Additional Notes/Comments:

BC Hydro split into $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{BC Hydro} \rightarrow \text{Kath Bowie} \rightarrow \text{flow data} \\ \text{ACTC} \rightarrow \text{Warren Chen} \rightarrow \text{transmission} \\ \text{flow} \end{array} \right.$

Item 14

Telephone Contact Log

Tracking Number: XXX

Person Contacted: Jim Scheel	Contacted By: Dony
Affiliation: Pend Oreille PUD	Affiliation:
Title: Director, Hydro Operations & Supply	
Discipline:	
Phone Number: main 509-447-3127 509-447-6702	Date of Contact: 2/8
Email: jscheele@popud.com mcauchy@popud.com	Phone number: Email:

Reason for Contact: Initial

Information Provided: left message 2/8, BR info needed

Information Obtained: Jim can be the contact or Mark Cauchy who is in charge of Box Canyon relicensing, 509-447-9331

Follow-up Actions Needed: talked to Jim only

Additional Notes/Comments:

Item 15

Telephone Contact Log

Tracking Number: XXX

Person Contacted: Matt Rios Contacted By: Doug Roush
Affiliation: BPA Affiliation:
Title: Transmission Account Executive
Discipline:
Phone Number: 360-619-6002 cell 609-6843 Date of Contact: 2/8
Email: mrios@bpa.gov Phone number:
Email:

Reason for Contact: Initial contact

Information Provided: Starting BR process; consultant will call later

Information Obtained: He is willing to help

Follow-up Actions Needed: Consultant will call

Additional Notes/Comments:

BPA Transmission

Item 16

(A)

Telephone Contact Log

Tracking Number: XXX

Person Contacted: Tom Shuhda Contacted By: Al Solonsky
Affiliation: USFS Affiliation: SCL
Title: Fish Biologist
Discipline: Fisheries and water quality
Phone Number: (509) 684-7211 Date of Contact: 2/8/05
Email: tshuhda@fs.fed.us Phone number:
Email:

Reason for Contact: First contact for PAD

Information Provided: Relicensing Kick-off for PAD
looking for existing information

Information Obtained: Told him that he'll be contacted and provided
w/ a list of what we have

Follow-up Actions Needed: Contact Tom and give him a list of what
we have - see if he has things we don't

Additional Notes/Comments:

Tom suggested these other people at USFS
Steve Krqemer (509) 684-7251 - Archaeology
Jan Bodie (509) 684-7190 - Recreation
Mike Gerdes (509) ? - New wildlife lead
Nancy Glines (509) 447-7360 - soils for Boundary
Kathy Bhlenstager (sp?) (509) 684-7178 - Botany
John Radlings (509) 684-7191 - noxious weeds

- They have aerial photos before + after Boundary Construction
 - How will we burrow documents?
-

Item 17

Telephone Contact Log

Tracking Number: XXX

Person Contacted: Kath Bowie	Contacted By: Doug
Affiliation: BC Hydro	Affiliation:
Title:	
Discipline:	
Phone Number: 604-528-2766	Date of Contact: 2/9/05
Email: power.records@bchydro.bc.ca	Phone number:
	Email:

Reason for Contact: Initial

Information Provided: BR info needed, consultant will be contacting them

Information Obtained: Best for Themis via email, reference SCL, reference Eric Weiss, be specific, note that they have info gap in some years

Follow-up Actions Needed:

Additional Notes/Comments:

Contact Kath -
reference Eric

Item 18

Telephone Contact Log

Tracking Number: XXX

Person Contacted: Eric Weiss

Contacted By: Doug

Affiliation: BC Hydro

Affiliation:

Title:

Discipline:

Phone Number: 604-528-1898

Date of Contact: 2/9, 2/9

Email:

Phone number:

Email:

Reason for Contact: Initial

Information Provided: Left message; start of BR process

Information Obtained: Asked if info is public domain (I said yes, wanted to know if we would be willing to share more operational data)

Follow-up Actions Needed:

Additional Notes/Comments:

Wing asked for hourly data recently from them. Eric asked that the consultant not ask for that again.
Seven Mile elevation data. Data to end of 2004

Item 19

Telephone Contact Log

Tracking Number: XXX

Person Contacted: *Sandy Dotts* Contacted By: *AI Solonsky*
Affiliation: *WDFW* Affiliation: *SCL*
Title: *Watershed Biologist*
Discipline: *Wildlife Biologist*
Watershed Planner
Phone Number: *(509)684-2031* Date of Contact: *2/9/05*
Email: *dottssrd@dfw.wa.gov* Phone number:
or sdotts@plix.com Email:

Reason for Contact: *First contact for PAD*

Information Provided: *Relicensing Kick-off for PAD*
(looking for existing information)

Information Obtained:
Told her that she'll be contacted and
provided w/ list of what we have

Follow-up Actions Needed:
contact her, give her list, see what
she has that we don't

Additional Notes/Comments:

Boundary Project (FERC No. 2144), Pre-Application Document
Appendix 6-1: Documentation of Contacts

Item 20

DATE: February 10, 2005

TO: Consultation File

FROM: Christine Pratt

SUBJECT: Phone Call Record – Helen Rueda-EPA (Portland)

I called Helen to notify her of SCL's Boundary Relicensing information gathering effort, per the FERC requirement to collect all existing information related to the Project for the Pre-Application Document. I affirmed that Helen will be our EPA contact for Boundary Relicensing.

Boundary Project (FERC No. 2144), Pre-Application Document
Appendix 6-1: Documentation of Contacts

Item 21

DATE: February 10, 2005

TO: Consultation File

FROM: Christine Pratt

SUBJECT: Phone Call Record – Christine Psyk-EPA (Seattle)

I called Christine to notify her of SCL's Boundary Relicensing information gathering effort, per the FERC requirement to collect all existing information related to the Project for the Pre-Application Document. Christine is Helen Rueda's Supervisor. I told her I had called Helen and asked that she forward any pertinent information to me.

Boundary Project (FERC No. 2144), Pre-Application Document
Appendix 6-1: Documentation of Contacts

Item 22

DATE: February 10, 2005

TO: Consultation File

FROM: Christine Pratt

SUBJECT: Phone Call Record – Ruth Watkins-Tri-State Water Quality Council

I called Ruth to notify her of SCL's Boundary Relicensing information gathering effort, per the FERC requirement to collect all existing information related to the Project for the Pre-Application Document. I asked that she forward any pertinent information to me, including her knowledge of other entities that may have pertinent information and clarified that she would be our contact for future water quality matters with the Tri-State Water Quality Council.

Item 23

Telephone Contact Log

Tracking Number: XXX

Person Contacted: Joe Maroney Contacted By: Al Solonsky
Affiliation: Kalispel Tribe Affiliation: SCL
Title: Fisheries Biologist
Discipline: Fisheries
Phone Number: (509) 445-1147 x272 Date of Contact: 2/14/05
Email: Jmaroney@Knr.org Phone number:
Email:

Reason for Contact: First contact for PAD

Information Provided: Relicensing Kick-off for PAD
Looking for existing information

Information Obtained: Told Joe that he'll be contacted
by R2 and provided a list of what we have
to describe existing conditions.

Follow-up Actions Needed:

Contact Joe and give him the list - he
will then tell us what we don't have

Additional Notes/Comments:

Boundary Project (FERC No. 2144), Pre-Application Document
Appendix 6-1: Documentation of Contacts

Item 24

DATE: February 16, 2005

TO: Consultation File

FROM: Christine Pratt

SUBJECT: Phone Call Record – Jean Parodi-WDOE– Boundary Relicensing

I called Jean to notify her of SCL's Boundary Relicensing information gathering effort, per the FERC requirement to collect all existing information related to the Project for the Pre-Application Document. I asked that she forward any pertinent information to me and clarified that she would be our contact for future water quality matters with WDOE.

Item 25

Contacts made by Michele Lynn:

Glenn Koehn, USFS, 3/7/05

I called to tell Glenn that our consultant would be contacting USFS to collect relevant info. for the project area. He said it would be best if we collect all our questions and submit them through Glenn. We talked more and agreed that it would be a good idea for SCL to come meet with USFS staff. March is probably out for them; probably looking at April. Glenn is the team leader for the hydro team; he reports directly to the Forest Supervisor. Glenn said that Mike Gerdes will be representing the USFS on terrestrial issues. Mike works out of Prineville, OR and has a huge amount of experience in hydropower relicensing – he used to be on the RHAT.

Item 26

Contact made by Michele Lynn:
Rob Masonis, American Rivers, 3/7/05

I called to introduce myself and let Rob know that SCL is kicking off the process for relicensing its Boundary project. I asked Rob if he knew about our project and whether American Rivers may be interested in participating. Rob said he had talked to Barbara Greene. He said that American Rivers's interests would likely be expressed through the Hydropower Reform Coalition (HRC). I should assume that contact with the HRC would result in subsequent coordination with American Rivers, American Whitewater, Trout Unlimited, Idaho Rivers United. Rob would like to be on the mailing list.

Item 27

Michele Lynn called:

Kaitlin Lovell, Trout Unlimited, 3/7/05

Trout Unlimited will be represented by the Hydropower Reform Coalition. We don't need to keep them on our mailing list. They will expect to hear from Rebecca Sherman (HRC) if issues arise that might concern them.

Item 28

Contact made by Michele Lynn:

Rick Donaldson, USFWS, 3/8/05

I called to introduce myself and let Rick know that our consultant would be contacting his office regarding relevant info for the project area. Rick said he wasn't sure if he or Dan Trochta would be representing USFWS on Boundary. Make Rick the point of contact for now – will know more after 3/15/05. The USFWS has put together an administrative record for Box Canyon – all in pdf format. Said he'd send us a copy. We talked about setting up a meeting to discuss info. they may have.

Item 29

Contact made by Michele Lynn:

Dan Trochta, USFWS, 3/8/05

I called Dan to introduce myself and let him know he may be receiving a call from our consultant looking for relevant info. Dan said he works on wildlife issues for WDFW. Scott Deeds is their bull trout coordinator. Rick Donaldson “does a little of everything.” Dan didn’t think he’d have much info. relative to the Boundary area. He suggested submitting a request to Susan Martin for a T&E species list.

Item 30

DATE: March 11, 2005

TO: John Prescott

FROM: Barbara Greene, John Armstrong

SUBJECT: Trip Report – Boundary Relicensing Stakeholder Meetings

Stakeholder outreach meetings to prepare for Boundary relicensing continued this week as we attended the following meetings with town officials in the project area:

Meteline Falls Town Council
Mayor Walt Caravan, town of Meteline
Meteline Town Council

SCL Message: These meetings were in support of City Light's efforts to establish relationships with local community officials. The meetings focused on the use of FERC's Integrated Licensing Process (ILP); general activities for 2005 to prepare for the formal process initiated in spring of 2006; and a broad discussion of socioeconomic impacts of the project on local communities.

1. Meteline Falls Town Council

Participants: Mayor Jane Reed
Councilmembers John Kinney, Sue Huntley, Dan Johnson,
City Clerk Angela Cain
Selkirk School district representative Nancy Lotze

Issues:

a) Impact fees paid by the City of Seattle to Pend Oreille County:

Meteline Falls Town Council had many questions about the impact fees and hoped that relicensing was a vehicle for them to negotiate directly with the City of Seattle for additional funds. We agreed to provide more information on the issue to Mayor Reed for the Council, but clarified that any issues with impact fees should be viewed as separate from the relicensing process. City Light's Paulette Sharp is gathering information and will produce a historical summary.

Council asked why the Selkirk School District no longer negotiates directly with the City of Seattle for their fees.

b) A general discussion of how socioeconomics will be incorporated into the preliminary application document led to a request for more information for the Council to better understand what issues might arise in this area.

Item 31

Telephone Contact Log

Tracking Number: XXX

Person Contacted: Steve Fransen
Contacted By: Al Solonky
Affiliation: NOAA Fisheries
Affiliation: SCL
Title: Fisheries Biologist
Discipline: Fisheries (and water quality?)
Phone Number: (360) 753-6038
Date of Contact: 3/9/05
Email: (206) 386-4580
al.solonky@seattle.gov

Reason for Contact: To find out if NOAA Fisheries has any resource information for our PAD and to see who from NOAA Fisheries might participate in relicensing.

Information Provided: Overview of Boundary project - status on relicensing.

Information Obtained:

See below

Follow-up Actions Needed: call Mark Schneider (503) 231-2306 and call Keith Kirkendall (503) 230-5431
← TDB Coordinator
↑ Hydro Branch Chief

Additional Notes/Comments:

Steve did not think that NOAA Fisheries would participate in Boundary relicensing since there are no anadromous fisheries issues. Steve also didn't think NOAA Fisheries had any information about the Pend Orielle River, but if they did, Steve thought it would be in the Biological Opinion for operating the Federal Columbia River Power System (FCRPS).

Steve and I discussed the BIOP briefly and both agreed that existing information in →

The BIOP was from the USFWS and dealt with resident fish (i.e. sturgeon and bull trout).

Steve suggested two things:

1) Ask Mark Schneider (NOAA Fisheries TDG coordinator) if he wants to be involved in relicensing as SCI deals with TDG issues.

2) We can call Steve's supervisor in Portland to find out if NOAA Fisheries will or does not plan to participate in relicensing of the Boundary Project.

TDG coordinator
Call Mark Schneider (503) 581-5306
and call Keith Kirkham (503) 530-2431
see below

Item 32

Contact made by Michele Lynn:

Eric Hoffman, BLM, 3/9/05

I called to ask Eric who from BLM might be interested in relicensing. I said that we wanted to contact the appropriate person to request relevant info. they may have about our project area. Eric said that, at this time, both he (Portland) and Kathy Helm (Spokane) should be kept in the loop. Kathy may take the lead in the future, but keep both informed until they decide. Requests for info. should go to both of them.

Item 33

Contact made by Michele Lynn:

Kathy Helm, BLM, 3/9/05

I told Kathy that I had talked to Eric Hoffman and that I was calling her as well to introduce myself and let her know that our consultant would be contacting her to see if her office had relevant info. on our project area. Kathy said BLM doesn't have much land in the area and probably doesn't have much resource info. But she'd be happy to talk to our consultant and see if there's something they can pull together.

Item 34

Contact made by Michele Lynn:

Doug Robison, WDFW, 3/9/05

I called to introduce myself and see if Doug will be WDFW's representative for relicensing. Doug said that yes, he will be their rep. He works in their Major Plants Division which includes hydro licensing. I told him that our consultant would be calling him to request relevant info. that his agency might have. He said it would be helpful to get a list of the info. we're looking for.

Item 35

DATE: March 11, 2005

TO: John Prescott

FROM: Barbara Greene, John Armstrong

SUBJECT: Trip Report – Boundary Relicensing Stakeholder Meetings

Stakeholder outreach meetings to prepare for Boundary relicensing continued this week as we attended the following meetings with town officials in the project area:

Metaline Falls Town Council
Mayor Walt Caravan, town of Metaline
Metaline Town Council

SCL Message: These meetings were in support of City Light's efforts to establish relationships with local community officials. The meetings focused on the use of FERC's Integrated Licensing Process (ILP); general activities for 2005 to prepare for the formal process initiated in spring of 2006; and a broad discussion of socioeconomic impacts of the project on local communities.

Mayor Walt Caravan, town of Metaline

Mayor Caravan suggested that the town may need a better understanding of how relicensing could affect electrical rates and jobs in the community.

Item 36

DATE: March 11, 2005

TO: John Prescott

FROM: Barbara Greene, John Armstrong

SUBJECT: Trip Report – Boundary Relicensing Stakeholder Meetings

Stakeholder outreach meetings to prepare for Boundary relicensing continued this week as we attended the following meetings with town officials in the project area:

Metaline Falls Town Council
Mayor Walt Caravan, town of Metaline
Metaline Town Council

SCL Message: These meetings were in support of City Light's efforts to establish relationships with local community officials. The meetings focused on the use of FERC's Integrated Licensing Process (ILP); general activities for 2005 to prepare for the formal process initiated in spring of 2006; and a broad discussion of socioeconomic impacts of the project on local communities.

Metaline Town Council

Participants: Mayor Walt Caravan
Councilmembers: Don Egbers, Jan DeGroat, Ruth Reiber, Torey Reeve

- a) Council members had a general interest in the Boundary relicensing timeline, and concern that we provide accurate and unbiased portrayal of issues and relicensing progress in the local press.

Follow Up:

7. Provide more information to the Metaline Falls Town Council on the history of impact fees between City Light and Pend Oreille County.
8. Begin placing relicensing updates in the local newspaper, the Selkirk Sun.

What we learned:

- a) Local community officials generally support our relicensing and understand that Boundary is an important economic engine for the community. They would like to better understand how they can be involved in the Boundary relicensing process, and examples of socioeconomic impacts from the project.
- b) Local community officials view relicensing as a rare opportunity to seek financial support for their municipalities and school districts.

Boundary Project (FERC No. 2144), Pre-Application Document
Appendix 6-1: Documentation of Contacts

- c) Local community officials are hopeful that impact fees can be raised through the relicensing process. We encouraged them to view relicensing separately from impact fees.
- d) Local officials' knowledge and experience of relicensing is based on the Pend Oreille PUD process for Box Canyon Dam. They are very concerned about potential increases in electrical rates from both the Box Canyon and the upcoming Boundary relicensing process.

Cc: Mike Haynes
Boundary Relicensing Team
Lonnie Johnson

Boundary Project (FERC No. 2144), Pre-Application Document
Appendix 6-1: Documentation of Contacts

Item 37

Name: Allyson Brooks
Affiliation: Department of Archaeology & Historic Preservation
Title: State Historic Preservation Officer
Discipline: Cultural
Email Address: Allyson.Brooks@dahp.wa.gov
Phone number: 306.586.3066
SCL Name: Lisa Rennie
Date of Contact: 3/9/2005
Reason for Contact: Provide information on R2 data gathering process and Boundary relicensing process.
Information Provided: same as above
Information Obtained: None
Follow-up Action Needed:
Comments: Left message.

Boundary Project (FERC No. 2144), Pre-Application Document
Appendix 6-1: Documentation of Contacts

Item 38

Name: Stanley Speaks
Affiliation: BIA
Title: Regional Director
Discipline: Cultural
Email Address: NA
Phone Number: 503.231.6702
SCL Name: Lisa Rennie
Date of Contact: 3/9/2005
Reason for Contact: Provide information on R2 data gathering process and Boundary relicensing process.
Information Provided: R2 data gathering & general discussion of ILP process
Information Obtained: Who and how to contact BIA
Follow-up Action Needed: R2 should direct requests for information in writing and specifically identify documents needed.
Comments: Bernie Bernham is BIA's hydro specialist (503.236.6750) Written comments should be addressed to Stanley Speaks and cc: Bernie Bernham

Item 39

Telephone Contact Log

Tracking Number: XXX

Person Contacted: Gary Birch Contacted By: Al Solonsky
Affiliation: BC Hydro Affiliation: SCL
Title:
Discipline:
Phone Number: (250) 304-8382 Date of Contact: 3/10/05
Email: Phone number: (206) 386-4580
Email: al.solonsky@seattle.gov

Reason for Contact: Search for background information for PAD.

Information Provided: Told Gary that we're starting to compile information for the first big document to kick off relicensing.

Information Obtained: See below

Follow-up Actions Needed: Get Unit #4 fisheries report - other studies of Seven Mile reservoir area may also be available. Contact James Baxter and John Gwilliam.

Additional Notes/Comments:

- Seven mile is a "capacity project" and is on an approved list to be operated in a load shaping or peaking mode. If there is a cold snap, BC Hydro can draw the reservoir down further than "normal".
- Under the current water use license for Seven Mile, there are several things that can "re-open" a review of the current plan. One of them is Boundary relicensing. Usually plans are open on 5, 10 or 15 year cycles. Following Boundary relicensing, BC Hydro will need to revisit the Seven Mile water use plan.

OVER ↘

Gary said that we may want to see BC Hydro's fisheries report for Unit #4 (I can't remember and didn't write it down, but I think he said it would be available in late March).

Gary recommended we talk to James Baxter (fisheries biologist w/ BC Hydro), since James has been involved in several years of research on the Salmo River (fertilization, bull trout, restoration and rainbow trout studies). James won't be back in the office for three weeks.

Gary also suggested we contact ^{head to} ~~Gary~~ ^{Gerry} Nellestijn, but Gary said he also won't be in the office for a few weeks. ^{- Salmo Streamkeeper}

With regards to wildlife information, Gary suggested we speak to John Gwilliam who has worked his whole career for the Columbia River Compensation Program. ^{on web}

Item 41

Contact made by Michele Lynn:

John Gangemi, American Whitewater, 3/10/05

I called to introduce myself and let John know that SCL is getting started on relicensing for Boundary. I told John a little about our schedule. He said they tend not to get involved in projects without whitewater, although there may be some flat water opportunities. John said AW will likely be represented by the Hydropower Reform Coalition. He said he didn't think they'd have any relevant info but that he'd be happy to talk to our consultant to see if there's anything they have that might be of use to us.

Boundary Project (FERC No. 2144), Pre-Application Document
Appendix 6-1: Documentation of Contacts

Item 42

DATE: March 10, 2005

TO: Consultation File

FROM: Christine Pratt

SUBJECT: Phone Call Record – Paul Pickett-WDOE-Environmental Assessment Program
(Olympia)

I called Paul to notify him of SCL's Boundary Relicensing information gathering effort, per the FERC requirement to collect all existing information related to the Project for the Pre-Application Document and requested any pertinent information WDOE may have regarding water quality data. He referred me to their website where their routine water quality data collection information is available. I affirmed that Paul will be our technical contact for water quality matters.

Boundary Project (FERC No. 2144), Pre-Application Document
Appendix 6-1: Documentation of Contacts

Item 43

DATE: March 10, 2005

TO: Consultation File

FROM: Christine Pratt

SUBJECT: Phone Call Record – Chris Maynard-WDOE (Olympia)

I called Chris to notify him of SCL's Boundary Relicensing information gathering effort, per the FERC requirement to collect all existing information related to the Project for the Pre-Application Document. I affirmed that Chris is the WDOE FERC Coordinator. He is also the key person associated with drafting the WDOE 401 Guidance Manual for Hydropower.

Item 44

DATE: March 26, 2005

TO: John Prescott

FROM: Barbara Greene, John Armstrong

SUBJECT: Trip Report – Boundary Relicensing Stakeholder Meetings

Stakeholder outreach meetings to prepare for Boundary relicensing continued the week of March 14 with the following meetings with town officials in the project area:

SCL Message: These meetings were in support of City Light's efforts to establish relationships with local community officials. The meetings focused on the use of FERC's Integrated Licensing Process (ILP); general activities for 2005 to prepare for the formal process initiated in spring of 2006.

Pend Oreille County Fire Protection District #2

Commissioner	Dick Norton
Commissioner	Rick Stone
Commissioner	Roy Layton (absent)

The commissioners had a general interest in relicensing because they provide services in the project area.

Follow Up:

1. Begin placing relicensing updates in the local newspaper, the Selkirk Sun.
2. Forward contact information for Tri County Economic Development Council to Lisa Rennie for follow up on socioeconomic issues.
3. Acquire the 2005 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy document.
4. Respond to Kalispel Tribe about City Light's interest in joining the study this summer of white sturgeon in the Pend Oreille River. Following discussion within the Boundary Relicensing Team, a recommendation was sent to Power Supply Officer John Prescott for approval, which was granted. The relicensing team is in the process of working out the details of this contract. This early effort will potentially eliminate the need for additional study of the presence of white sturgeon during the study phase of relicensing in 2007-2008. It is cost effective, and can be funded through the 2005 Boundary Relicensing budget.

What we learned:

1. Local officials' knowledge and experience of relicensing is based on the Pend Oreille PUD process for Box Canyon Dam. They are very concerned about potential

increases in electrical rates from both the Box Canyon relicensing process, and the upcoming Boundary relicensing process.

2. The towns south of Lone are less focused on Boundary relicensing because they are on the Box Canyon reservoir and feel impacted by potential mitigation efforts from that relicensing effort. The town of Lone is interested in Boundary relicensing, but less so than the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, located to the north. This is primarily because of geographics.

Item 45

DATE: March 26, 2005

TO: John Prescott

FROM: Barbara Greene, John Armstrong

SUBJECT: Trip Report – Boundary Relicensing Stakeholder Meetings

Stakeholder outreach meetings to prepare for Boundary relicensing continued the week of March 14 with the following meetings with town officials in the project area:

Cusick Mayor and Town Council

SCL Message: These meetings were in support of City Light’s efforts to establish relationships with local community officials. The meetings focused on the use of FERC’s Integrated Licensing Process (ILP); general activities for 2005 to prepare for the formal process initiated in spring of 2006.

1. Cusick Mayor Paul Haas

Mayor Haas was primarily interested in the resolution of the Pend Oreille PUD relicensing of Box Canyon. He is concerned that City Light will encounter similar mitigation requests from stakeholders that will lead to increased rates.

2. Cusick Town Council

Mayor	Paul Haas
Councilmember	Mike Ostlie
Councilmember	Bernice Smith
Councilmember	Ken Murray
Councilmember	Laura Heise
Councilmember	Bob Spencer

The Cusick town council does not see a direct impact from Boundary relicensing on their town. They are closely following the Pend Oreille PUD relicensing of Box Canyon and are primarily concerned with the potential for increased electrical rates. The link between future increases in City Light electrical rates and local county rates were discussed. The town council expressed an interest in being kept up to date through communications and future visits and did not particularly want the volumes of technical information that is sent to participants on FERC’s service list. The town has done an impressive job of finding grant monies to fund a skate park for kids, having raised 80% of the \$400,000 needed.

Follow Up:

1. Begin placing relicensing updates in the local newspaper, the Selkirk Sun.

2. Forward contact information for Tri County Economic Development Council to Lisa Rennie for follow up on socioeconomic issues.
3. Acquire the 2005 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy document.
4. Respond to Kalispel Tribe about City Light's interest in joining the study this summer of white sturgeon in the Pend Oreille River. Following discussion within the Boundary Relicensing Team, a recommendation was sent to Power Supply Officer John Prescott for approval, which was granted. The relicensing team is in the process of working out the details of this contract. This early effort will potentially eliminate the need for additional study of the presence of white sturgeon during the study phase of relicensing in 2007-2008. It is cost effective, and can be funded through the 2005 Boundary Relicensing budget.

What we learned:

1. Local officials' knowledge and experience of relicensing is based on the Pend Oreille PUD process for Box Canyon Dam. They are very concerned about potential increases in electrical rates from both the Box Canyon relicensing process, and the upcoming Boundary relicensing process.
2. The towns south of Lone are less focused on Boundary relicensing because they are on the Box Canyon reservoir and feel impacted by potential mitigation efforts from that relicensing effort. The town of Lone is interested in Boundary relicensing, but less so than the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, located to the north. This is primarily because of geographics.

Boundary Project (FERC No. 2144), Pre-Application Document
Appendix 6-1: Documentation of Contacts

Item 46

DATE: March 15, 2005

TO: Consultation File

FROM: Christine Pratt

SUBJECT: Phone Call Record – John Gross-Kalispel Tribe

I called John to notify him of SCL's Boundary Relicensing information gathering effort, per the FERC requirement to collect all existing information related to the Project for the Pre-Application Document and requested any pertinent information the Kalispel Tribe may have regarding water quality data. I affirmed that John will be our Kalispel Tribe contact for water quality matters.

Boundary Project (FERC No. 2144), Pre-Application Document
Appendix 6-1: Documentation of Contacts

Item 47

DATE: March 15, 2005

TO: Consultation File

FROM: Christine Pratt

SUBJECT: Phone Call Record – Mark Schneider-NOAA-Fisheries

I called Mark to notify him of SCL's Boundary Relicensing information gathering effort, per the FERC requirement to collect all existing information related to the Project for the Pre-Application Document and requested any pertinent information WDOE may have regarding water quality data. I affirmed that Mark will be our NOAA-Fisheries contact.

Item 48

DATE: March 26, 2005

TO: John Prescott

FROM: Barbara Greene, John Armstrong

SUBJECT: Trip Report – Boundary Relicensing Stakeholder Meetings

Stakeholder outreach meetings to prepare for Boundary relicensing continued the week of March 14 with the following meetings with town officials in the project area:

Cusick School District Board of Directors

SCL Message: These meetings were in support of City Light's efforts to establish relationships with local community officials. The meetings focused on the use of FERC's Integrated Licensing Process (ILP); general activities for 2005 to prepare for the formal process initiated in spring of 2006.

Cusick School District Board of Directors

Chairman	Tom Foster
Board Member	Gordon Campbell
Board Member	Larry Cordes
Board Member	Kelly Driver
Board Member	Bob Nichols

School District Board of Directors were interested in relicensing but had no immediate questions. The highlight of this meeting was a high school student and member of Future Business Leaders of America who was charged with chairing the meeting.

Follow Up:

1. Begin placing relicensing updates in the local newspaper, the Selkirk Sun.
2. Forward contact information for Tri County Economic Development Council to Lisa Rennie for follow up on socioeconomic issues.
3. Acquire the 2005 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy document.
4. Respond to Kalispel Tribe about City Light's interest in joining the study this summer of white sturgeon in the Pend Oreille River. Following discussion within the Boundary Relicensing Team, a recommendation was sent to Power Supply Officer John Prescott for approval, which was granted. The relicensing team is in the process of working out the details of this contract. This early effort will potentially eliminate the need for additional study of the presence of white sturgeon during the study phase of relicensing in 2007-2008. It is cost effective, and can be funded through the 2005 Boundary Relicensing budget.

What we learned:

1. Local officials' knowledge and experience of relicensing is based on the Pend Oreille PUD process for Box Canyon Dam. They are very concerned about potential increases in electrical rates from both the Box Canyon relicensing process, and the upcoming Boundary relicensing process.
2. The towns south of Lone are less focused on Boundary relicensing because they are on the Box Canyon reservoir and feel impacted by potential mitigation efforts from that relicensing effort. The town of Lone is interested in Boundary relicensing, but less so than the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, located to the north. This is primarily because of geographics.

Item 49

DATE: March 26, 2005

TO: John Prescott

FROM: Barbara Greene, John Armstrong

SUBJECT: Trip Report – Boundary Relicensing Stakeholder Meetings

Stakeholder outreach meetings to prepare for Boundary relicensing continued the week of March 14 with the following meetings with town officials in the project area:

Tri County Economic Development Council

SCL Message: These meetings were in support of City Light’s efforts to establish relationships with local community officials. The meetings focused on the use of FERC’s Integrated Licensing Process (ILP); general activities for 2005 to prepare for the formal process initiated in spring of 2006.

4. Tri County Economic Development Council

Suzanne Norquist specialist	Tri-County Economic Development Council, county
Eileen Dugger	Pend Oreille PUD employee, vice chair of Newport Chamber
Bob Shanklin	Port Commissioner, new EDC treasurer
Lonnie Johnson	New vice chairman of Economic Development Council
Leonard Magart	long time EDC member
Nioka Threlkeld	Leonard’s caregiver
Jeni Forman Director	Tri-County Economic Development Council, Executive
Susan Harriss	Tri-County Economic Development Council
Curt Knapp	Pend Oreille PUD commissioner
Mitch Brown	Pend Oreille County Commissioner
Joe Onley	Pend Oreille PUD Fiber Optics Manager, EDC chair
Dean Cummings	Pend Oreille County Commissioner

Located in Northeast Washington, Tri-County Economic Development District (TEDD) provides business assistance and oversees economic development efforts in Ferry, Stevens and Pend Oreille County while providing assistance in business financing throughout a 10 county area of Eastern Washington through the Rural Opportunities Loan Fund.

Organized in 1969 as an Economic Development District and later as a non-profit corporation, TEDD is committed to serving small businesses with financing and technical assistance. TEDD also works with local communities to promote job creation, economic stability and overall quality of life.

Key contacts at the TEDD include Suzanne Norquist and Susan Harris. The 2005 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy for the tri-county is now available and will be useful in the preparation of City Light's preliminary application document. This group will be a great resource and potential partner for any future City Light efforts related to tourism and recreation in the project area.

Other news for the local community includes plans for a new bridge over the Pend Oreille River in Usk, a small town just south of Cusick. Construction is scheduled for the next two years. Plans call for a higher bridge to allow for clearance of riverboats three stories high, reflecting the Economic Development Council and County Commissioners' future plans to increase this form of tourism in the area.

Follow Up:

1. Begin placing relicensing updates in the local newspaper, the Selkirk Sun.
2. Forward contact information for Tri County Economic Development Council to Lisa Rennie for follow up on socioeconomic issues.
3. Acquire the 2005 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy document.
4. Respond to Kalispel Tribe about City Light's interest in joining the study this summer of white sturgeon in the Pend Oreille River. Following discussion within the Boundary Relicensing Team, a recommendation was sent to Power Supply Officer John Prescott for approval, which was granted. The relicensing team is in the process of working out the details of this contract. This early effort will potentially eliminate the need for additional study of the presence of white sturgeon during the study phase of relicensing in 2007-2008. It is cost effective, and can be funded through the 2005 Boundary Relicensing budget.

What we learned:

1. Local officials' knowledge and experience of relicensing is based on the Pend Oreille PUD process for Box Canyon Dam. They are very concerned about potential increases in electrical rates from both the Box Canyon relicensing process, and the upcoming Boundary relicensing process.
2. The towns south of lone are less focused on Boundary relicensing because they are on the Box Canyon reservoir and feel impacted by potential mitigation efforts from that relicensing effort. The town of lone is interested in Boundary relicensing, but less so than the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, located to the north. This is primarily because of geographics.
- 3.

Item 50

DATE: March 26, 2005

TO: John Prescott

FROM: Barbara Greene, John Armstrong

SUBJECT: Trip Report – Boundary Relicensing Stakeholder Meetings

Stakeholder outreach meetings to prepare for Boundary relicensing continued the week of March 14 with the following meetings with town officials in the project area:

Ione Mayor and Town Council

SCL Message: These meetings were in support of City Light's efforts to establish relationships with local community officials. The meetings focused on the use of FERC's Integrated Licensing Process (ILP); general activities for 2005 to prepare for the formal process initiated in spring of 2006.

Ione Mayor Steve Davis

Mayor Davis is a Pend Oreille PUD employee who was primarily interested in any differences between the Pend Oreille PUD relicensing of Box Canyon and Boundary relicensing.

Ione Town Council

Steve Davis	Mayor
Ed Stambaugh	Parks Commissioner
Chris Chaney	Streets Commissioner
Donald Fowell	Fire Commissioner
Mike Kyle	Airport Commissioner
Leanna Powers	Water/Sewer Commissioner

The town of Ione is working with the Washington State Department of Ecology on the removal of a small dam on the west side of town that crosses a small inlet of the Pend Oreille River. Removal is scheduled to begin within the next couple of months. The town council expressed an interest in being kept up to date through communications and future visits and did not particularly want the volumes of technical information that is sent to participants on FERC's service list.

Follow Up:

1. Begin placing relicensing updates in the local newspaper, the Selkirk Sun.
2. Forward contact information for Tri County Economic Development Council to Lisa Rennie for follow up on socioeconomic issues.
3. Acquire the 2005 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy document.

4. Respond to Kalispel Tribe about City Light's interest in joining the study this summer of white sturgeon in the Pend Oreille River. Following discussion within the Boundary Relicensing Team, a recommendation was sent to Power Supply Officer John Prescott for approval, which was granted. The relicensing team is in the process of working out the details of this contract. This early effort will potentially eliminate the need for additional study of the presence of white sturgeon during the study phase of relicensing in 2007-2008. It is cost effective, and can be funded through the 2005 Boundary Relicensing budget.

What we learned:

1. Local officials' knowledge and experience of relicensing is based on the Pend Oreille PUD process for Box Canyon Dam. They are very concerned about potential increases in electrical rates from both the Box Canyon relicensing process, and the upcoming Boundary relicensing process.
2. The towns south of Lone are less focused on Boundary relicensing because they are on the Box Canyon reservoir and feel impacted by potential mitigation efforts from that relicensing effort. The town of Lone is interested in Boundary relicensing, but less so than the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, located to the north. This is primarily because of geographics.