

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

---

**Item 151**

**From:** <Dan\_Trochta@fws.gov>

**To:** <Michele.Lynn@Seattle.Gov>

**Date:** 8/5/2005 2:20:16 PM

**Subject:** Re: Fw: Scope of Work for Vegetation Mapping - Boundary Hydroproject

Michele, we have reviewed the plan and have the following comments.

Re Vegetation Classification method: Agree with using Cowardin/NWI classification system to delineate wetland systems.

Re Step 2, Option 1 or Option 2, transcribing veg data to GIS maps:

Whichever provides the most accurate results. It seems that manually transcribing data would be more accurate, based on description provided.

Other: Suggest identifying old growth conifer forest (if present), old growth trees, especially Ponderosa Pine, provide perch and nesting habitat for bald eagles. It would also be useful to identify stands of mature cottonwood trees that also provide similar benefits to bald eagles and an array of other avian species. Include observations of noxious weeds while identifying and recording plant species in each cover type.

Rick

---

Rick Donaldson

Habitat Conservation Branch

Upper Columbia Fish & Wildlife Office

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service - Spokane

Phone: 509-893-8009

FAX : 509-891-6748

email: : rick\_donaldson@fws.gov

----- Forwarded by Rick Donaldson/UCRB/R1/FWS/DOI on 07/28/2005 04:44 PM

-----

"Michele Lynn"

<Michele.Lynn@Se To: <robisdler@dfw.wa.gov>, <gkoehn@fs.fed.us>,

attle.Gov> <dosterman@knrd.org>, <rentz@knrd.org>,

<kathy\_helm@or.blm.gov>, <dan\_trochta@fws.gov>,

07/26/2005 01:29 <rick\_donaldson@fws.gov>

PM cc: "Barbara Greene" <barbara.greene@Seattle.Gov>,

"John Armstrong" <John.Armstrong@Seattle.Gov>

Subject: Scope of Work for Vegetation Mapping - Boundary Hydroproject

Seattle City Light (SCL) is proposing to initiate work related to vegetation/cover type mapping in support of the relicensing of the Boundary Hydroproject. The attached document summarizes SCL's proposal related to this effort. It was prepared by, and will be implemented by our consultant, EDAW. This work will serve as the basis for future study plans/work efforts and as such, we are seeking your input on the plan. I am requesting that you review the document and submit comments to me by August 5, 2005. If you have questions, please feel free to contact me at the email/phone listed below. Thank you in advance for your input.

Sincerely,

Michele Lynn

Michele Lynn

Senior Environmental Analyst

Environment and Safety Division

Seattle City Light

206-386-4578 - phone

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

---

206-386-4589 - fax

michele.lynn@seattle.gov

(See attached file: FINAL EID July 22\_2005.doc)

**CC:** [Rick\\_Donaldson@fws.gov](mailto:Rick_Donaldson@fws.gov)

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

---

**Item 152**

**Name:** Keith Martin

**Affiliation:** Washington Dept. of Transportation

**Title:** Local Programs Engineer, Eastern Region

**Discipline:** State government

**Email Address:** martink@wsdot.wa.gov

**Phone number:** (509) 324-6080

**EDAW Name:** Jeff Caudill

**Date of Contact:** 8/9/2005

**Reason for Contact:** Further discussion of the North Pend Oreille Scenic Byway Management Plan and implementation of "The River and the Road" (referred to me by Paula Connelly).

**Information Provided:** General info on our efforts and reason for contact.

**Information Obtained:** Additional information on steps already completed or in progress for the implementation of the proposals contained in "The River and the Road." Provided information on the location and status of all projects contained in the document.

**Follow-up Action Needed:** none

**Comments:** Much work has been done to implement the proposals in "The River and the Road."

**Item 153**

**From:** <Dan\_Trochta@fws.gov>

**To:** "Michele Lynn" <Michele.Lynn@Seattle.Gov>

**Date:** 8/16/2005 12:49:35 PM

**Subject:** Re: Scope of Work for Invasive Species Inventory and Mapping

We reviewed the draft for Invasive Plant Species Inventory and Mapping and have the following comments and questions:

The plan looks good and we think the Target List (Table 3-1) of invasive plants is complete. However, we suggest that another agency with local knowledge of invasive plants also review the list. We suggest that plant surveys be conducted during the time of season when they can best be identified. If surveys are not complete this season, conduct additional surveys next year. We are not familiar with the class designation of weeds and how the designation would affect control actions. Since there are not many right-of-ways in the project area would someone have to request control of species such as spotted knapweed? Since species such as spotted knapweed won't be mapped unless there are dense infestations, how will they be located during control actions? Consider establishing some photo points during the inventory for the purpose of tracking future trends.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the plan.

"Michele Lynn"

<Michele.Lynn@Seattle.Gov> To

"Sharon Sorby"

08/02/2005 04:51 <ssorby@coopext.cahe.wsu.edu>,

PM <robisdlr@dfw.wa.gov>,

<gkoehn@fs.fed.us>,

<dosterman@knrd.org>,

<rentz@knrd.org>,

<kathy\_helm@or.blm.gov>,

<dan\_trochta@fws.gov>,

<rick\_donaldson@fws.gov>

cc

"Barbara Greene"

<barbara.greene@Seattle.Gov>, "John  
Armstrong"

<John.Armstrong@Seattle.Gov>

Subject

Scope of Work for Invasive Species

Inventory and Mapping

Seattle City Light (SCL) is proposing to initiate Invasive Species Inventory and Mapping work in support of the relicensing of the Boundary Hydroproject. The attached document summarizes SCL's proposal related to this effort. It was prepared by, and will be implemented by our consultant, EDAW. This work will serve as the basis for future study plans/work efforts and as such, we are seeking your input on the plan. I am requesting that you review the attached document and submit comments to me by August 16, 2005.

(Note: Some of you recently reviewed an Early Information Development [EID] plan for Vegetation Mapping. This Invasive Species Inventory and Mapping plan contains some boilerplate language that is identical to the language in the Vegetation Mapping EID. To assist in reducing the time required to review this new document, I have underlined the text that relates specifically to this scope of work. If you reviewed the

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

---

Vegetation Mapping EID and wish to focus on the language that is specific to this new plan, feel free to focus on the underlined text. Otherwise, I encourage you to read the entire document.)

If you have questions, please feel free to contact me at the email/phone listed below. Thank you in advance for your input.

Sincerely,

Michele Lynn

Michele Lynn

Senior Environmental Analyst

Environment and Safety Division

Seattle City Light

206-386-4578 - phone

206-386-4589 - fax

michele.lynn@seattle.gov

(See attached file: EID FINAL.doc)

**Item 154**

**From:** Glenn Koehn <gkoehn@fs.fed.us>  
**To:** <michele.lynn@seattle.gov>  
**Date:** 8/19/2005 7:41:27 AM  
**Subject:** Invasive Species Mapping Proposal

Attached are FS comments to SCL proposed invasive species mapping project. These are the same as the hard copy I provided yesterday at your workshop.

(See attached file: Comments to SCL Invasive Species Mapping Project.doc)

Additionally, attached is a short paper that outline FS objectives during licensing. I intended to give this to you yesterday, but ended up not attending the terrestrial break-out group - opting instead for the cultural/socio-economic group. You might consider sharing this with the other group leaders on your team.

(See attached file: FS\_Objectives\_Scope\_relicensing.doc)

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Regards, Glenn

J. Glenn Koehn  
Hydropower Coordinator and  
Lands/Minerals Program Mgr.  
(509) 684-7189  
FAX (509) 684-7280  
gkoehn@fs.fed.us

**CC:** Glenn Koehn <gkoehn@fs.fed.us>

**GENERAL FOREST SERVICE OBJECTIVES IN RELICENSING  
PACIFIC NORTHWEST REGION**

In licensing proceedings affecting National Forest System (NFS) lands, the objectives of the Forest Service (FS) are to:

**1)** Ensure that continued or proposed operation of the project under a new license is consistent with management direction, including standard and guidelines, contained in approved National Forest Land and Resource Management Plans (Forest Plan).

- 2) Ensure that sufficient evidence is assembled to determine the effects to National Forest System resources and programs caused by the project in the near term under operational or structural alternatives proposed by the licensee. FS emphasis is to analyze existing information to determine such effects and recommend studies where information is lacking or needs refinement to address specific project situations. The methods utilized to determine these effects should be incorporated as monitoring measures and employed at appropriate intervals over the term of the new license to produce adaptive operations relative to public resources and programs on NFS lands.
- 3) Ensure that FS terms and conditions and recommendations regarding protection, mitigation or enhancement measures are commensurate with project caused effects.

**Authorities:**

**4(e)-** FS will stipulate binding terms and conditions to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) under Section 4(e) of the Federal Power Act (FPA) when project facilities are located on NFS lands. Terms and conditions submitted under this authority will address continuing effects of project operations on National Forest System resources or programs, including project-induced recreation.

**7(a)-** FS makes a finding under Section 7(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act for hydroelectric projects below/above or on a stream tributary to a designated wild and scenic river (WSR) administered by the FS. The project proposal is evaluated to determine whether it will invade the area or unreasonably diminish the scenic, recreational, and fish and wildlife values present in the area on the date of the river's designation into the National System. This authority applies whether or not the project under consideration is sited on NFS lands.

**10(a)-** FS will recommend terms and conditions for the new license under Section 10(a) of the FPA to address continuing effects to and enhancements for NFS lands where the need for such are clearly established by existing information or studies in situations where application of the authority under Section 4(e) of FPA is inappropriate.

**VII. Consistency Review:**

The National Forest Management Act (NFMA) requires the FS to develop and implement land and resource management plans for each National Forest. Section 6 also directs that: "Resource plans and permits, contracts, and other instruments for the use and occupancy of NFS lands shall be consistent with the land management plans. Those resource plans and permits, contracts, and other such instruments currently in existence shall be revised as soon as practicable to be made consistent with such plans. When land management plans are revised, resource plans and permits, contracts, and other instruments, when necessary, shall be revised as soon as practicable. Any revision in present or future permits, contracts, and other instruments made pursuant to this section shall be subject to valid existing rights." Thus, the intent of NFMA is that uses of NFS lands, including hydropower projects, be consistent with the land and resource management plans.

The objective therefore, of FS participation in licensing and relicensing is to provide terms and conditions to FERC that will, when included in the FERC license, make the Project consistent with the LRMP, as amended.

#### **VIII. Policy:**

**Continuing Impacts** - It is the policy of the FS to ensure that continuing impacts of project occupancy and operations on NFS lands are addressed over new license terms. It is not the policy of the FS to stipulate or recommend measures which mitigate for past project impacts. For example, FS will assess the impacts arising from continued inundation of NFS lands based on the habitat or resources impacted by the inundation over the new license term.

**Baseline** - FS is not overly concerned with what analytical baseline is established for a proceeding as long as it does not preclude assessment of pre-project resource conditions to determine the continued effects of project occupancy and operations on NFS lands.

**Studies** - FS will recommend studies where existing information is insufficient to determine the effects of continued project occupancy and operations on NFS lands over the new license term. Study areas can vary by resource and are not constrained to the project area boundary set out in the FERC license.

**Settlement Agreements** - FS fully supports development of Settlement Agreements (SA), which are based on a solid evidentiary record and an evaluation of the record in the applicant prepared environmental document. In a settlement agreement, FS may stipulate under 4(e) that the agreement be incorporated into the new license for the project. FS strongly suggests the participation of FERC staff in the preparation of SA language to ensure that the Commission in the new license order may incorporate it with little or no modification.

#### **Scope of Relicensing (Boundary Project)**

The scope for relicensing of the Boundary Hydroelectric Project is defined by the Forest Plan, as amended by INFISH. This includes both site specific and watershed scale on NFS lands within the Boundary reach of the Pend Oreille River watershed. The project area, area influenced by the project, consists of the area within the existing project boundary and adjacent lands. Study areas, to be considered in the design of various resource studies, will need to vary depending on the resource being studied.

This is also consistent with the approach taken under the Integrated Licensing Process where project boundaries are defined as encompassing generating facilities, the reservoir to the high water mark, all shoreline lands needed to meet project purposes other than the generation of power, and all lands needed to implement mitigation measures.

The Existing Information Analysis conducted by the FS in October 2000 represented the first look at the Project by the FS, related to the relicensing of the project. The analysis consisted of documenting the existing information related to the project and to assess potential impacts and benefits to NFS lands; the relevant FS policy and Forest Plan direction that will guide formulation of terms and conditions; the analysis of the information; a list of potential study needs; and the preliminary FS objectives for the relicensing process. This document is still the

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

---

best source of information for use by the FS together with information received since that date from a variety of sources including Seattle City Light.

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

---

**Item 155**

**Name:** Town of Metaline Falls

**Affiliation:**

**Title:**

**Discipline:**

**Email Address:** metfalls@potc.net

**Phone number:**

**EDAW Name:** Jeff Caudill

**Date of Contact:** 8/23/2005

**Reason for Contact:** Looking to obtain a copy of the Metaline Falls Town Comprehensive Plan.

**Information Provided:** Basic information on our effort.

**Information Obtained:** Agreed to allow me to stop in and make a copy of the Town Comprehensive Plan (during a future site visit).

**Follow-up Action Needed:** Set up a meeting with the City to make a copy of the document.

**Comments:** Obtained a copy during site visit.

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

---

**Item 156**

**Name:** Mike Lithgow  
**Affiliation:** Pend Oreille County  
**Title:** Assistant Planner  
**Discipline:** local government  
**Email Address:** mlithgow@pendoreille.org  
**Phone number:** (509) 447-6457  
**EDAW Name:** Jeff Caudill  
**Date of Contact:** 8/23/2005  
**Reason for Contact:** Obtain a copy of the Town Comprehensive Plans for Metaline and Lone.  
**Information Provided:** None  
**Information Obtained:** Set up a time to obtain a copy of the Metaline Town Comprehensive Plan and the Lone Town Comprehensive Plan from the Pend Oreille Planning Department during my site visit.  
**Follow-up Action Needed:** Stop into the Planning Department during the site visit.  
**Comments:** Two town comprehensive plans obtained.

**Item 157**

**From:** Michele Lynn  
**To:** kathy\_helm@or.blm.gov  
**Date:** 8/24/2005 12:18:14 PM  
**Subject:** invasive species and vegetation mapping work efforts

Hi Kathy,

We were very pleased that you were able to attend the workshop last week. I know we gave you hard copies of the Invasive Species and Vegetation Mapping Early Information Development (EID) plans at the workshop, but I wanted to send you copies of the electronic versions (attached). If the BLM has any comments, we'd appreciate getting them by tomorrow. We would like to finalize the plans by the end of the week so we can plan our field effort.

I'm concerned that my email communications are not reaching you. The Vegetation Mapping EID was sent to you on July 26 and the Invasive Species EID was sent on August 2; I don't know why they didn't transmit properly. In the future, I'd appreciate it if you'd shoot back a quick acknowledgement of receiving my emails so I know they are making their way to you.

I'm sorry you weren't able to join us in the field on Friday. If you'd like to get out to see the project, let me know and we can plan something.

Michele

Michele Lynn  
Senior Environmental Analyst  
Environment and Safety Division  
Seattle City Light  
206-386-4578 - phone  
206-386-4589 - fax  
michele.lynn@seattle.gov

**Item 158**

**Michele Lynn - Re: email check**

---

**From:** Sharon Sorby <ssorby@cahnr.wsu.edu>  
**To:** "Michele Lynn" <Michele.Lynn@Seattle.Gov>  
**Date:** 8/29/2005 3:41 PM  
**Subject:** Re: email check

---

<i>Centaurea macrocephala</i>	bighead knapweed	Class A within 5 miles of project
<i>Centaurea nigrescens</i>	Vochin knapweed	Class A upstream, (Sullivan Creek)
<i>Cynoglossum officinale</i>	houndstongue	Class C
<i>Cytisus scoparius</i>	Scotchbroom	Class B-designate
<i>Carduus nutans</i>	musk thistle	Class B-designate
<i>Euphorbia myrsinites</i>	Myrtle spurge	Class C upstream, on river bank
<i>Hypochaeris radicata</i>	common catsear	Class B-designate
<i>Onopordum acanthium</i>	Scotch thistle	Class B-designate
<i>Polygonum bohemicum</i>	Bohemian knotweed	Class B-designate
<i>Polygonum cuspidatum</i>	Japanese knotweed	Class B-designate
<i>Senecio jacobaea</i>	tansy ragwort	Class B-designate

At 11:54 AM 8/29/2005 -0700, you wrote:

Thanks for your message, Sharon. I'm hoping to get your comments asap as we're trying to finalize the plan. Thanks!

Michele

>>> Sharon Sorby <ssorby@cahnr.wsu.edu> 08/26 3:34 AM >>>  
Hi Michael,

Yes, this is my email and yes, i'd like to comment, but i'm sorry, i can't get anything to you before first thing Monday morning -- i'll take it home over the weekend. :) (Guess i should have last weekend, but i thought i'd have time this week as it was supposed to rain, but then it didn't -- gotta spray when the sun shines!)

Thanks,  
Sharon

At 04:43 PM 8/25/2005 -0700, you wrote:

>Hi Sharon,  
>  
>I wanted to make sure I got your new email address right. Please  
>respond to this message to confirm that you received it.

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

---

>  
>Also, do you expect to submit comments on our Early Information  
>Development Plan for Invasive Plant Species Inventory and Mapping?  
>We're finalizing the plan this week and would like to  
>address/incorporate any comments you have.  
>  
>Thanks,  
>  
>Michele Lynn  
>  
>Michele Lynn  
>Senior Environmental Analyst  
>Environment and Safety Division  
>Seattle City Light  
>206-386-4578 - phone  
>206-386-4589 - fax  
>michele.lynn@seattle.gov  
file:///C:/Temp/GW}00001.HTM 9/6/2005

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

---

**Item 159**

**Name:** Greg Argel  
**Affiliation:** BIA  
**Title:** Realty Officer at BIA NW Regional Office  
**Discipline:**  
**Email Address:**  
**Phone number:** (503) 231-6715  
**EDAW Name:** Nancy Bird  
**Date of Contact:** 8/31/2005  
**Reason for Contact:** Tribal Resources issues.  
**Information Provided:** Telephone conversation between Nancy Bird and Greg Argel to discuss tribal treaties / trusts / or ceded land rights that apply to the Boundary project.  
**Information Obtained:** Discussion of authority of specific tribes. Kalispel Indians have no legal authority over ceded lands.  
**Follow-up Action Needed:** none  
**Comments:** none

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

---

**Item 160**

**Name:** Greg Argel  
**Affiliation:** BIA  
**Title:** Realty Officer at BIA NW Regional Office  
**Discipline:**  
**Email Address:**  
**Phone number:** (503) 231-6715  
**EDAW Name:** Nancy Bird  
**Date of Contact:** 8/31/2005  
**Reason for Contact:** Tribal Resources issues.  
**Information Provided:** none  
**Information Obtained:** Received a fax with notice and consultation requirements for non-treaty tribes (such as the Kalispel) that are not guaranteed hunting and fishing rights in usual and accustomed areas.  
**Follow-up Action Needed:** none  
**Comments:** none

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

---

**Item 161**

**Name:** Kisos

**Affiliation:** Indian and Northern Affairs Canada

**Title:**

**Discipline:**

**Email Address:**

**Phone number:** (604) 775-7114

**EDAW Name:** Nancy Bird

**Date of Contact:** 8/31/2005

**Reason for Contact:** Tribal Resource Issues in B.C.

**Information Provided:** Telephone conversation between Nancy Bird and Kisos about tribes within a 50-mile radius of the Boundary project in Canada.

**Information Obtained:** 2 maps were sent identifying three tribes within the vicinity.

**Follow-up Action Needed:** none

**Comments:** none

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

---

**Item 162**

**Name:** Greg Argel  
**Affiliation:** BIA  
**Title:** Realty Officer at BIA NW Regional Office  
**Discipline:**  
**Email Address:**  
**Phone number:** (503) 231-6715  
**EDAW Name:** Nancy Bird  
**Date of Contact:** 9/2/2005  
**Reason for Contact:** Tribal Resources issues.  
**Information Provided:** Telephone conversation between Nancy Bird and Greg Argel to discuss Kalispel ceded land rights that apply to the Boundary project.  
**Information Obtained:** Confirmed that the Kalispel are a non-treaty tribe with no guaranteed hunting and fishing rights in usual and accustomed areas.  
**Follow-up Action Needed:** none  
**Comments:** none

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

---

**Item 163**

**From:** Michele Lynn  
**To:** dan\_trochta@r1.fws.gov; dosterman@knrd.org; kathy\_helm@or.blm.gov; Koehn, Glenn; mbodie@fs.fed.us; mgerdes@fs.fed.us; rentz@knrd.org; rick\_donaldson@r1.fws.gov; robisdlnr@dfw.wa.gov; ssorby@cahnrs.wsu.edu  
**Date:** 9/8/2005 2:54:54 PM  
**Subject:** Final EIDs for Cover Type Mapping and Invasive Species Inventory

Seattle City Light has completed the final revisions to the Early Information Development (EID) plans for Cover Type Mapping and Invasive Plant Species Inventory and Mapping. We apologize for the delay in completing the plans; we are continuing to refine our internal review process to abbreviate the turnaround time associated with revising documents.

We made every effort to incorporate your proposed changes to the plans. In some cases, we revised the plan to address your questions/concerns and when that wasn't feasible, we provided a direct response (in an accompanying table) to your comments.

Attached are four (4) files for your records:

- 1) The final EID for Cover Type Mapping
- 2) Table with responses to agency/stakeholder comments, re: Cover Type Mapping EID
- 3) The final EID for Invasive Species Inventory and Mapping
- 4) Table with responses to agency/stakeholder comments, re: Invasive Species Inventory and Mapping

The products of these efforts will be presented in the Preliminary Application Document, due to FERC in May, 2006. We look forward to sharing the information with you at that time.

Please feel free to share the plans with others who may be interested. If you have questions, please contact me at the phone/email listed below.

Sincerely,

Michele Lynn

Michele Lynn  
Senior Environmental Analyst  
Environment and Safety Division  
Seattle City Light  
206-386-4578 - phone  
206-386-4589 - fax  
michele.lynn@seattle.gov

**CC:** Andersen, Emily; Anderson, Finlay; Armstrong, John; Dwerlkotte, Rich; Greene, Barbara; McShane, Colleen

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

**Cover Type Mapping EID Plan – Responses to Agency Comments**

COMMENTS	SCL RESPONSE
<p><b>USDA-FS General Comments</b></p> <p>It is suggested that the cover type mapping cover the entire area between Highway 31 (to the east) and County Road 2975 (to the west) in the northern portion of the project area and extend to ¼ mile from the reservoir in the southern portion of the project area. This will better match up with the aerial mapping project also proposed (7-15-05) by Seattle City Light.</p>	<p>SCL agrees to expand the study area for cover type mapping to include the area between Highway 31 (to the east) and County Road 2975 (to the west) in the northern portion of the project area. However, the new aerial photography for the Project does not cover this entire area, and existing DNR ortho quads will be used as a mapping base for the area beyond ¼ mi. While the boundary for the overall mapping effort will be expanded for the northern portion of the study area, the intensity of field verification will be less outside of the area originally defined. Concerning the proposed study area to the south of Metaline Falls, which is bounded by Highway 31 on the westside and a ¼-mi. buffer on the east side, SCL believes that the boundary, as originally proposed, is adequate. The highway forms a natural boundary on the west side. In addition, this area is primarily in private ownership and SCL's influence, in terms of management, is limited. See Section 3.1 of the final EID Plan.</p>
<p><b>USDA-FS Aquatic</b></p> <p>(1) It is unclear when cover type mapping will be done for littoral cover type. Will this be done at full pool of the reservoir or at another water level? This will make a difference in the mapping depending upon when this occurs.</p>	<p>The cover type maps will be based on aerial photographs of the study area that were taken on August 20, 2005, when the pool was 5-7 ft below the normal summer full pool of 1,990 ft msl. Since the littoral zone is defined as the area between summer high and low water (1,980-1,900 ft), the photographs will show only part of this zone. However, the low boundary of the littoral zone can be obtained from the bathymetry data that will also be collected this year. Field verification is scheduled for the week of September 12 and should allow for identification of vegetated areas within a good portion of the littoral zone. See revisions in Section 3.3 of the final EID Plan.</p>
<p>(2) Water-associated descriptors will be included for shoreline and deepwater habitat. What are the descriptors for these two habitats? How do they differ? A review of the website classification did not clear this up.</p>	<p>The Cover Type Mapping EID Plan has been revised to provide more detail and definition of these types. See revisions in Section 3.3 and Table 3-1 of the final EID Plan.</p>
<p>(3) When will the field verification process take place? The timing is</p>	<p>Field verification is scheduled for the week of September 12, 2005.</p>

<p>important as certain aquatic plants may be missed in the matrix of species if done at the wrong time.</p>	<p>Regarding aquatic plants, a comprehensive inventory was never intended as a product of this EID; if warranted, an inventory/survey of this nature could be included in the upcoming study plan. Regarding terrestrial plant species, SCL understands that it is always possible that some plant species may be missed because of seasonality. However, development of the plant species list began during a June reconnaissance trip to the study area, so some plants not identifiable in September were likely recorded during this earlier trip. Thus, we believe that a fairly extensive species list will be produced, capturing the dominant, sub-dominant, and common plants in each cover type. If, at a later date, it is determined that additional survey work is warranted, it will be scheduled at that time. See modified Section 3.3 of the final EID Plan.</p>
<p>(4) Will the matrix of species also list dominant and subdominant aquatic species? Will mapping tally acres of each cover type and also acres with dominant species within each cover type? Specifically, would a product of the mapping include the acres of littoral area dominated by Eurasian water milfoil?</p>	<p>The matrix of species will include any aquatic plants observed during field verification or the June reconnaissance trip. The cover type map will show littoral areas that are vegetated and will indicate plant series for riparian, wetland, and littoral types. The mapping will tally acres of these types by plant series. A sampling program to identify and accurately map aquatic vegetation to the species level (i.e. the acres of littoral area dominated by water milfoil) is beyond the scope of the cover type mapping EID.</p>
<p><b>USDA-FS Recreation</b></p>	
<p>(5) For the purposes of producing "an accurate map that shows the extent and distribution of the vegetation and land cover types and uses occurring in the study area for the Boundary Project", it would be useful to extend the "buffer" north of Metaline Falls to Highway 31 east of the project and to County Route 2975 west of the project. Cutting it off at 0.25 miles on either side does not give a clear picture of the terrain involved or represent use patterns and access to the project. It may not be necessary to perform in-depth studies within the total area bounded by these roads for all Cover Types, however social research tied to current and potential recreation use will need to consider access to the project through the area bounded by these roads.</p>	<p>See response to comment 1 above. Further, a GIS road layer will be produced for the PAD, detailing access to/from the project.</p>

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

<p>(6) In 2003, the Colville National Forest participated in the national NVUM (National Visitor Use Monitoring) process and will be participating in the next round of monitoring during 2008. Preparation for this process will occur in 2007 with the establishment of exit points where visitors leave the Forest. Coordinating the results of the NVUM process with any social research done for the Boundary Project will be important throughout the relicensing process. It is recommended that Seattle City Light consider using the NVUM protocol for exit surveys and apply it to the broader study area defined by Highway 31 and County Route 2975 mentioned above. Demographic questions could be styled after the NVUM product. Utilizing the collaborative approach to working with the local communities (previously successful with other projects on this Forest) would likely yield additional questions for the survey to address qualitative issues. This work would be additive to the Forest's NVUM work in 2008, and intended to complement that analysis yet be specific to this area.</p>	<p>Thank you for informing us of this process. This issue will be dealt with in the recreation resources forum.</p>
<p><b>USDA-FS Terrestrial</b></p>	
<p>(7) Using Kovalchick and Clausnitzer's classification for wetland, riparian, and aquatic habitats would provide greater detail as to wildlife and fish values, natural and artificial establishment of the dominant species, etc. This classification would however probably take more ground-truthing. This classification can be found at <a href="http://www.treesearch.fs.fed.us/pubs/7405">http://www.treesearch.fs.fed.us/pubs/7405</a>.</p>	<p>SCL agrees to indicate the primary plant series, as defined by Kovalchick and Clausnitzer (2004), for each mapped riparian, wetland, and littoral polygon. See Section 3.3 of the EID Plan.</p>
<p><b>USDA-FS – Mike Gerdes</b></p>	
<p>(8) As we discussed last Thursday (8.18.05) keeping the study areas consistent between initial studies for the PAD and future relicensing studies is important for our ability to overlay data between studies. Therefore, as suggested in the USDA Forest Service response of 8.01.2005 to the cover type mapping proposal, the cover type mapping should include the area between Highway 31 (to the east) and County Road 2975 (to the west) in the northern portion of the project area and extend to ¼ mile from each side of the reservoir in the southern portion of the project area. In the terrestrial resources ppt, 4-studies were listed: shoreline inventory; vegetation/land cover type mapping; noxious weed inventory &amp; mapping; and wildlife &amp; plant reconnaissance. Further,</p>	<p>See response to comment 1 above</p>

<p>SCL is proposing to provide aerial mapping. Consistency of study areas between these initial studies important and will set the foundation for relicensing studies.</p>	
<p>(9) Step 1: Develop Classification System: As suggested in the FS response (8.01.05) there is a new riparian classification system. Kovalchick and Clausnitzer's classification for wetland, riparian, and aquatic habitats. This classification can be found at <a href="http://www.treesearch.fs.fed.us/pubs/7405">http://www.treesearch.fs.fed.us/pubs/7405</a>.</p> <p>I realize the intent of these initial studies is to gain insight to what's existing for development of the PAD. But a question I have in looking forward to relicensing studies have you considered developing a potential natural vegetation map for the same study area? The intent of this information would aid in development of site-specific pm&amp;e measures if such were needed.</p>	<p>See response to comment 7 above.</p> <p>A potential vegetation map is beyond the scope of the cover type inventory and mapping exercise. If deemed warranted, this could be considered as part of future studies.</p>
<p>(10) Table 3-1. Vegetated upland types: I do not see a cover type for timber harvest regeneration sites, however in Developed cover types/recent timber harvest we may get there. Is that the intent of that field?</p>	<p>Yes, this classification is intended to be used for young regenerating clearcuts up to about 10 yrs old. See Table 3-1.</p>
<p>(11) Step 2: Cover Type Delineation and Preliminary Mapping: I too like option 2 but understand the constraints. Again, the FS requests that we have access to the GIS data layers and associated database for our independent analysis. I agree with the minimum mapping units: 1 ac for upland and 0.1 ac for wetland/riparian.</p>	<p>Options 1 and 2 will produce the same level of accuracy and detail in the mapping. However, at this point delineating cover type polygons onto aerial photographs, then digitizing into the GIS is the only option because orthophotos will not be available until about mid-October, which is too late to use for field verification. See revisions in Section 3.3, Step 2 of the final EID Plan. SCL will provide the USDA-FS with requested databases.</p>
<p>(12) Step 3: Field Verification: It is suggested that "all areas accessible by car or boat will be field-checked..." Using this as a guide can you estimate percentage for the study area ground-truthed? I'm just getting at making the cover type mapping as accurate as possible.</p>	<p>An estimate of the extent of field verification has been added to Section 3.3, Step 3 of the final EID Plan .</p>
<p>(13) Also, you indicate that plant species for each cover type be identified and recorded. Can this be made as a database linked to the</p>	<p>Plant species will be recorded by cover type but not for each individual polygon. Since there will not be a spatial component to the plant</p>

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

GIS cover type map?	species matrix, it cannot be linked to the GIS.
(14) Step 4: Draft Cover Type Map: For consistency between studies I suggest that the 3 sub-area designation be used on the other studies. These sub-areas would prove especially useful for the noxious weed mapping. I'd bet we would see a decreasing trend in weeds moving from upstream to the downstream reach below the dam.	Comment noted---agree.
<b>USDI-FWS</b>	
(15) Re Vegetation Classification method: Agree with using Cowardin/NWI classification system to delineate wetland systems.	Comment noted.
(16) Re Step 2, Option 1 or Option 2, transcribing veg data to GIS maps: Whichever provides the most accurate results. It seems that manually transcribing data would be more accurate, based on description provided.	See response to comment 13 above.
(17) Other: Suggest identifying old growth conifer forest (if present), old growth trees, especially Ponderosa Pine, provide perch and nesting habitat for bald eagles. It would also be useful to identify stands of mature cottonwood trees that also provide similar benefits to bald eagles and an array of other avian species. Include observations of noxious weeds while identifying and recording plant species in each cover type.	<p>Observations during site reconnaissance trips suggest that there is little or no old-growth conifer forest in the study area. However, any polygons with significant amounts of old-growth conifer forest or mature cottonwood stands will be noted during field verification and included on the cover type map. Identifying and recording individual old growth trees is beyond the scope of this inventory. See Section 3.3 of the final EID Plan.</p> <p>Terrestrial species of noxious weeds will be mapped during the cover type field verification trip. See the Exotic Invasive Plant Species EID Plan for more detail.</p>

**Invasive Species EID Plan – Responses to Agency Comments**

<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>SCL RESPONSE</b>
<b>USDI-FWS Comments</b>	
(1) The plan looks good and we think the Target List (Table 3-1) of invasive plants is complete. However, we suggest that another agency with local knowledge of invasive plants also review the list.	The Pend Oreille County Noxious Weed Control Board reviewed the EID and their comments have been incorporated into the final plan.
(2) We suggest that plant surveys be conducted during the time of season when they can best be identified. If surveys are not complete this season, conduct additional surveys next year.	The invasive plant species inventory will be conducted the week of September 12 in conjunction with the cover type mapping. Most weed species are easily identifiable into the fall months, but if it is apparent that target species noted during reconnaissance trips in June and August are no longer easily identifiable, additional surveys will be conducted in 2006.
(3) We are not familiar with the class designation of weeds and how the designation would affect control actions. Since there are not many right-of-ways in the project area would someone have to request control of species such as spotted knapweed? Since species such as spotted knapweed won't be mapped unless there are dense infestations, how will they be located during control actions?	Control of Class A and B-designate species is required by law. Class B and C weeds are common and widespread. The County could request control of Class B or C weed species, but typically would only do so in areas where there is a clear threat to agriculture or important natural resources. Particularly dense infestations of Class B and C weeds, including spotted knapweed, in the study area would be mapped. The likelihood of successfully controlling scattered widespread weed populations is low, so exact location information is not considered necessary.
(4) Consider establishing some photo points during the inventory for the purpose of tracking future trends.	SCL does not feel that establishment of photo points is warranted at this time. If specific sites are targeted for management in the future, it may be appropriate to establish photo points as part of a management plan.
<b>USDA-FS Comments</b>	
<b>Study Area</b> It is suggested that the invasive species mapping study area cover the entire area between Highway 31 (to the east) and County Road 2975 (to the west) in the northern portion of the project area and extend to ¼ mile each side of the reservoir in the southern portion of the project area. This will better match up with the aerial mapping project also proposed (7-15-05) by Seattle City Light.	SCL agrees to expand the study area for the invasive species inventory and mapping to include the area between Highway 31 (to the east) and County Road 2975 (to the west) in the northern portion of the project area. However, the new aerial photography for the Project does not cover this entire area, and existing DNR ortho quads will be used as a mapping base for the area beyond ¼ mi. While the boundary for the overall invasive species mapping effort will be expanded for the northern portion of the study area, the intensity of field verification will be less outside of the area originally defined. Concerning the proposed study area to the south of Metaline Falls, which is bounded by Highway

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

	<p>31 on the westside and a ¼-mi. buffer on the east side, SCL believes that the boundary, as originally proposed, is adequate. The highway forms a natural boundary on the west side. In addition, this area is primarily in private ownership and SCL's influence, in terms of management, is limited. See Section 3.1 of the final EID Plan.</p>
<p><b>Objectives</b>  The initial inventory and mapping should include Class B and C species. As stated in the footnote to Table 3-1, these classes are to be controlled on right-of-ways and other areas where requested with the overall goal of containment and reducing the negative impact to an acceptable level. Including Class B and C species in the EID plan sets the stage for refinement of future studies.</p>	<p>SCL believes that mapping Class B and C weed species is beyond the scope of this EID exercise and would serve little purpose. These species will be recorded and mapped as point locations where they are observed along the reservoir, near Project facilities, access roads, and recreation developments. Dense infestations which may warrant control will be mapped as polygons. Most of these species are ubiquitous and occur throughout the study area at low densities, and would therefore be almost impossible to map. The mapped polygon for diffuse knapweed, for example would include almost the entire study area.</p>
<p><b>Methods</b>  It is recommended that the noxious weed list in Attachment A be used as the comprehensive target species list. If the contractor is just looking for the listed target noxious weeds in Table 3-1, new invaders not on the target species list but occurring in Pend Oreille County could be overlooked.</p> <p>Eurasian water-milfoil (EWM) is listed in Washington as a Category B weed species. It appears that this weed will not be mapped unless in 'particularly dense' concentrations. This may not be accurate enough. While EWM does occur in high densities, it also occurs with other aquatic plant species in Boundary Reservoir in lower densities. It is extremely important to map all EWM infestations in the reservoir. It is important for establishing a baseline of present condition, densities and distribution. The baseline is needed to be able to monitor changes in EWM during the life of the next license as a result of anticipated control measures on the part of SCL.</p>	<p>The target species list is simply intended to provide guidance to the field crew on the invasive species most likely to occur in the study area. The revised target list (See Table 3-1 in EID Plan) now includes a number of potential new invaders that were added by the Pend Oreille County Noxious Weed Control Board. Crews conducting the surveys are familiar with noxious weeds and will be on the look out for <u>any</u> Class A or B-designate species, whether or not they are on the target list, and will record and map these species if they occur. Many of the noxious weeds listed in Attachment A are associated with habitats and conditions not found in the study area.</p> <p>The Invasive Species Plan has been revised to clarify that <u>terrestrial</u> weed species will be the focus of inventory and mapping. The locations of dense infestations of milfoil will be mapped, but this EID effort is not intended to provide a thorough and accurate map of aquatic weed species. If needed, these species can be addressed during the study planning phase.</p>

<p>In addition, initiating mapping in late August is very late in the season. There is a risk that some concentrations of plants may be missed.</p>	<p>The invasive species inventory is now planned for September 12-16. SCL understands that this is late in the season, but this EID effort, which is being coordinated with the cover type mapping, could not be initiated until the aerial photographs were flown and processed in late August. Fortunately, many terrestrial weed species can be identified late in the growing season. In addition, the locations of a number of weed species were recorded during previous reconnaissance trips in June and mid-August. Additional inventory and mapping, if needed, can be conducted in summer 2006.</p>
<p><b>Field Inventory and Mapping</b>  Not identified is the noxious weed sampling frequency. The draft EID proposal suggests that surveys will be conducted in coordination with field verification of the preliminary cover type mapping exercise. Not knowing what percent of the project area is field verified for the cover type mapping, is the contractor planning on 100% sampling in the study area or is a lesser degree of sampling proposed? Please provide a detailed inventory methodology including sampling frequency of the study area.</p>	<p>An estimate of the extent of field verification has been added to Section 3.3, Step 2 of the final EID Plan.</p>
<p><b>Data storage, Map and Species List</b>  GIS data input of polygons and points are appropriate. The USDA Forest Service requests that the final GIS data be shared so the agency can conduct its independent analysis.</p>	<p>SCL agrees to share final GIS data with the USDA-FS.</p>
<p><b>PEND OREILLE COUNTY NOXIOUS WEED CONTROL BOARD</b></p>	
<p>Please add the following 11 species to the list in Table 3-1.</p> <p><i>Centaurea macrocephala</i> - bighead knapweed - Class A within 5 miles of project  <i>Centaurea nigrescens</i> - Vochin knapweed - Class A upstream, (Sullivan Creek)  <i>Cynoglossum officinale</i> - boundstongue - Class C</p>	<p>These 11 species have been added to the table.</p>

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

---

<p><i>Cytisus scoparius</i> - Scotchbroom - Class B-designate <i>Carduus nutans</i> - musk thistle - Class B-designate <i>Euphorbia myrsinites</i> - Myrtle spurge - Class C upstream, on river bank <i>Hypochaeris radicata</i> - common catsear - Class B-designate <i>Onopordum acanthium</i> - Scotch thistle - Class B-designate <i>Polygonum bohemicum</i> - Bohemian knotweed - Class B-designate <i>Polygonum cuspidatum</i> - Japanese knotweed - Class B-designate <i>Senecio jacobaea</i> - tansy ragwort - Class B-designate</p>	
--	--



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

---

**Item 164**

Lisa Rennie - Scope of work for cultural resources overview - Boundary Hydroelectric Project

Page 1

9/14/2005

**From:** Lisa Rennie  
**To:** Abrahamson, Randy; Bailey, Rich; Koehn, Glenn; Kramer, Steve; Lyons, Kevin; Pleasants, Camille; Whitlam, Rob  
**Subject:** Scope of work for cultural resources overview - Boundary Hydroelectric Project

Seattle City Light (SCL) is proposing to initiate work related to a cultural resources overview in support of the relicensing of the Boundary Hydroelectric Project. The attached document (Early Information Development Plan: Cultural Resources Overview) summarizes SCL's proposal related to this effort. It was prepared by, and will be implemented by our consultant, Western Shore Heritage Services, Inc. This work will serve as the basis for future work efforts/study plans and as such, we are seeking your input on the plan. I am requesting that you review the document and submit comments to me by **September 28, 2005**. If you have questions, please feel free to contact me at (206) 684-3793 or [lisa.ennie@seattle.gov](mailto:lisa.ennie@seattle.gov). Also, if you have trouble opening the file or would prefer to receive a hard copy of the document by mail, please contact me. Thank you in advance for your input.

Sincerely,

Lisa Rennie

**CC:** Andersen, Emily; Anderson, Finlay; Armstrong, John; Greene, Barbara; Hartmann, Glenn

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

---

**Item 165**

Name: Rob Whitlam  
Affiliation: Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation  
Title: State Archaeologist  
Discipline: Cultural  
Email Address: Rob.Whitlam@dahp.wa.gov  
Phone Number: 360.586.3080  
SCL Name: Lisa Rennie  
Date of Contact: 9/14/2005  
Reason for Contact: Called regarding Cultural Resources early information development effort and upcoming Boundary relicensing meetings.  
Information Provided:  
Information Obtained: Out of office until September 28.  
Follow-up Action Needed: Call again after September 28  
Comments: Left message

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

---

**Item 166**

Name: Steve Kramer  
Affiliation: USDA Forest Service, Colville National Forest  
Title: Forest Archaeologist & Heritage Program Manager  
Discipline: Cultural  
Email Address: skramer@fs.fed.us  
Phone Number: 509.684.7251  
SCL Name: Lisa Rennie  
Date of Contact: 9/15/2005  
Reason for Contact: Cultural Resources early information development effort and work session dates.  
Information Obtained:  
Follow-up Action Needed:  
Comments: Left message

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

---

**Item 167**

Name: Steve Kramer  
Affiliation: USDA Forest Service, Colville National Forest  
Title: Forest Archaeologist & Heritage Program Manager  
Discipline: Cultural  
Email Address: skramer@fs.fed.us  
Phone Number: 509.684.7251  
SCL Name: Lisa Rennie  
Date of Contact: 9/19/2005  
Reason for Contact: Comments of Cultural Resources EID  
Information Provided:  
Information Obtained: Date availability. Steve is reviewing the EID and will forward comments. Informed me that the Forest Service has an inventory design that we should consider in developing our methodology. Advised that we should contact Rich Bailey at BLM. Discussion of APE determination and linear sites.  
Follow-up Action Needed:  
Comments:

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

---

**Item 168**

**Name:** Mike Lithgow  
**Affiliation:** Pend Oreille County  
**Title:** Assistant Planner  
**Discipline:** local government  
**Email Address:** mlithgow@pendoreille.org  
**Phone number:** (509) 447-6457  
**EDAW Name:** Jeff Caudill  
**Date of Contact:** 9/22/2005  
**Reason for Contact:** Looking to obtain more documents from the county.  
**Information Provided:** None  
**Information Obtained:** Copy of the County's Critical Areas Ordinance (sent electronically) and Future Land Use Map (sent via standard mail).  
**Follow-up Action Needed:** none  
**Comments:** none

**Item 169**

**Memorandum**

Date: 9/20/2005

To: Consultation file

Barbara Greene and Lisa Rennie (SCL) met with Tom O'Keefe (American Rivers), Rebecca Sherman (Hydropower Reform Coalition) and Katilin Lovell (Trout Unlimited) here at SCL offices in Seattle, to discuss the potential involvement of these organizations in the relicensing.

**Item 170**

**Memorandum**

Date: 9/22/2005

To: Consultation file

Jeff Caudill (EDAW) emailed Mike Lithgow (Pend Oreille County) inquiring about obtaining more documents from the county. Copies of the County's Critical Areas Ordinance (sent electronically) and Future Land Use Map (sent via standard mail) were obtained.

**Item 171**

**Boundary Relicensing:  
Summary of 401 and TMDL Consultation Meeting with WDOE**

Attendees: Barbara Greene, Seattle City Light  
Christine Pratt of Seattle City Light  
Jean Parodi, 401 Certification, WDOE  
Jon Jones, TMDL Coordinator, WDOE

Date: September 27, 2005

**1. TDG TMDL**

**I. Update on timeline**

The TDG TMDL timeline has changed per the following: external draft (informal) deadline changed from Nov. '05 to Jan. '06. The external draft (public review) deadline changed from Jan. '06 to Mar. '06 (City Light opportunity to review).

The Advisory Group meets for first time Oct. 20 in Newport, and will include TDG discussion.

City Light proposed draft TDG TMDL implementation plan language. Jean Parodi liked the outline, no specific comments yet. She will forward the proposed language to Paul Pickett (WDOE) for further review.

**Ongoing data collection**

Christine discussed the current TDG Monitoring Stations that have been collecting data since 1999. She explained that the site was selected because it was determined to be the best place downstream where a station could be installed that provided uniform gas level readings across the channel, and where the meter can remain in place and not be destroyed by spill energy.

**II. Boundary dam operational issues**

Christine explained that the 2 newer Toshiba units operate with an air injection system to prevent cavitation, resulting in the addition of gas to powerhouse discharge. City Light Generation Engineering staff have worked on different operational scenarios to minimize gas production and discharge, but more studies are needed to gain further minimization.

**III. TDG spill events**

Christine shared spill data from 2002 showing two profile lines depicting the relationship of high flow/low TDG and increased flow/decreased slope of gas levels. The 1st relationship demonstrates that dams upstream with less hydraulic capacity than Boundary must open their gates and let high flow water pass through so at high flow, Boundary receives water with lower gas levels. The 2<sup>nd</sup> relationship demonstrates that with higher flows, water appears to reach a

physical limit on the ability to force more gas into solution, resulting in the slope of gas levels at increasing flow levels tapers off and almost levels out.

#### **IV. Compliance point**

Christine highlighted the difficulty in determining the compliance point at Boundary Dam. Discussion ensued about the mixing of the pH & spill waters, and the close proximity of the discharges. Jean commented that this dam appears similar to the challenges at Wells Dam, and that perhaps the downstream station does make sense. City Light replied that this had been discussed informally with Paul Pickett. Jean mentioned that the Box Canyon compliance point is six tenths of a mile downstream of their Dam because it was the closest point where turbulent energy from spill wouldn't disrupt/destroy the station. She suggested the issue be discussed with Ecology & City Light technical staff in a future meeting.

Next steps: City Light and WDOE staff will convene a meeting with technical staff from both organizations to discuss the TDG issues in more detail.

## **2. STATUS OF OTHER TMDLS**

#### **V. Temperature**

The temperature TMDL timeline is the same as that listed on current EAP Schedule.

The first Advisory Group meeting will be held on 10/20/05 in Newport.

Jon Jones said Tetra Tech has been hired –per EPA grant funding – to write the DIP for the temperature TMDL. Ruth Watkins will be explaining the role of Tetra Tech at the Advisory Group meeting in October.

Christine reviewed the Boundary Project Area map showing the temperature data collection sites where City Light is collecting data for 2004-2005 seasons, and the weather stations at both Box Canyon and Boundary forebay for the upcoming model runs.

#### **pH**

Jean explained Ecology's ambient monitoring data that records monthly grabs for the past 5-6 years at selected sites. One of these sites is at the Metaline Falls bridge where readings recorded in the later summer months of August and September were 8.6 - 8.7. Jean theorized that the higher summer month readings may be due to a combination of increased primary productivity coming from the Box Canyon Reservoir upstream and the natural geology of the area. WDOE does not collect data for upstream at Albeni Falls Dam. The pH listing will trigger development of an aquatic plant management plan for City Light per the 401 water quality certificate.

#### **Aldrin (pesticide)**

Aldrin is listed as a Category 5 parameter. The WDOE study on fish tissue in the Pend Oreille River states that aldrin should be moved to a Category 1 listing category. The WDOE process for removal as Category 5 will happen at the next 303(d) listing review by Ecology.

**VI. Tributary TMDLs**

The tributary TMDLs are not scheduled yet. Ecology's TMDL scoping activity occurs every 5 years; the next scoping session will focus on the Snake River tributaries.

**VII.**

**VIII. PCBs**

Total PCBs are the only chemical to exceed the national toxics rule in the Pend Oreille River. This chemical was studied in the fish tissue study; Ecology concluded that PCBs should remain a Category 5 listing but that fish tissue should be monitored by WDOE in 5 years. PCBs should be addressed in a statewide approach. City Light does not anticipate involvement in this TMDL now.

**3. 401 WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATE ISSUES**

**IX. Water quality attainment plan**

A water quality attainment plan is due to WDOE at the time of the application for 401 certification. Jean provided a CD with examples, including Box Canyon's DRAFT TDG Abatement Plan and AVISTA's TDG PME study. Jean emphasized that these are drafts and may need more work. The water quality attainment plan will need to address all water quality parameters, not just gas.

**X. Gas abatement plan**

Jean said this will be due at the time of the 401 application. She provided examples.

**XI. Existing and designated use study**

Jean will provide clarification on WDOE's expectation of this study and when it is due.

**XII. Toxics inventory by City Light**

Christine provided an overview of this effort and said the results will be available in the PAD.

**XIII. Fecal coliform**

Jean asked if City Light had any septic discharges to the water. Christine responded that all septic waste in the Boundary area is managed on-site with a land-based septic system. There are no other known sources. Jean said she has never raised this as a concern at other dams. The ambient monitoring database shows no concerns. Monthly grab samples of nutrient loading (nitrogen and phosphorous) show fairly low readings, resulting in little concern. City Light will address this parameter in the water quality attainment plan, but it doesn't appear to be a significant effort.

City Light is not collecting this data, but will work with other interested parties in the study planning phase of Boundary relicensing. WDOE agreed with this approach. This provides the

opportunity to hear questions and concerns of interested parties. WDOE agreed with this approach.

**XIV. Nutrients, chlorophyll a**

City Light is not collecting this data, but will work with other interested parties in the study planning phase of Boundary relicensing. WDOE agreed with this approach. This provides the opportunity to hear questions and concerns of interested parties. WDOE agreed with this approach.

**XV.**

**XVI. Exotics, invasive species**

Jean stated City Light will need to develop an aquatics plant management plan.

**4. Other discussion:**

Barbara sought input from WDOE on the configuration of Work Groups. Jean observed that issues get bogged down when fish/aquatics are grouped with water quality. While there are clear overlaps, the bulk of time tends to be spent on fisheries issues. Jean recommended keeping the groups small to allow work to proceed.

**Washington State Department of Ecology & Seattle City Light**

Tuesday, September 27, 2005

**Proposed Agenda**

1. TDG TMDL
  - Update on timeline
  - City Light's draft summary Implementation Strategy
    - Ongoing data collection
    - Boundary Dam operational issues
    - TDG in spill events
    - Compliance point
2. 401 Issues
  - Water quality attainment plan – timeline, examples
  - Gas abatement plan – timeline, examples
  - Existing and designated use study – timeline, examples
  - Toxics inventory by City Light
  - Fecal coliform
  - Nutrients, chlorophyll A
  - Exotics, invasive species
3. Status of Other TMDLs
  - Temperature
  - pH
  - Pesticides

**Item 172**

**Name:** Kevin Lyons

**Affiliation:** Kalispel Natural Resources Division

**Title:** Archaeologist

**Discipline:** Cultural Resources

**Email Address:** kjlyons@knrd.org

**Phone Number:** 509.445.1147

Tour Participants: Kevin Lyons (KNRD), Glenn Hartmann (WSHS), and Lisa Rennie (SCL)

**Date of Contact:** 9/29/2005

Reason for Contact: Joint Kalispel Reservation cultural sites and Boundary Reservoir tour

**Information Provided:** Tour of the Boundary Reservoir started at Metaline Park.

We traveled upstream to Box Canyon Dam along the west side of the River and then downstream to Boundary Dam along the east bank (stopping to go ashore at SCL Wildlife lands) and then back upstream to Metaline Park along the west side of the River.

Information Obtained: Site tour on the Kalispel Reservation to provide a context for archaeological sites that might be found within the Boundary Project area. We also learned that many of the sites on the Reservation have an associated fishing component.

**Follow-up Action Needed:**

**Comments:**

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

---

**Item 173**

Name: Jeni Forman  
Affiliation: Tri-County Economic Development District  
Title: Executive Director  
Discipline: Socio Economics  
Email Address: jforman@pplx.com  
Phone Number: 509.684.4571  
SCL Name: Lisa Rennie  
Date of Contact: 10/6/2005  
Reason for Contact: Called to introduce myself to Jeni and to find out if the Pend Oreille County Economic Development Specialist position had been filled. Also, to provide information on Boundary Relicensing process  
Information Provided: See above  
Information Obtained: Updated contact information for Jeni & contact information for Joshua Hall  
Follow-up Action Needed: Add Jeni to Boundary relicensing contact list.  
Comments: Joshua should be first contact for information, however please call if additional information is needed.

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

---

**Item 174**

Name: Joshua Hall  
Affiliation: Tri-County Economic Development District  
Title: Economic Development Specialist – Pend Oreille County  
Discipline: Socio Economics  
Email Address: jhall\_tedd@povn.com  
Phone Number: 509.447-5569  
SCL Name: Lisa Rennie  
Date of Contact: 10/6/2005  
Reason for Contact: Called to introduce myself to Joshua who recently took the Pend Oreille County Economic Development Specialist position. Also, to provide information on Boundary Relicensing process  
Information Provided: See above  
Information Obtained: Name and contact information  
Follow-up Action Needed: Add Joshua to Boundary relicensing contact list.  
Comments: Left message

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

---

**Item 175**

Name: Lauren McCroskey  
Affiliation: US Army Corp of Engineers  
Title: Architectural Historian  
Discipline: Cultural  
Email Address: Lauren.L.McCroskey@nws02.usace.army.mil  
Phone Number: 206.764.3538  
SCL Name: Lisa Rennie  
Date of Contact: 10/12/2005  
Reason for Contact: Provide information of Boundary relicensing process and determine appropriate contact person for cultural resources  
Information Provided: general information on relicensing process  
Information Obtained: US Army Corp contact name for archaeology: Lawr Salo (lawr.v.salo@nws02.usace.army.mil)  
Follow-up Action Needed: Emailed (10/14/2005) Lauren background information (Brief Description of Boundary Process and relicensing process) and Boundary relicensing web site.  
Comments: Lawr Salo currently on assignment in Mississippi, will look at information upon return in about a month.

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

---

**Item 176**

Lisa Rennie - Early Information Development Plan for Cultural Resources Overview

Page 1

10/14/2005

**From:** Lisa Rennie  
**To:** Abrahamson, Randy; Bailey, Rich; Koehn, Glenn; Kramer, Steve; Lyons, Kevin; Pleasants, Camille; Whittam, Rob  
**Subject:** Early Information Development Plan for Cultural Resources Overview

Attached is Seattle City Light's final Early Information Development Plan for a Cultural Resources Overview. This final plan includes (in Section 2.3) a brief discussion of comments received on the draft plan. Please feel free to share this plan with others who may be interested. Also, if you have any questions regarding the final plan, or you have trouble opening the file, please let me know. Thanks very much for your time and input.

Sincerely,

Lisa Rennie

**CC:** Andersen, Emily; Anderson, Finlay; Greene, Barbara; Hartmann, Glenn

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

---

**Item 177**

**Name:** Josh Hall

**Affiliation:** Tri-County Economic Development District

**Title:** Economic Development Specialist, Pend Oreille Co.

**Discipline:** Economic Development

**Email Address:** jhall@povn.com

**Phone number:** (800) 813-2032

**EDAW Name:** Jeff Caudill

**Date of Contact:** 10/24/2005

**Reason for Contact:** Gather Josh's perspective on the past, current, and future economic environment within Pend Oreille County.

**Information Provided:** none

**Information Obtained:** Discussed (1) the role of TEDD; (2) TEDD programs in Pend Oreille County; (3) Companies within the county and reasons they moved there; (4) Role of tourism & recreation in economy; (5) Contacts for real estate professionals and business owners.

**Follow-up Action Needed:** (1) Make sure I receive a copy of the North County Revitalization Plan; (2) Call contacts provided by Josh to obtain more information on local business and real estate activity

**Comments:**

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

---

**Item 178**

**Name:** Jim Marthaller  
**Affiliation:** Pend Oreille County  
**Title:** Planning Director  
**Discipline:** local government  
**Email Address:** jmarthaller@pendoreille.org  
**Phone number:** (509) 447-4821  
**EDAW Name:** Jeff Caudill  
**Date of Contact:** 6/2/2005  
**Reason for Contact:** Discussion about development and land use trends with county planner  
**Information Provided:** Review of progress to date in relicensing process.  
**Information Obtained:** Jim and I discussed recent development activities in Pend Oreille County, specifically focusing on northern Pend Oreille County. Discussed subdivision activities and the location of land use types in the county and along the project shore. Discussed expe  
**Follow-up Action Needed:** none  
**Comments:** none

**Item 179**

**Seattle City Light--Boundary Hydroelectric Project--Contacts**

**Tracking Number:** 64

**Date of Contact:** 11/16/2005

**Contact Information**

**Contacted By Information**

**Name:** Mark Cauchy

**Name:** A. Olson

**Affiliation:** Pend Oreille PUD

**Affiliation:** R2 Resource Consultants

**Title:** Director, Regulatory &  
Environmental Affairs

**Phone Number:** (425) 556-1288

**Discipline:**

**Email Address:** aolson@r2usa.com

**Phone Number:** (509) 447-5824

**Email Address:** mcauchy@poppud.com

**Reason for Contact:** I contacted Mark to obtain a report concerning adfluvial fish trapping.

**Information Provided:**

**Information Obtained:** Mark emailed the desired report.

**Follow-up Action Needed:** None.

**Comments:**

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

---

**Item 180**

Michele Lynn - Re: Seattle City Light Boundary Relicensing Request

Page 1

**From:** <Roberta\_Estes@blm.gov>  
**To:** "Barbara Greene" <barbara.greene@Seattle.Gov>  
**Date:** 11/17/2005 4:26:43 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Seattle City Light Boundary Relicensing Request

Hello Barbara:

Thanks for contacting me. Kevin Devitt is our Border Area Field Manager with primary responsibility for BLM lands within his area. He is also the primary point of contact for the Boundary Hydroproject. I've forwarded your message on to him. He'll contact you as to your information request.

His phone number is (509) 536-1263 and his e-mail is:  
Kevin\_Devitt@or.blm.gov

Again thanks for contacting me & good luck with you project.

Roberta (Robin) B. Estes  
Associate District Manager  
Spokane District Office  
1103 N. Fancher Rd.  
Spokane, WA 99212  
Desk (509) 536-1264  
Cell (509) 995-9213

"Barbara Greene"  
<barbara.greene@Seattle.Gov>  
11/17/2005 11:28 AM  
To  
<roberta\_estes@blm.gov>  
cc  
"Barbara Greene"  
<barbara.greene@Seattle.Gov>,  
"Michele Lynn"  
<michele.lynn@Seattle.Gov>  
Subject  
Seattle City Light Boundary  
Relicensing Request

Dear Robin,

---

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

---

I am contacting you to request your assistance relating to Seattle City Light's (SCL) relicensing process for the Boundary Hydroproject, located on the Pend Oreille River. SCL is in the process of developing the Preliminary Application Document (PAD) for submittal to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) in May, 2006. The PAD is the first major relicensing document required by FERC. We are required to summarize existing, relevant information about the project in the PAD, enabling agencies and interested parties to identify issues and develop study requests.

In April of this year, SCL was informed by BLM staff that information exists pertaining to the NE Lands Data Project. We understand that baseline data were collected for multiple resource areas, including sampling of 18 plots in the project vicinity. BLM has significant land holdings in the project area and data collected for these lands is important to fill gaps in our knowledge of the resources in the area. This information is likely to be highly relevant to the relicensing proceedings and we have not been successful in obtaining it from staff at the BLM Spokane District office. I am requesting your assistance in making this information available to us. Our draft PAD has placeholders for this pertinent information and we would like to incorporate it into the document before we circulate it for review within the City of Seattle.

Michele Lynn [phone: 206.386.4578] from our office is leading the recreation, land use and terrestrial resource areas for our relicensing process. She will call you in the next week to discuss this request. At that time, she will be happy to answer any questions you may have about the relicensing process, and would welcome a conversation regarding BLM's participation in the proceedings.

In addition, please feel free to contact me at 206.615.1091 with any questions. Thank you for your assistance.

Barbara Greene

Barbara Greene  
Boundary Relicensing Program Lead  
Seattle City Light  
206.615.1091  
barbara.greene@seattle.gov

**CC:** "Barbara Greene" <barbara.greene@Seattle.Gov>, "Michele Lynn" <michele.lynn@Seattle.Gov>, <Kevin\_Devitt@blm.gov>, <Rosemary\_Mazaika@blm.gov>, <AlTariq\_Samuels@blm.gov>

---

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

---

**Item 181**

**Name:** Randy Nelson

**Affiliation:** Coldwell Bankers/TEDD Economic Development Committee

**Title:** Real Estate Agent

**Discipline:**

**Email Address:**

**Phone number:** (509) 447-2421

**EDAW Name:** Jeff Caudill

**Date of Contact:** 11/18/2005

**Reason for Contact:** To discuss the recent real estate development trends in Pend Oreille County.

**Information Provided:** General information on the relicensing effort.

**Information Obtained:** Randy and I discussed development trends he has witnessed, focusing largely on north Pend Oreille County. Comparisons between activities in southern and northern portions of the county were made.

**Follow-up Action Needed:** none

**Comments:** none

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

---

**Item 182**

**Name:** Ken Stocks  
**Affiliation:** Kalispel Tribe of Indians  
**Title:**  
**Discipline:** Community Development  
**Email Address:** kstocks@kalispeltribe.com  
**Phone number:** (509) 445-1147  
**EDAW Name:** Jeff Caudill  
**Date of Contact:** 11/21/2005  
**Reason for Contact:** To gather socioeconomic information on the Kalispel Tribe of Indians.  
**Information Provided:** none  
**Information Obtained:** Ken will send an electronic copy of the Planning Document for the Kalispel Tribe of Indians (Executive Summary).  
**Follow-up Action Needed:** none  
**Comments:** Received Executive Summary from Ken.

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

---

**Item 1831**

Lisa Rennie - Re: Boundary Hydroelectric Project Relicensing

Page 1

**From:** Lisa Rennie  
**To:** Abrahamson, Randy  
**Date:** 11/23/2005 2:42:46 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Boundary Hydroelectric Project Relicensing

Mr Randy Abrahamson  
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer  
Spokane Tribe of Indians

Dear Mr. Abrahamson:

I am responding to your request for Township-Range-Sections (TRS) information for the Boundary Project to assist you in addressing traditional cultural properties (TCP) and cultural resources issues that the Spokane Tribe of Indians may have in relation to Seattle City Light's relicensing proceedings. We are in the process of producing more refined maps and information on the Project's boundaries and adjacent property ownership, which I will provide to you as soon as they are available. In the meantime, the attached USFS map has a TRS grid overlay. Although the Project's boundaries are not delineated on the map, the Project is generally within the following TRS:

Township 40 North, Range 43 E, Sections 3, 10, 11, 14, 15, 23, 26, and 35

Township 39 North, Range 43 E, Sections 2, 3, 10, 11, 15, 16, 21, 22, 28, 29, 32, and 33

Township 38 North, Range 43 E, Sections 4, 5, 7, 8, 17, 18, 19 and 20

In regard to a description of the Project scope, I am attaching a document which describes the relicensing process. Also, attached is an invitation to our next Boundary relicensing workshop, which is being held on Wednesday, November 30, 2005 from 9:00 am to 3:15 pm at the Red Lion River Inn, 700 N. Division, Spokane, WA. All sessions during the day will be held at the Red Lion River Inn. The Cultural Resources break out session will be held from 1:30 p.m. to 3:15 p.m. in the Clearwater Room. I hope that you will be able to join us.

Thank you for notifying us of the Spokane Tribe's interest in Boundary relicensing issues pertaining to traditional cultural properties and cultural resources. We look forward to working with you, and I will contact you next week to discuss any information needs you might have and, if you are not able to attend the November 30 workshop, to perhaps arrange a meeting.

Sincerely,

Lisa Rennie  
Cultural Resources Lead  
Boundary Relicensing Team

Lisa Rennie  
Office of External Affairs  
Seattle City Light  
PO Box 34023  
Seattle, WA 98124-4023  
(206) 684-3793

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential, proprietary, and/or privileged information protected by law. If you are not an intended recipient, you may not use, copy, or distribute this e-mail message or its

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

---

Lisa Rennie - Re: Boundary Hydroelectric Project Relicensing

Page 2

attachments. If you have received this e-mail message in error, please alert the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

>>> "Randy Abrahamson" <[randya@spokanetribe.com](mailto:randya@spokanetribe.com)> 11/18 10:23 AM >>>

November 18, 2005

Greg Nickels  
Mayor of Seattle

RE: Hydroelectric Project

Mr. Nickels:

Thank you for inviting the Spokane Tribe of Indians to be a consulting party is greatly appreciated.

Pursuant to compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and 36 CFR 800, we are hereby in consultation for this project.

I have received the letter of City of Seattle upcoming relicensing hydroelectric project

The Spokane Tribe would like township and range & section and the scope of work for this upcoming project to address traditional cultural properties (TCP) and cultural resources.

Should additional information comes available our assessment may be revised.

Please feel free to contact me at (509) 258-4315.

Again thank you for the opportunity to comment and consider this a positive action that will assist us in protecting our shared heritage.

Sincerely,

Randy Abrahamson  
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer

CC: Fiskin, Alec; Greene, Barbara

---

**Item 184**

Note from Barbara Greene: Nov 29, 2005 meeting with Rick Donaldson and Rich Torquemada (USFWS) to preview the Nov 30 workshop, review fisheries and water quality presentations from August 18, 2005 workshop; Al Solonsky also present

Item 185



**The Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation**

P.O. Box 150, Nespelem, WA 99155

(509) 634-2200

FAX: (509) 634-4116



November 30, 2005

Pleasants

Gregory J. Nickels, Mayor  
Seattle City Hall, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
600 Fourth Avenue,  
P.O. Box 94749  
Seattle, Washington 98124-4749

Attn: Barbara Greene, Relicensing Program Lead

Re: **Boundary Hydroelectric Project Relicensing, Pend Orielle County, Washington**

GU SFU  
TG L Direct  
JF John  
Holliday

Dear Mayor Nickels,

The Colville Confederated Tribal Historic Preservation Office has received and reviewed your correspondence of November 3, 2005, regarding the above referenced undertaking. We offer the following comments:

The project will take place within an area that is the traditional homeland of the Lakes tribe, a constituent of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation. The project area also lies along the eastern boundary of the original Colville Reservation. Should you discover Native American archaeological materials or human remains during your inventory efforts or during project implementation, please consult with us about appropriate treatment and disposition.

Thank you for your continued concerns about the cultural resources of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation. If you have any technical questions call Peter Noyes at (509) 634-2646. All other questions can be addressed to me at 509-634-2654.

Sincerely,

Camille Pleasants  
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer

CP/pn

cc: file (ferc 05)  
Chron

407

**Item 186**

**Seattle City Light--Boundary Hydroelectric Project--Contacts**

Tracking Number: 63

Date of Contact: 12/5/2005

**Contact Information**

**Contacted By Information**

Name: Joe DosSantos

Name: A. Olson

Affiliation: Avista Corporation

Affiliation: R2 Resource Consultants

Title: Fisheries Biologist

Phone Number: (425) 556-1288

Discipline:

Email Address: aolson@r2usa.com

Phone Number:

Email Address:

**Reason for Contact:** Joe called me in response to an email I sent to Tim Swant regarding the Native Salmonid Restoration Plan.

**Information Provided:**

**Information Obtained:** I asked Joe if anything major changes in course of action, or other developments occurred during 2005. Joe said it was a relatively quiet year. In general, things are progressing as expected. They deployed the trap below Noxon Rapids Dam, but no bull trout were captured this year. The number of fish captured at the Cabinet Gorge Hatchery ladder were also down with only 4 fish captured, when normal is around 40. Although there are occasional bumps in the road, mainly surrounding how much data is enough to make a decision, the process and relationships with the agencies and other stakeholders seem to be working relatively smoothly. Joe said the agencies are all on-board the trap-and-haul and tributary trapping approach, especially with the current administration.

**Follow-up Action Needed:** None.

**Comments:** Subsequent to my email to Tim Swant, I located Annual Reports and Implementation Plans prepared by Avista and the NSRP I had initially inquired about.

**Item 187**

**TDG TMDL & 401 Processes-Technical Discussion**  
**WA Department of Ecology & Seattle City Light**  
**Boundary Hydroelectric Project**  
**December 5, 2005**  
**Seattle**

**Agenda**

- I.** Update on timeline
  - a. TMDL & 401
  
- II.** Ongoing data collection
  - a. Continued data collection
  - b. New redundant meter
  - c. USGS TDG data website “live”
  
- III.** Boundary Dam operational testing
  - a. Non-spill: units 55 & 56 air admission testing (winter ‘05-’06)
  - b. Spill: in-house analytical tool for base case operations and sluice gates throttling
  
- IV.** Proposed Expert TDG panel

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

---

**Item 188**

Michele Lynn - Re: Boundary Dam Relicensing

Page 1

**From:** <Diane\_Stutzman@blm.gov>  
**To:** "Michele Lynn" <michele.lynn@Seattle.Gov>  
**Date:** 12/21/2005 2:28:27 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Boundary Dam Relicensing

Hi Michelle,  
Sandie Gourdin in our office will burn a disk for you and mail it out as soon as possible.  
Best holiday wishes,  
Diane

\*\*\*\*\*  
Diane Stutzman  
Botanist  
Bureau of Land Management  
Spokane District Office  
1103 N. Fancher Way  
Spokane, WA 99212-1275  
(509) 536-1250  
\*\*\*\*\*

"Michele Lynn"  
<michele.lynn@Seattle.Gov>  
To  
<Diane\_Stutzman@blm.gov>  
cc  
12/21/2005 11:57 AM  
Subject  
Re: Boundary Dam Relicensing

Diane,

It would be great if you'd burn them to a disk. You can send them to:

Michele Lynn  
Environmental Affairs Division  
Seattle City Light  
700 Fifth Ave., Suite 3300  
P.O. Box 34023  
Seattle, WA 98124-4023

---

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

---

Thanks very much!

Michele

>>> <Diane\_Stutzman@blm.gov> 12/20 7:16 AM >>>

Hello Michelle,  
I have located the documents you are interested in. They are available electronically, but are pretty large for e-mailing. Would you like them burned onto a disk and mailed to you? If so, to what address should I send them?  
Diane

\*\*\*\*\*  
Diane Stutzman  
Botanist  
Bureau of Land Management  
Spokane District Office  
1103 N. Fancher Way  
Spokane, WA 99212-1275  
(509) 536-1250  
\*\*\*\*\*

"Michele Lynn"  
<michele.lynn@Sea  
title.Gov>  
To <Diane\_Stutzman@blm.gov>  
12/15/2005 10:56  
cc AM  
Subject Re: Boundary Dam Relicensing

---

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

---

Diane,

I have a request for another document. I'd like to get a copy of the BLM's Resource Mgt. Plan that covers the area within the Boundary Project area. Do you have an electronic copy you can send? Thanks very much,

Michele Lynn

>>> <Diane\_Stutzman@blm.gov> 12/06 1:33 PM >>>

Hello Michele,  
Kevin Devitt gave me your name. Within the last two weeks I sent a packet of information to your office on BLM parcels within the area affected by the Boundary Dam. At that time, I am not certain whether our Metadata on the Northeast Lands Data Project was complete. Since then we have made some revisions to that information. The updated metadata is attached. If you need any additional information, feel free to contact me. I am working part-time this winter, and am generally in Monday- Wednesday. I will not be in Christmas or New Years' weeks.  
Sincerely,  
Diane Stutzman

(See attached file: NLDP\_METADATA.doc)

\*\*\*\*\*  
Diane Stutzman  
Botanist  
Bureau of Land Management  
Spokane District Office  
1103 N. Fancher Way  
Spokane, WA 99212-1275  
(509) 536-1250  
\*\*\*\*\*

---

**CC:** <Sandie\_Gourdin@blm.gov>

---

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

---

**Item 189**

Name: Steve Kramer  
Affiliation: USDA Forest Service, Colville National Forest  
Title: Forest Archaeologist & Heritage Program Manager  
Discipline: Cultural  
Email Address: skramer@fs.fed.us  
Phone Number: 509.684.7251  
SCL Name: Lisa Rennie  
Date of Contact: 1-?-2006  
Reason for Contact: February Workshop availability  
Information Provided: Workshop date  
Information Obtained: Discussion of Historic Property Management Plans (HPMP), Sec. 106 process, TCP.  
Follow-up Action Needed:  
Comments:

**Item 190**

**Name:** James Baxter

**Affiliation:** BC Hydro

**Title:**

**Discipline:**

**Email Address:**

**Name:** Al Solonsky

**Affiliation:** SCL

**Date of Contact:** 1/2/06

**Email Address:**

**Reason for Contact:** To find out the status of bull trout radio tagging study on the Salmo River.

**Information Provided:** I told James about our relicensing efforts. I told James that the USFS told us at a recent meeting about a potential radio tagging study on the Salmo River. I told James that we were interested in knowing more about it, if it was funded and how we might install a radio tag receiver at Boundary.

**Information Obtained:** James said that the study was planned, but not yet funded and not yet 100% sure. James told me that if it did move forward they would be using Lotek 2000 code set tags and we would need to make sure that our firmware on the receiver allows the data logger to be used as a logging station. James said he would probably know if the study was going to be funded in January or February.

**Follow-up Action Needed:** Call James back in January or February to see if the study is going to move forward.

**Comments:**

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

---

**Item 191**

From: "Kinsella Kevin POM" <Kevin.Kinsella@teckcominco.com>  
To: <christine.pratt@seattle.gov>  
Cc: "Brown Mark POM" <Mark.Brown@teckcominco.com>; "Godlewski Dave SPOK"  
<Dave.Godlewski@teckcominco.com>; "Morgan Brock POM"  
<Brock.Morgan@teckcominco.com>  
Subject: Solid Waste Site Assessment Report  
Date: Monday, January 16, 2006 9:48 AM

Christine,

Review of the draft solid waste site assessment report has been completed by Teck Cominco American Inc. The draft is attached for Seattle City Light's review and comment. I apologize for the delay in getting it to you. Call me if you have any questions.

I hope your holidays were good.

Kevin

Kevin E. Kinsella

Environmental Coordinator

Pend Oreille Mine

Teck Cominco American Inc.

O: (509) 446-5310

F: (509) 446-2830

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

---

**Item 192**

**Name:** James Baxter

**Affiliation:** BC Hydro

**Title:**

**Discipline:**

**Email Address:**

**Name:** Al Solonsky

**Affiliation:** SCL

**Date of Contact:** 1/18/06

**Email Address:**

**Reason for Contact:** I called to find out if the Salmo River bull trout tagging study was going to be funded.

**Information Provided:**

**Information Obtained:** James said that it was not yet known if BC Hydro was going to move forward with the study this spring. He thought it would, but approval had not yet been obtained from the Water Controller (an authorization in Canada like FERC).

**Follow-up Action Needed:** Call back later, maybe sometime in February.

**Comments:**

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

---

**Item 193**

From: "Barbara Greene" <barbara.greene@Seattle.Gov>

To: <maryv@aimcomm.com>; <arnw@amrivers.org>; <bswift@amrivers.org>; "Thomas O'Keefe" <okeefe@amwhitewater.org>; "Kim Meidal" <Km.Meidal@bchydro.bc.ca>; <maureen.dehaan@bchydro.bc.ca>; <power.records@bchydro.bc.ca>; "Vladimir Plesa" <Vladimir.Plesa@bchydro.bc.ca>; <eric.weiss@bchydro.com>; <gary.birch@bchydro.com>; "Harry Brownlow" <harry.brownlow@bchydro.com>; "Richard Bailey" <richard\_bailey@blm.gov>; "Lori Blau" <blaula@bowater.com>; <machtolfpa@bowater.com>; "Greg Vaughn" <vaughng@bowater.com>; <ssorby@cahnrs.wsu.edu>; "Bill Green" <bill@ccrirc.org>; "Judy McQuary" <judy.mcquary@columbiapower.org>; <lea.dreher@columbiapower.org>; "Llewellyn Matthews" <llewellyn.matthews@columbiapower.org>; <victor.jmaeff@columbiapower.org>; <bill.towey@colvilletribes.com>; "Patti Bailey" <patti.bailey@colvilletribes.com>; <tnturner@comcast.net>; <allysonb@cted.wa.gov>; "Rob Whitlam" <rob.whitlam@dahp.wa.gov>; <etulloch@deq.idaho.gov>; "Doug Robison" <robisdrl@DFW.WA.GOV>; <thepoint@direcway.com>; <daniel.millar@ec.gc.ca>; <dkni461@ecy.wa.gov>; <jbel461@ecy.wa.gov>; <jojo461@ecy.wa.gov>; <jpar461@ecy.wa.gov>; <rueda.helen@epa.gov>; <martin.don@epamail.epa.gov>; "Ardis Bynum" <abynum@fs.fed.us>; "Diana Sieh" <dhsieh@fs.fed.us>; <gkoehn@fs.fed.us>; <jridlington@fs.fed.us>; "Kathy Ahlenslager" <kahlenslager@fs.fed.us>; <lwilson@fs.fed.us>; <mbodie@fs.fed.us>; "Steve Kramer" <skramer@fs.fed.us>; "Tom Shuhda" <tshuhda@fs.fed.us>; <rich\_torquemada@fws.gov>; <rick\_donaldson@fws.gov>; <colin.spence@gov.bc.ca>; <daymon.trachsel@gov.bc.ca>; <kathy.eichenberger@gov.bc.ca>; <northwest@hydroreform.org>; <jime@iac.wa.gov>; "Neil Aaland" <neila@iac.wa.gov>; <mmaiolie@idfg.idaho.gov>; "Deane Osterman" <dosterman@knrd.org>; "Floyd Finley" <ffinley@knrd.org>; "John Gross" <jgross@knrd.org>; "Joe Maroney" <jmaroney@knrd.org>; "Kevin Lyons" <klyons@knrd.org>; "Ray Entz" <rentz@knrd.org>; <susanh@msn.com>; <keith.kirkendall@noaa.gov>; <mark.schneider@noaa.gov>; <stephanie\_toothman@nps.gov>; <susan\_rosebrough@nps.gov>; <jking@nwcouncil.org>; <shorton@nwcouncil.org>; <tgrover@nwcouncil.org>; "Lawr Salo" <lawr.v.salo@nws02.usace.army.mil>; <kathy\_helm@or.blm.gov>; <kurtzj@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca>; <jim.harris@parks.wa.gov>; "Jeni Forman" <jforman@plix.com>; <don@pocd.org>; <jonley@popud.com>; <mcauchy@popud.com>; <faith@povn.com>; "Josh Hall" <jhall\_tedd@povn.com>; <sparky@povn.com>; <dan\_trochta@r1.fws.gov>; <ruthtristatecouncil@sandpoint.net>; "John Halliday" <HallidJ@Seattle.Gov>; "Randy Abrahamson" <randya@spokanetribe.com>; <gerry@streamkeepers.bc.ca>; <bill.duncan@teckcominco.com>; <dave.godlewski@teckcominco.com>; <Kevin.Kinsella@teckcominco.com>; "Mark Tiley" <mark.tiley@telus.net>; <fkrause@tnc.org>; "Kaitlin Lovell" <klovell@tu.org>; <marian.l.valentine@usace.army.mil>; <cindy.preston@wadnr.gov>; <kurt@washingtontrotout.org>  
Cc: <sdpadula@aol.com>; "Emily Andersen" <andersen991@comcast.net>; "David Turner" <David.Turner@ferc.gov>; <Finlay\_Anderson@longviewassociates.com>; <kdemsey@longviewassociates.com>; "Al Solonsky" <Al.Solonsky@Seattle.Gov>; "Arlene Ragozin" <Arlene.Ragozin@Seattle.Gov>; "Barbara Greene" <barbara.greene@Seattle.Gov>; "Carol Butler" <carol.butler@Seattle.Gov>; "Christine Pratt" <Christine.Pratt@Seattle.Gov>; "Doug Rough" <doug.rough@Seattle.Gov>; "John Armstrong" <john.armstrong@Seattle.Gov>; "Kim Pate" <Kim.Pate@Seattle.Gov>; "Laura Wishik" <Laura.Wishik@Seattle.Gov>; "Lisa Rennie" <Lisa.Rennie@Seattle.Gov>; "Lynn Best" <lynn.best@Seattle.Gov>; "Michele Lynn" <michele.lynn@Seattle.Gov>; "Mike Haynes" <mike.haynes@Seattle.Gov>; "Tom Van Bronkhorst" <tom.vanbronkhorst@Seattle.Gov>; "William Foster" <William.Foster@Seattle.Gov>  
Subject: Boundary Relicensing Workshop Agenda, Notice of Summary toCome  
Date: Tuesday, January 24, 2006 10:44 AM

**Agenda**

Attached is the agenda for the Boundary relicensing workshop scheduled for Thursday, February 16, 2006. Please note that we will discuss dates for work group meetings at the February 16 workshop.

**November 30 meeting summary**

The meeting summary from the November 30, 2005 workshop is now posted on the City Light Boundary relicensing website.

**Identified Resource Issues & Study Needs Summary**

To enhance discussion at the February 16 workshop, City Light will be

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

---

providing you with a summary of the identified resource issues and potential studies that we anticipate will be included in the Preliminary Application Document (PAD) to be issued in early May. The summary will also include information on known or potential adverse impacts, and existing protection, mitigation, and enhancement measures, to the extent that this type of information has been developed. This summary will be available on City Light's website - [www.seattle.gov/light/News/Issues/BndryRelic/default.asp](http://www.seattle.gov/light/News/Issues/BndryRelic/default.asp) An email will be sent to you notifying you when the document has been posted.

The summary will reflect our current thinking with regard to resource issues and study needs based on our review of existing relevant information, and discussions with many of you. As you know, we have been working on the PAD in earnest and significant additional work is needed to complete the document for an early May publication. We look forward to your comments at the workshop on the summary of issues and studies, but given the constraints of the Integrated Licensing Process we anticipate that they will be most useful in informing the proposed study plan, rather than the PAD. Our main focus in 2006 will be working with you to identify potential studies needed to fill data gaps, which will inform our proposed study plan to be filed with FERC later this fall.

**Work group meeting schedule**

An important goal for the February 16 workshop is to discuss a calendar for a series of workgroup meetings where we can jointly analyze the details of needed studies in each of the resource areas. These proposed dates will be sent to you in advance of the workshop in an effort to finalize a 2006 schedule.

City Light continues to welcome your ideas on issues and study needs regarding the Boundary Project relicensing and appreciates your continued involvement. We look forward to seeing you on February 16 in Spokane.

Please feel free to contact me with questions at 206.615.1091 or by response to this email.

Thanks,  
Barbara

Barbara Greene  
Boundary Relicensing Program Lead  
Seattle City Light  
206.615.1091  
[barbara.greene@seattle.gov](mailto:barbara.greene@seattle.gov)

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

---

Boundary Relicensing Workshop  
February 16, 2006  
**Oakwood Quality Inn**  
7919 N. Division  
Spokane, WA  
**AGENDA**

Goals of Meeting:

1. Update on new City Light 2006 efforts
2. Solicit feedback on Issues & Study Needs Summary
3. 2006 work group meeting schedule

Coffee	Cascade C	8:00am – 8:30am
Introductory Session ( <i>Barbara Greene</i> ) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review goals of meeting, agenda</li> <li>• Schedule update</li> <li>• Discuss Issues &amp; Study Needs Summary</li> <li>• Goals of break out sessions <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Update on new City Light 2006 efforts</li> <li>b. Feedback on Issues &amp; Study Needs Summary</li> <li>c. 2006 work group meeting schedule</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	Cascade C	8:30am - 8:45am
General Q & A	Cascade C	8:45am – 9:00am
Boundary reservoir data overview ( <i>Kim Pate</i> ) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water levels</li> <li>• Flow fluctuations</li> </ul>	Cascade C	9:00am – 9:30am
Break		9:30am - 9:45am
Concurrent work group sessions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Terrestrial (<i>Michele Lynn</i>)</li> <li>• Water Quality (<i>Christine Pratt</i>)</li> <li>• Cultural (<i>Lisa Rennie</i>)</li> </ul>	Oakwood Cascade C Northwood	9:45am – 12:00pm
Lunch	On Your Own	12:00pm-1:30pm
Concurrent break out sessions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fish &amp; Aquatics (<i>Al Solonsky</i>)</li> <li>• Recreation, land use, aesthetics, socioeconomics (<i>Michele Lynn, Lisa Rennie</i>)</li> </ul>	Cascade C Oakwood	1:30pm – 4:15pm
Closing Remarks	Cascade C	4:15pm – 4:30pm

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

---

**Item 194**

From: "Pickett, Paul" <PPic461@ECY.WA.GOV>  
To: "Christine Pratt" <Christine.Pratt@Seattle.Gov>  
Subject: RE: New TDG meter  
Date: Wednesday, January 25, 2006 9:51 AM

Christine,

Actually I'm booked already on the 16th, so I'll have to send regrets.

Also, I've been totally booked with Lake Whatcom so I haven't done anything with PendO TDG. However, that may change soon. I'll let you know when it does.

Paul

-----Original Message-----

From: Christine Pratt [mailto:Christine.Pratt@Seattle.Gov]  
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2006 9:34 AM  
To: Pickett, Paul  
Subject: RE: New TDG meter

Paul - Gosh, sorry you didn't know about our next Boundary Relicensing Workshop in February.

Feb. 16th is the date - in Spokane - at the Quality Inn at 7919 Division. Would be good if you could be there.

Please let me know if you plan to attend...hope so.

Also - are you going to be around today? Wanted to talk to follow-up from our 12/05 meeting here in Seattle - check in on your review of the TDG Reports we provided and further thoughts you may have on gas -

I'll try and catch up with you this afternoon -

Christine

>>> "Pickett, Paul" <PPic461@ECY.WA.GOV> 01/25 9:19 AM >>>  
Thanks for the news, Christine.

I haven't heard about the Feb workshop - what's going on?

Paul

-----Original Message-----

From: Christine Pratt [mailto:Christine.Pratt@Seattle.Gov]

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

---

Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2006 9:36 AM  
To: Jones, Jon W.; Parodi, Jean; Pickett, Paul  
Cc: Al Solonsky  
Subject: Fwd: New TDG meter

Jean, Jon & Paul - FYI -

Attached is an e-mail from Al Solonsky notifying us all that the 2nd TDG meter downstream of Boundary Dam is to be installed this week.

See you at our February Workshop in Spokane!

Christine  
206.386.4571

**Item 195**

From: <Jake\_Jakabosky@blm.gov>  
To: "Christine Pratt" <Christine.Pratt@Seattle.Gov>  
Subject: Re: Fwd: SCL Boundary -- Flume Creek Ownership (Version 01/10/06)  
Date: Wednesday, January 25, 2006 9:05 AM

The map is interesting but raises more questions than it answers. It indicates "other Public", probably the State, owning portions of the west river bank upstream of Flume Creek. This appears to be on the same surveyed 200 vertical foot above-the-river contour as that shown as SCL property around Flume Cr. In addition, the "unknown" ownership on Flume Creek is also an extension of the same surveyed 200 ft. contour shown on the "Project No. 2144, Exhibit K, Sheet 4" (labeled "Project Boundary Line") and on the BLM Master Title Plats as "Federal Power Commission Order of 10/30/1953, Power Project 2144".

It would also be helpful, as long as we are going to this effort, to know who owns the river banks within 100 feet of the river at the Pend Oreille Mine Air Shaft (aka 500 Raise) about 1/3 mile north of Flume Creek (and adjacent to a tiny island in the river) on the west side of the river. This site, located directly across the river from Teck Cominco's Pend Oreille Mine, will be an issue soon as EPA has been investigating it and it is definitely an environmental problem.

In addition, the green indicating USA due east of the mouth of Flume Cr. on the east edge of the map is neither BLM nor Forest Service owned Public Lands.

We are going to need much more sophisticated survey maps to solve these issues. I hope we can do that very soon.

Jake Jakabosky (Joel)  
Environmental Protection Specialist  
US Bureau of Land Management  
1103 N. Fancher Rd., Spokane, WA 99212  
(509) 536-1221, Fax (509) 536-1275  
Jake\_Jakabosky@or.blm.gov

"Far and away the best prize that life offers is the chance to work hard at work worth doing." Theodore Roosevelt.

**Item 196**

>>>> Kim Pate 02/08 11:18 AM >>>>

> Hi Christine,

>

> Attached is 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 hourly data listing forebay and

>

> tailwater elevations (NDVD 1929), inflow and discharge (cfs), and spill

> (cfs).

>

> I'll ask Wing to provide the 2005 data sheet to append to this file.

>

> Kim

>

> Kimberly Pate, M.S., P.E.

> Seattle City Light

> 700 5th Avenue, Suite 3300

> P.O. Box 34023

> Seattle, WA 98124-4023

> PH: 206.684.3705

> FAX: 206.684.3799

> [kim.pate@seattle.gov](mailto:kim.pate@seattle.gov)

>

>

>>>> Christine Pratt 2/7/2006 3:59 PM >>>>

> Kim - Regarding Paul's request for "river and spill flows for  
> 2001-2005", in what form would we have such information?

>

> 1. For spill flows - are we talking total cfs in each of the calendar  
> years?

> 2. For river flows - are we talking total cfs per day, per month, per  
> year? How is this typically reported - and what do we have that we  
> could send to Paul?

>

> Thanks.

> C.

>

>>>> ["Pickett, Paul" <PPic461@ECY.WA.GOV>](mailto:PPic461@ECY.WA.GOV) 02/06 2:51 PM >>>>

> Christine,

>

> I just got off the phone with Brett Smith at USGS, and it looks like  
> they'll be able to get me the TDG and temperature data I need. That

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

---

> leaves just the river and spill flows for 2001 through 2005. Let me  
> know  
> if you have any questions.  
>  
> Paul  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> [From: Christine Pratt \[mailto:Christine.Pratt@Seattle.Gov\]](mailto:Christine.Pratt@Seattle.Gov)  
> Sent: Friday, February 03, 2006 8:00 AM  
> To: Pickett, Paul  
> Subject: Re: Update on Box Canyon TDG data  
>  
>  
> Hi Paul - Sorry about not getting back with you sooner. But realizing  
> the extent of your data request has sent me in many different  
> directions  
> here - and raising some questions about how we can meet your needs.  
>  
> So - in order to make sure we provide what you want - and in the  
> format  
> that will be helpful to you - think it best that we get all the right  
> parties on a quick phone call and talk this through.  
>  
> Folks on our end would be Al, Dan Kirschbaum, Alex Byrne and Kim  
Pate  
> (I think you met all these folks at our Dec. 5th meeting).  
>  
> I'm thinking about a day next week - let me know when you'll be  
> available next week and I'll try and get this troop together for a  
> 30-45  
> minute call.  
>  
> Thanks, Paul.  
> Christine  
>  
> [>>>> "Pickett, Paul" <PPic461@ECY.WA.GOV> 01/26 4:07 PM >>>](mailto:PPic461@ECY.WA.GOV)  
> Christine,  
>  
> I am trying to get back into the Pend Oreille TDG TMDL project, so I'd  
> like to get caught up with data and reports.  
>  
> I have the USGS published TDG data for 200-2002, which only has daily

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

---

- > max, min, and average. What I would like is continuous TDG, river
- > flows,
- > spill flow, Barometric pressure, DO, and temperature data for the the
- > spill season for 2001 through 2005 (every quarter hour, hour, or at
- > whatever frequency the USGS is collecting it).
- >
- > Thanks for your help on this. Let me know if you have any questions.
- > I'll be reviewing all the existing report over the next week, so maybe
- > we can talk later next week about where I'm headed with this.
- >
- > Paul
- >
- > Paul J. Pickett, P.E.
- > Water Quality Engineer
- > Environmental Assessment Program
- > Washington State Dept. of Ecology
- > P.O. Box 47710
- > Olympia, WA 98504-7710
- >
- > voice (360) 407-6882
- > fax (360) 407-6884

**Item 197**

From: "Jeff Caudill" <CaudillJ@edaw.com>  
To: "Karen Demsey" <kdemsey@easystreet.com>  
Subject: Fwd: RE: Please Pass along to Josh Hall  
Date: Thursday, February 02, 2006 2:02 PM

Karen,  
See reply below in response to my inquiry about the river boat tours.

-J

>>> "EDC" <edc@povn.com> 2/2/2006 2:00 PM >>>

Jeff,

Sorry took so long to get back. The riverboat idea has morphed somewhat, and is a long way out. Tentatively there would be two smaller river boats, one servicing south county and the other servicing north county, but it all takes place in the Box Canyon reservoir. To my knowledge they will go as far as Ione.

The operation would most likely be based in Newport and Cusick or Ione.

Let me know if there is anything else you need.

Joshua Hall  
Economic Development Specialist - Pend Oreille County  
Tri-County Economic Development District  
301 West Spruce, Suite E  
Newport, WA 99156  
Voice: (509) 447-5569  
Fax: (509) 447-3709  
Email: jhall\_tedd@povn.com  
Web: www.teddonline.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Jeff Caudill [mailto:CaudillJ@edaw.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2006 12:06 PM  
To: edc@povn.com  
Subject: Please Pass along to Josh Hall

Hey Josh,  
You and I spoke a few months ago about economic development in Pend Oreille County and I just had a follow up question (our reviewers were wondering):

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

---

You mentioned a new river boat cruise along the Pend Oreille River has been proposed.

Do you happen to know whether this tour would be on Boundary Reservoir or another part of the river? Also, do you know where along the river boat cruise would be based?

Your help is appreciated. Thanks.

-J

Jeff Caudill  
Planner  
EDAW, Inc.  
815 Western Ave  
Seattle, WA 98104  
(206) 267-7758

**Item 198**

**From:** [Christine Pratt](#)

**To:** [Doug Robison](#) ; [dkni461@ecy.wa.gov](#) ; [jojo461@ecy.wa.gov](#) ; [jpar461@ecy.wa.gov](#) ; [ppic461@ecy.wa.gov](#) ; [Tom Shuhda](#) ; [John Gross](#) ; [Michelle Wingert](#) ; [Dan Trochta](#) ; [Rick Donaldson](#)

**Cc:** [SDPADULA@aol.com](#) ; [andersen991@comcast.net](#) ; [Randall Filbert](#) ; [mkeefe@r2usa.com](#) ; [Al Solonsky](#) ; [Barbara Greene](#) ; [John Armstrong](#) ; [Kim Pate](#) ; [Michele Lynn](#) ; [jim@taylorassoc.net](#)

**Sent:** Friday, February 03, 2006 11:18 AM

**Subject:** Scope of Work - Water Quality Sampling 2006

Greetings All -

Attached is the 2006 Scope of Work (SOW) that our Consultant (Taylor & Associates, Inc.) will implement in 2006 in regard to water quality sampling. This e-mail is follow-up to a request made at our Boundary Project Relicensing Workshop in November (Spokane) to provide copy of this upcoming work.

The 2006 field work will begin in the Spring and continue through the Fall. The bulk of this work will be a continuation of the field work done in 2005, with a couple of exceptions. In 2006, we have added nutrients and total hardness parameters for laboratory analysis. In addition, we will be conducting a small pilot study to help assess the effect(s) of macrophyte beds on water chemistry, pH in particular.

This field work will support both the temperature TMDL underway and future study development in the upcoming preliminary study planning (PSP) phase of relicensing.

In the event you have questions about this SOW, please contact SCL (me) vs. our Consultant; we prefer to work directly with our stakeholders. In that regard, the upcoming February Workshop (Feb. 16th in Spokane) may be a good opportunity to ask questions you may have. Course, there's always the phone or e-mail, feel free to contact me anytime.

Thanks for your interest and involvement in our Boundary Relicensing efforts.

Christine Pratt  
Water Quality Lead - Boundary Project Relicensing  
Seattle City Light  
206.386.4571  
[christine.pratt@seattle.gov](mailto:christine.pratt@seattle.gov)

**Item 199**

Email from Jean Parodi (WDOE), to Christine Pratt (SCL), Feb. 6, 2006:

Hi Christine- Here's the report and some graphs from the study the  
> Pend  
> Oreille PUD did to look at the relative effects of a macrophyte bed on  
> DO, pH and temperature. (The report says "draft", but I don't seem to  
> have a "final" on my computer. I don't recall it changed a great  
> deal.)  
> I'm not sure I'd think of this as very rigorous and definitive, but I  
> think it probably does paint a general picture of what you might  
> expect.  
>  
> See you next week,  
>  
> Jean  
>

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

---

**Item 200**

----- Original Message -----

From: "Barbara Greene" <[barbara.greene@Seattle.Gov](mailto:barbara.greene@Seattle.Gov)>  
To: <[maryv@aimcomm.com](mailto:maryv@aimcomm.com)>; <[arnw@amrivers.org](mailto:arnw@amrivers.org)>; <[bswift@amrivers.org](mailto:bswift@amrivers.org)>;  
"Thomas  
O'Keefe" <[okeefe@amwhitewater.org](mailto:okeefe@amwhitewater.org)>; <[sdpadula@aol.com](mailto:sdpadula@aol.com)>; "Kim Meidal"  
<[Km.Meidal@bchydro.bc.ca](mailto:Km.Meidal@bchydro.bc.ca)>; <[maureen.dehaan@bchydro.bc.ca](mailto:maureen.dehaan@bchydro.bc.ca)>;  
<[power.records@bchydro.bc.ca](mailto:power.records@bchydro.bc.ca)>; "Vladimir Plesa"  
<[Vladimir.Plesa@bchydro.bc.ca](mailto:Vladimir.Plesa@bchydro.bc.ca)>; <[eric.weiss@bchydro.com](mailto:eric.weiss@bchydro.com)>;  
<[gary.birch@bchydro.com](mailto:gary.birch@bchydro.com)>; "Harry Brownlow" <[harry.brownlow@bchydro.com](mailto:harry.brownlow@bchydro.com)>;  
"Paul Vassilev" <[paulvassilev@bchydro.com](mailto:paulvassilev@bchydro.com)>; "Richard Bailey"  
<[richard\\_bailey@blm.gov](mailto:richard_bailey@blm.gov)>; "Lori Blau" <[blaula@bowater.com](mailto:blaula@bowater.com)>;  
<[machtolfpa@bowater.com](mailto:machtolfpa@bowater.com)>; "Greg Vaughn" <[vaughng@bowater.com](mailto:vaughng@bowater.com)>;  
<[ssorby@cahnrs.wsu.edu](mailto:ssorby@cahnrs.wsu.edu)>; "Bill Green" <[bill@ccrirc.org](mailto:bill@ccrirc.org)>; "Judy McQuary"  
<[judy.mcquary@columbiapower.org](mailto:judy.mcquary@columbiapower.org)>; <[lea.dreher@columbiapower.org](mailto:lea.dreher@columbiapower.org)>; "Llewellyn  
Matthews" <[llewellyn.matthews@columbiapower.org](mailto:llewellyn.matthews@columbiapower.org)>;  
<[victor.jmaeff@columbiapower.org](mailto:victor.jmaeff@columbiapower.org)>; <[bill.towey@colvilletribes.com](mailto:bill.towey@colvilletribes.com)>; "Patti  
Bailey" <[patti.bailey@colvilletribes.com](mailto:patti.bailey@colvilletribes.com)>; "Sheri Sears"  
<[sheri.sears@colvilletribes.com](mailto:sheri.sears@colvilletribes.com)>; "Emily Andersen"  
<[andersen991@comcast.net](mailto:andersen991@comcast.net)>; "Terry Turner" <[tturner@comcast.net](mailto:tturner@comcast.net)>;  
<[allysonb@cted.wa.gov](mailto:allysonb@cted.wa.gov)>; "Rob Whitlam" <[rob.whitlam@dahp.wa.gov](mailto:rob.whitlam@dahp.wa.gov)>;  
<[etulloch@deq.idaho.gov](mailto:etulloch@deq.idaho.gov)>; "Doug Robison" <[robisdlr@DFW.WA.GOV](mailto:robisdlr@DFW.WA.GOV)>;  
<[thepoint@direcway.com](mailto:thepoint@direcway.com)>; "Paul Hohlt" <[4paul2hohlt@earthlink.net](mailto:4paul2hohlt@earthlink.net)>; "Jim  
Carney" <[acquarterhorses@earthnet.ws](mailto:acquarterhorses@earthnet.ws)>; <[daniel.millar@ec.gc.ca](mailto:daniel.millar@ec.gc.ca)>;  
<[dkni461@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:dkni461@ecy.wa.gov)>; <[jbel461@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:jbel461@ecy.wa.gov)>; <[jojo461@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:jojo461@ecy.wa.gov)>;  
<[jpar461@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:jpar461@ecy.wa.gov)>; "Chuck Everett" <[everettca@edaw.com](mailto:everettca@edaw.com)>;  
<[McShaneC@edaw.com](mailto:McShaneC@edaw.com)>; "Jill Sterrett" <[sterrettj@edaw.com](mailto:sterrettj@edaw.com)>; "Rn Tressler"  
<[tressler@edaw.com](mailto:tressler@edaw.com)>; <[rueda.helen@epa.gov](mailto:rueda.helen@epa.gov)>; <[martin.don@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:martin.don@epamail.epa.gov)>;  
"Ardis Bynum" <[abynum@fs.fed.us](mailto:abynum@fs.fed.us)>; "Diana Sieh" <[dhsieh@fs.fed.us](mailto:dhsieh@fs.fed.us)>; "Debbie  
Wilkins" <[dwilkins@fs.fed.us](mailto:dwilkins@fs.fed.us)>; <[gkoehn@fs.fed.us](mailto:gkoehn@fs.fed.us)>; <[jridlington@fs.fed.us](mailto:jridlington@fs.fed.us)>;  
"Kathy Ahlenslager" <[kahlenslager@fs.fed.us](mailto:kahlenslager@fs.fed.us)>; <[jwilson@fs.fed.us](mailto:jwilson@fs.fed.us)>;  
<[mbodie@fs.fed.us](mailto:mbodie@fs.fed.us)>; "Steve Kramer" <[skramer@fs.fed.us](mailto:skramer@fs.fed.us)>; "Tom Shuhda"  
<[tshuhda@fs.fed.us](mailto:tshuhda@fs.fed.us)>; <[rich\\_torquemada@fws.gov](mailto:rich_torquemada@fws.gov)>; <[rick\\_donaldson@fws.gov](mailto:rick_donaldson@fws.gov)>;  
<[colin.spence@gov.bc.ca](mailto:colin.spence@gov.bc.ca)>; <[daymon.trachsel@gov.bc.ca](mailto:daymon.trachsel@gov.bc.ca)>;  
<[kathy.eichenberger@gov.bc.ca](mailto:kathy.eichenberger@gov.bc.ca)>; <[northwest@hydroreform.org](mailto:northwest@hydroreform.org)>;  
<[jime@iac.wa.gov](mailto:jime@iac.wa.gov)>; "Neil Aaland" <[neila@iac.wa.gov](mailto:neila@iac.wa.gov)>;  
<[mmaiolie@idfg.idaho.gov](mailto:mmaiolie@idfg.idaho.gov)>; "Deane Osterman" <[dosterman@knrd.org](mailto:dosterman@knrd.org)>; "Floyd  
Finley" <[ffinley@knrd.org](mailto:ffinley@knrd.org)>; "John Gross" <[jgross@knrd.org](mailto:jgross@knrd.org)>; "Joe Maroney"  
<[jmaroney@knrd.org](mailto:jmaroney@knrd.org)>; "Kevin Lyons" <[klyons@knrd.org](mailto:klyons@knrd.org)>; "Ray Entz"  
<[rentz@knrd.org](mailto:rentz@knrd.org)>; <[Finlay\\_Anderson@longviewassociates.com](mailto:Finlay_Anderson@longviewassociates.com)>;  
<[kdemsey@longviewassociates.com](mailto:kdemsey@longviewassociates.com)>; "Randall Filbert"  
<[RandallFilbert@msn.com](mailto:RandallFilbert@msn.com)>; <[susanh@msn.com](mailto:susanh@msn.com)>; <[keith.kirkendall@noaa.gov](mailto:keith.kirkendall@noaa.gov)>;  
<[mark.schneider@noaa.gov](mailto:mark.schneider@noaa.gov)>; <[stephanie\\_toothman@nps.gov](mailto:stephanie_toothman@nps.gov)>;  
<[susan\\_rosebrough@nps.gov](mailto:susan_rosebrough@nps.gov)>; <[jking@nwcouncil.org](mailto:jking@nwcouncil.org)>; <[shorton@nwcouncil.org](mailto:shorton@nwcouncil.org)>;  
<[tgrover@nwcouncil.org](mailto:tgrover@nwcouncil.org)>; "Lawr Salo" <[lawr.v.salo@nws02.usace.army.mil](mailto:lawr.v.salo@nws02.usace.army.mil)>;  
<[kathy\\_helm@or.blm.gov](mailto:kathy_helm@or.blm.gov)>; <[kurtzj@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca](mailto:kurtzj@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca)>;  
<[jim.harris@parks.wa.gov](mailto:jim.harris@parks.wa.gov)>; "Ron Curren" <[rcurren@pendoreille.org](mailto:rcurren@pendoreille.org)>; "Jeni

---

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

---

Forman" <[jforman@plix.com](mailto:jforman@plix.com)>; <[don@pocd.org](mailto:don@pocd.org)>; "Evelyn Reed"  
<[office@pocmuseum.org](mailto:office@pocmuseum.org)>; <[jonley@popud.com](mailto:jonley@popud.com)>; <[mcauchy@popud.com](mailto:mcauchy@popud.com)>; "Judy  
Ashton" <[cutter@potc.net](mailto:cutter@potc.net)>; <[faith@povn.com](mailto:faith@povn.com)>; "Josh Hall"  
<[jhall\\_tedd@povn.com](mailto:jhall_tedd@povn.com)>; <[sparky@povn.com](mailto:sparky@povn.com)>; <[dan\\_trochta@r1.fws.gov](mailto:dan_trochta@r1.fws.gov)>;  
"MaryLouise Keefe" <[mkeefe@r2usa.com](mailto:mkeefe@r2usa.com)>; "Phil Hilgert" <[philgert@r2usa.com](mailto:philgert@r2usa.com)>;  
<[ruthtristatecouncil@sandpoint.net](mailto:ruthtristatecouncil@sandpoint.net)>; "Al Solonsky"  
<[Al.Solonsky@Seattle.Gov](mailto:Al.Solonsky@Seattle.Gov)>; "Carol Butler" <[carol.butler@Seattle.Gov](mailto:carol.butler@Seattle.Gov)>;  
"Christine Pratt" <[Christine.Pratt@Seattle.Gov](mailto:Christine.Pratt@Seattle.Gov)>; "Doug Rough"  
<[doug.rough@Seattle.Gov](mailto:doug.rough@Seattle.Gov)>; "John Armstrong" <[john.armstrong@Seattle.Gov](mailto:john.armstrong@Seattle.Gov)>;  
"Kim Pate" <[Kim.Pate@Seattle.Gov](mailto:Kim.Pate@Seattle.Gov)>; "Lisa Rennie" <[Lisa.Rennie@Seattle.Gov](mailto:Lisa.Rennie@Seattle.Gov)>;  
"Michele Lynn" <[michele.lynn@Seattle.Gov](mailto:michele.lynn@Seattle.Gov)>; "Tom Van Bronkhorst"  
<[tom.vanbronkhorst@Seattle.Gov](mailto:tom.vanbronkhorst@Seattle.Gov)>; "Randy Abrahamson"  
<[randya@spokanetribe.com](mailto:randya@spokanetribe.com)>; <[gerry@streamkeepers.bc.ca](mailto:gerry@streamkeepers.bc.ca)>; "Bruce MacDonald"  
<[macdonaldbru@tac.pfo-mpo.qc.qa](mailto:macdonaldbru@tac.pfo-mpo.qc.qa)>; <[bill.duncan@teckcominco.com](mailto:bill.duncan@teckcominco.com)>;  
<[dave.godlewski@teckcominco.com](mailto:dave.godlewski@teckcominco.com)>; <[Kevin.Kinsella@teckcominco.com](mailto:Kevin.Kinsella@teckcominco.com)>; "Mark  
Tiley" <[mark.tiley@telus.net](mailto:mark.tiley@telus.net)>; <[fkrause@tnc.org](mailto:fkrause@tnc.org)>; "Kaitlin Lovell"  
<[klovell@tu.org](mailto:klovell@tu.org)>; <[marian.l.valentine@usace.army.mil](mailto:marian.l.valentine@usace.army.mil)>; "Carol Graham"  
<[selkirkloop@verizon.net](mailto:selkirkloop@verizon.net)>; <[cindy.preston@wadnr.gov](mailto:cindy.preston@wadnr.gov)>;  
<[kurt@washingtontrout.org](mailto:kurt@washingtontrout.org)>; "Keith Martin" <[martink@wsdot.wa.gov](mailto:martink@wsdot.wa.gov)>;  
<[glenn@wshsinc.com](mailto:glenn@wshsinc.com)>  
Cc: "David Turner" <[David.Turner@ferc.gov](mailto:David.Turner@ferc.gov)>; "Arlene Ragozin"  
<[Arlene.Ragozin@Seattle.Gov](mailto:Arlene.Ragozin@Seattle.Gov)>; "Barbara Greene" <[barbara.greene@Seattle.Gov](mailto:barbara.greene@Seattle.Gov)>;  
"John Halliday" <[HallidJ.P02.Utility@Seattle.Gov](mailto:HallidJ.P02.Utility@Seattle.Gov)>; "Laura Wishik"  
<[Laura.Wishik@Seattle.Gov](mailto:Laura.Wishik@Seattle.Gov)>; "Lynn Best" <[lynn.best@Seattle.Gov](mailto:lynn.best@Seattle.Gov)>; "Mike  
Haynes" <[mike.haynes@Seattle.Gov](mailto:mike.haynes@Seattle.Gov)>; "William Foster"  
<[William.Foster@Seattle.Gov](mailto:William.Foster@Seattle.Gov)>  
Sent: Thursday, February 09, 2006 5:11 PM  
Subject: Boundary Relicensing materials

- > Attached are a several materials we intend to post to our website, but
  - > in the interest of getting them to you as soon as possible, they are
  - > provided here:
  - >
  - > 1 - Identified Resource Issues & Study Needs Summary. This Summary
  - > includes the identified resource issues and potential studies that we
  - > anticipate will be included in the Preliminary Application Document
  - > (PAD) that City Light will file with FERC in early May. The Summary
  - > also includes information on known or potential adverse impacts, and
  - > existing protection, mitigation, and enhancement measures, to the extent
  - > that this type of information has been developed.
  - >
  - > This Summary reflects City Light's current thinking with regard to
  - > resource issues and study needs based on our review of existing relevant
  - > information, and discussions with many of you. The identified issues
  - > and potential studies will be a focus of next week's work group
-

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

---

- > meetings. We will plan to briefly review this information at the start
  - > of each work group meeting.
  - >
  - > 2 - Agenda for next week's meeting.
  - >
  - > 3 - Proposed work group meeting schedule for 2006. An important goal
  - > for the February 16 workshop is to reach agreement on a series of work
  - > group meetings for 2006 that allows us to jointly analyze the details
  - > of needed studies in each of the resource areas. These proposed dates
  - > are attached for your review. If everyone could hold all of the days
  - > that are tentatively shown on the schedule, we can discuss this schedule
  - > in each of the work group meetings next week and determine a final
  - > schedule soon after hearing your feedback.
  - >
  - >
  - > Additional information you'll find on our website soon:
  - >
  - > 1 -The scope of hydrographic survey work that Battelle will perform for
  - > City Light - to be posted under the Feb 16 workshop as materials to be
  - > used.
  - >
  - > 2 - A summary of City Light's hydrologic record and resource analysis
  - > for Boundary Dam that will be discussed in the morning session at next
  - > week's workshop - to be posted under the Feb 16 workshop as materials to
  - > be used.
  - >
  - > 3 - Final Toxics Inventory Screen report - to be posted under the Feb
  - > 16 workshop as materials to be used.
  - >
  - > 4 - Battelle scope of work for hydrographic survey work - to be posted
  - > under the Nov 30, 2005 workshop as a follow up item.
  - >
  - >
  - > City Light continues to welcome your ideas on issues and study needs
  - > regarding the Boundary Project relicensing and appreciates your
  - > continued involvement. We look forward to seeing you on February 16th in
  - > Spokane.
  - >
  - > Please feel free to contact me with questions at 206.615.1091 or by
  - > response to this email.
  - >
  - >
  - > Barbara
  - >
  - >
  - > Barbara Greene
-

**Item 201**

----- Original Message -----

From: "Lisa Rennie" <[Lisa.Rennie@Seattle.Gov](mailto:Lisa.Rennie@Seattle.Gov)>

To: "Rich Bailey" <[Richard\\_Bailey@blm.gov](mailto:Richard_Bailey@blm.gov)>; "Camille Pleasants" <[Camille.pleasants@colvilletribes.com](mailto:Camille.pleasants@colvilletribes.com)>; "Rob Whitlam" <[rob.whitlam@dahp.wa.gov](mailto:rob.whitlam@dahp.wa.gov)>; "Glenn Koehn" <[gkoehn@fs.fed.us](mailto:gkoehn@fs.fed.us)>; "Steve Kramer" <[skramer@fs.fed.us](mailto:skramer@fs.fed.us)>; <[kjlyons@knrd.org](mailto:kjlyons@knrd.org)>; "Randy Abrahamson" <[randya@spokanetribe.com](mailto:randya@spokanetribe.com)>

Cc: "Steve Padula" <[sdpadula@aol.com](mailto:sdpadula@aol.com)>; <[kdemsey@longviewassociates.com](mailto:kdemsey@longviewassociates.com)>; "Barbara Greene" <[barbara.greene@Seattle.Gov](mailto:barbara.greene@Seattle.Gov)>; "Glenn Hartmann" <[glenn@wshsinc.com](mailto:glenn@wshsinc.com)>

Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2006 11:05 AM

Subject: Boundary Relicensing - Draft Archaeological Predictive Model

- > Attached is a draft discussion of the Archaeological Predictive Model
- > that is being developed by Western Shore Heritage Services for Seattle
- > City Light as part of its Boundary Relicensing early information
- > development effort for cultural resources. City Light's intent is to
- > conduct an assessment of the model in late spring/early summer of this
- > year. The model will be used to support 2006 cultural resource study
- > plan development.
- >
- > Your review and comments would be greatly appreciated as we would like
- > to finalize the model by March 17, 2006. We will also be discussing the
- > draft model at the Boundary Relicensing Cultural Resources workgroup
- > session on February 16 in Spokane. The agenda for the workshop is also
- > attached.
- >
- > If you have any questions, please contact me at the phone/email listed
- > below.
- >
- > Sincerely,
- >
- > Lisa Rennie
- > Office of External Affairs
- > Seattle City Light
- > PO Box 34023
- > Seattle, WA 98124-4023
- > [lisa.rennie@seattle.gov](mailto:lisa.rennie@seattle.gov)
- > (206) 684-3793

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

---

**Item 202**

DATE: February 14, 2006

TO: Consultation File

FROM: Christine Pratt

SUBJECT: Phone Call Record - Jake Jacobosky-BLM – Flume Creek Property Ownership

I called Jake to notify him of continuing work to provide the level of detail required on the Flume Creek ownership map. Jake notified me that he will be retiring in 12 days and another BLM contact will be calling to continue work on these ownership questions. BLM surveyors will review their records for property owned around Flume Creek and all of Section 16.

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

---

**Item 203**

**Name:** John Jordan  
**Affiliation:** Pend Oreille PUD  
**Title:** Director of Finance and Administrative Services  
**Discipline:**  
**Email Address:**  
**Phone number:** (509) 447-9335  
**EDAW Name:** Jeff Caudill  
**Date of Contact:** 2/15/2006  
**Reason for Contact:** January 1 rate increase for the PUD  
**Information Provided:** none  
**Information Obtained:** General information on magnitude of and effect of electricity rate increase on the PUD's residential, commercial, and industrial customers.  
**Follow-up Action Needed:** none  
**Comments:** none

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

---

**Item 204**

**Name:** Jerry Spessard

**Affiliation:** Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

**Title:** Adjudicator

**Discipline:**

**Email Address:**

**Phone number:** (509) 536-1200

**EDAW Name:** Jeff Caudill

**Date of Contact:** 2/15/2006

**Reason for Contact:** Questions about land use management of BLM lands within Project boundary

**Information Provided:** none

**Information Obtained:** BLM parcels adjacent to the Pend Oreille River are not currently managed for any specific use. These lands are used as dispersed recreation areas.

**Follow-up Action Needed:** Jerry's boss will be providing parcel maps of BLM-managed lands to Chuck E. at February workshop.

**Comments:** Received maps.

**Item 205**

**Seattle City Light Boundary Dam Relicensing**

**Boundary Relicensing Workshop  
 February 16, 2006  
 Oakwood Quality Inn  
 7919 N. Division  
 Spokane, WA  
 AGENDA**

Goals of Meeting:

1. Update on new City Light 2006 efforts
2. Solicit feedback on Issues & Study Needs Summary
3. 2006 work group meeting schedule

Coffee	Cascade C	8:00am – 8:30am
Introductory Session ( <i>Barbara Greene</i> ) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review goals of meeting, agenda</li> <li>• Schedule update</li> <li>• Discuss Issues &amp; Study Needs Summary</li> <li>• Goals of break out sessions                     <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Update on new City Light 2006 efforts</li> <li>b. Feedback on Issues &amp; Study Needs Summary</li> <li>c. 2006 work group meeting schedule</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	Cascade C	8:30am - 8:45am
General Q & A	Cascade C	8:45am – 9:00am
Boundary reservoir data overview ( <i>Kim Pate</i> ) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water levels</li> <li>• Flow fluctuations</li> </ul>	Cascade C	9:00am – 9:30am
Break		9:30am - 9:45am
Concurrent work group sessions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Terrestrial (<i>Michele Lynn</i>)</li> <li>• Water Quality (<i>Christine Pratt</i>)</li> <li>• Cultural (<i>Lisa Rennie</i>)</li> </ul>	Oakwood Cascade C Northwood	9:45am – 12:00pm
Lunch	On Your Own	12:00pm-1:30pm
Concurrent break out sessions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fish &amp; Aquatics (<i>Al Solonsky</i>)</li> <li>• Recreation, land use, aesthetics, socioeconomics (<i>Michele Lynn, Lisa Rennie</i>)</li> </ul>	Cascade C Oakwood	1:30pm – 4:15pm
Closing Remarks	Cascade C	4:15pm – 4:30pm

**Seattle City Light**  
**Boundary Project Relicensing**  
**February 16, 2006 Stakeholders Workshop Summary**

**Introductory Session**

Barbara Greene (SCL) reviewed the agenda (attached) and goals for the workshop. The following are major points from the introductory session:

- City Light encouraged stakeholders to voice their feedback on the Issue and Study Needs Summary (distributed February 9) in the individual resource breakout sessions for the purposes of beginning development of the Proposed Study Plan (PSP) but noted that comments may not necessarily be reflected in the Preliminary Application Document (PAD), which is still on target to be issued in early May (handout on the organization of PAD attached).
- City Light has begun work on an outline for the PSP, which should be available for stakeholder review prior to the May workgroup meetings (handout of FERC ILP study process and relevancy criteria attached). A template for providing study requests should also be available around the same time.
- Four three-day workgroup sessions are currently proposed for summer/fall 2006 (May, June, August and September) (see proposed meeting schedule for exact dates). Barbara asked stakeholders to let City Light know of any problems or concerns with the dates and/or duration as currently proposed. Other major deadlines and meeting dates for 2006 were reviewed (handouts of an ILP timeline for 2006 and table of major ILP milestones related to the Boundary Project [August 2004 – September 2009] attached).
- It was noted that City Light's database of existing Boundary Project information remains available on the Project website as a list accompanied by a document request form. Once City Light completed its review of documents for sensitive information (i.e., critical energy infrastructure information [CEII]), the balance of information will be available on the website as individual files (in pdf format).

Kim Pate (SCL) gave a brief overview of work done to date on Boundary operations data (PowerPoint presentation attached).

- *Comment* – John Gross (Kalispel Tribe): Where are reservoir elevations measured?  
*Response* – Kim Pate: The Boundary forebay and USGS gage(s) below Box Canyon. In 2006 pressure transducers will be installed above and below Metaline Falls, in the forebay and tailrace to record changes in water surface elevations. The reservoir water surface below Metaline Falls drops much farther than the water surface elevation above Metaline Falls when the pool level is below elevations between 1975 ft and 1980 ft.
- *Comment* – What is elevation of spillway crest and dam?  
*Response* – 1946 ft; full pool is 1990 ft; top of dam is 2000 ft.
- *Comment* – Doug Robison (WDFW): Why is reservoir elevation above 1990 ft under certain conditions?  
*Response* – Kim Pate: Elevation is never above 1990 ft in the forebay; but can get above 1990 ft in the upper pool (i.e., above Metaline Falls). Elevations depend on flows. Doug Robison: It will be important to know what this high water level value is above the falls.

- *Comment* – Tom Shuhda (USFS): Are the years presented representative of the flows and elevations in an average water year?  
*Response* – Kim Pate: Yes, the years selected are representative but will need further refinement and verification as the hydrologic dataset is finalized.
- *Comment* – Tom Shuhda: What are velocities below Metaline Falls?  
*Response* – Kim Pate: The new bathymetry, flows and elevations will need to be tied together to determine velocities.
- *Comment* – Dean Cummings (Pend Oreille County Commissioner): Is there any evidence of long-term flow reductions in the Pend Oreille River Basin as a whole?  
*Response* – Phil Hilgert (R2 Resource Consultants): Some information for the years 1987-2004 is presented in the draft hydrology report along with a comparison of annual flows from 1913 to 2004.
- *Comment* – Kevin Lyons (Kalispel Tribe): What will be the form of the bathymetry output?  
*Response* – Kim Pate: Digital data; 2 ft contours down to elevation 1950 ft; 5 ft contours from 1950 ft and below. A draft report should be available mid-summer.
- *Comment* – Tom Shuhda: Is City Light considering a study to “map” the hydrologic record between Boundary Dam and Seven Mile?  
*Response* – Al Solonsky (SCL): Bathymetry will be developed below Boundary Dam to the border; also pressure transducers will be installed to collect stage data.
- *Comment* – Tom Shuhda: Does Z Canyon have any flow constraint effects similar to Metaline Falls?  
*Response* – Kim Pate: No, Z Canyon was referenced as a geographical area distinct from forebay and upper pool sections of the reservoir. Tom Shuhda: A map of hydraulic controls would be helpful. Kim Pate: City Light will be able to develop such a map with a digital elevation model that is currently under development.
- *Comment* – Greg Vaughn (Ponderay Newsprint): Is the water ever completely shut off at the dam?  
*Response* – Lonnie Johnson (SCL): Yes, releases from the dam can be shut off at night, depending on the flow conditions in the river. A follow up question asked was whether other dams typically shut off flows at night. Lonnie Johnson: Not aware of typical operations at other Pend Oreille River projects. City Light looks to the downstream projects (Seven Mile and Waneta) to reregulate flows in a similar fashion.
- *Comment* – Bill Duncan (Teck Cominco): Did Pend Oreille PUD look at tailwater effects of the Box Canyon Project during its relicensing?  
*Response* – Kim Pate: Not sure.

**Fish and Aquatics**

***Attendance:***

John Armstrong, Seattle City Light (SCL)  
Lynn Best, SCL  
Mitch Brown, Pend Oreille County  
Carol Butler, City of Seattle  
Scott Deeds, U.S. Forest Service (USFS)  
Rick Donaldson, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)  
Bill Duncan, Teck Cominco  
Randall Filbert, Long View Associates (LVA) (SCL consultant)  
William Foster, City of Seattle  
Barbara Greene, SCL  
Phil Hilgert, R2 Resource Consultants Inc. (R2) (SCL consultant)  
Susan Hurley, LVA (SCL consultant)  
Scott Jungblom, Pend Oreille PUD  
Jim Marthaller, Pend Oreille County  
Keith Martin, North Pend Oreille Scenic Byway  
Joe Maroney, Kalispel Tribe  
Jan Mulder, Environmental Science Associates (SCL consultant)  
Gerry Nellestijn, Salmo Watershed Streamkeepers Society  
Steve Padula, LVA (SCL consultant)  
Kim Pate, SCL  
Doug Robison, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)  
Tom Shuhda, USFS  
Al Solonsky, SCL  
Mark Tiley, CCRIFC  
Dan Trochta, USFWS  
Curt Vail, WDFW

***Agenda:***

Review and discussion of issues/study needs document by issue area:

- Load-following and pool level fluctuations
- Instream flows in the Pend Oreille River
- Sediment transport
- Wood recruitment and transport
- Effects of aquatic vegetation on fish and benthic macroinvertebrates
- Aquatic productivity
- Recreational fishery

***Meeting Summary:***

- *Comment* – Tom Shuhda (USFS): Genetics samples should be collected from target species when they are captured as part of studies undertaken to address other objectives.  
*Response* – City Light: The plan is to conduct such sampling by collecting tissue samples from a bull trout, rainbow and westslope cutthroat captured during fish studies.
- *Comment* – Mark Tiley (CCRIFC): An international effort was underway to study sturgeon in the Columbia River; because City Light is contributing to TDG impacts, it should consider contributing money to the study effort.  
*Response* – City Light: Comment noted.

- *Comment* – Tom Shuhda: The scope of the entrainment study should be expanded to include spillway entrainment.  
*Response* – City Light: Comment noted.
- *Comment* – Doug Robison (WDFW): Fry stranding studies should be completed to augment modeling efforts conducted to assess stranding under different operational scenarios. WDFW offered to provide information on methods used to evaluate reservoir stranding.  
*Response* – City Light: Biological data will be collected to support habitat modeling. The request for stranding studies would be considered.
- *Comment* – Mark Tiley: Potential for stranding of fish in substrate interstices should be addressed.  
*Response* – City Light: This issue will be addressed in future workgroup meetings.
- *Comment* – Joe Maroney (Kalispel Tribe): Fish passage at Boundary Dam would have beneficial effects by increasing the potential range of bull trout from the Salmo River, regardless of whether or not fish passage is implemented at Seven Mile and Waneta dams.  
*Response* – City Light: Assessment of connectivity issues will be addressed during workgroup future meetings.
- *Comment* – Mark Tiley: Triploid trout planted by City Light could be adversely affecting native salmonids through competition.  
*Response* – City Light: This issue would be evaluated by the Fish & Aquatics Workgroup during Proposed Study Plan (PSP) development.
- *Comment* – Tom Shuhda: City Light should conduct studies to assess effects of current (and perhaps proposed) reservoir operations on zooplankton populations. Zooplankton sampling should occur in both the littoral (including macrophyte beds) and pelagic regions of the reservoir. Vertical migrations of zooplankton should be compared to powerhouse intake depths.  
*Response* – City Light: Zooplankton will be sampled both in littoral and open-water areas. Consideration will be given to whether there is a need for assessing vertical migrations of zooplankton.
- *Comment* – Bill Duncan (Teck Cominco): The varial zone should be defined for both littoral and pelagic portions of the reservoir.  
*Response* – City Light: Impacts of fluctuating reservoir surface elevation will be evaluated in both littoral and pelagic environments.
- *Comment* – Tom Shuhda: Biological sampling and observations to support modeling of the reservoir should be conducted at several reservoir levels during each season.  
*Response* – City Light: Biological sampling will be conducted to support modeling. The protocol for which will be discussed during workgroup meetings and outlined in the PSP.
- *Comment* – Doug Robison: Tributary deltas should be evaluated not only for effects on aquatic organisms, but also terrestrial organisms dependent on deltas.  
*Response* – City Light: The Terrestrial Workgroup will be handling this issue.

*DRAFT*

- *Comment* – Tom Shuhda: Fish sampling will be needed to verify species composition and condition of fish observed with hydroacoustics.  
*Response* – City Light: Some level of fish sampling will be required, the details of which have yet to be fully identified.
- *Comment* – Doug Robison: Entrainment results should be evaluated in terms of fish abundance and species composition in the region (yet to be formally defined) of the forebay.  
*Response* – City Light: Field studies will be needed to assess species composition and abundance in various portions of the reservoir; the scope of this effort has yet to be identified.
- *Comment* – Doug Robison and Mark Tiley: City Light should thoroughly evaluate potential tagging/tracking options for fish studies, specifically nano-tags and combined acoustic-radio tags (CART tags).  
*Response* – City Light: Planning for such an evaluation is currently underway. R2 Resource Consultants will share with workgroup participants a matrix that summarizes tagging options in terms of fish length and tag life.
- *Comment* – Tom Shuhda: Mapping the current distribution of macrophyte beds, especially Eurasian watermilfoil, is an important component of the macrophyte study.  
*Response* – City Light: Mapping will be conducted as part of relicensing.
- *Comment* – Doug Robison: It will be important to know how macroinvertebrate abundance and species composition under existing operations vary from what would occur if the Project were operated as run-of-river. Also, macroinvertebrates should be evaluated in terms of their value as a food source for fish.  
*Response* – City Light: These issues will be more thoroughly addressed during formulation of the PSP.
- *Comment* – Doug Robison: There is a need to understand how large wood is passed at Box Canyon with spill. There is also a need to check wording used with regard to “inundation zone” relative to large wood.  
*Response*: City Light: The issue of large wood routing will be addressed with the Workgroup during PSP development.

Water Quality

**Attendance:**

Lynn Best, Seattle City Light (SCL)  
Lori Blau, Ponderay Newsprint  
Mitch Brown, Pend Oreille County  
Carol Butler, City of Seattle  
Dean Cummings, Pend Oreille County  
Bill Duncan, Teck Cominco  
Randall Filbert, Long View Associates (LVA) (SCL consultant)  
John Gross, Kalispel Tribe  
Phil Hilgert, R2 Resource Consultants (R2) (SCL consultant)  
Jon Jones, Washington Department of Ecology (WDOE)  
Scott Jungblom, Pend Oreille PUD  
Joe Maroney, Kalispel Tribe  
Jan Mulder, Environmental Science Associates (SCL consultant)  
Gerry Nellestijn, Salmo Watershed Streamkeepers Society  
Jean Parodi, WDOE  
Steve Padula, LVA (SCL consultant)  
Kim Pate, SCL  
Christine Pratt, SCL  
Tom Shuhda, U.S. Forest Service (USFS)  
Al Solonsky, SCL  
Mark Tiley, CCRIFC

**Meeting Summary:**

Total Dissolved Gas (TDG)

- **Comment** – All stakeholders: General approval of the TDG panel/workgroup concept and schedule, with specific study plans developed for the PSP.  
**Response** – City Light: Efforts will be made to ensure that this process is efficient and that progress updates are provided at workgroup meetings, during which stakeholders will have an opportunity to provide feedback.
- **Comment** – Tom Shuhda (USFS): City Light should consider structural as well as operational measures for TDG reduction.  
**Response** – City Light: Both structural and operational options for TDG abatement are being considered.
- **Comment** – Jean Parodi (WDOE): Flow from Albeni Falls is not regulated by Washington’s TMDL; TDG levels of same should be considered as “a given” in the formulation of the TMDL.  
**Response** – City Light/other stakeholders: Acknowledged the statement.
- **Comment** – Tom Shuhda: Studies to address TDG effects on fish should be considered.  
**Response** – City Light: The deleterious effects of high levels of TDG on fish are generally established. Retrieving and evaluating fish at Boundary for this purpose will be difficult. Assessing TDG effects on fish will likely be more appropriate following implementation of TDG abatement measures, for the purpose of assessing their performance.

Terrestrial Resources

**Attendance:**

John Armstrong, Seattle City Light (SCL)  
Jann Bodie, U.S. Forest Service (USFS)  
Mark Cauchy, Pend Oreille County PUD  
Karen Demsey, Long View Associates (LVA) (SCL consultant)  
Chuck Everett, EDAW (SCL consultant)  
Jim Eychaner, Washington Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC)  
William Foster, Seattle City Light general counsel  
Mike Gerdes, USFS  
Josh Hall, TEDD  
Paul Hohlt, International Selkirk Loop  
Susan Hurley, LVA (SCL consultant)  
Jon Jones, Washington Department of Ecology (WDOE)  
Glenn Koehn, USFS  
Michele Lynn, SCL  
Doug Robison, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)  
Susan Rosebrough, National Park Service (NPS)  
Sharon Sorby, Pend Oreille County Noxious Weed Control Board  
Jill Sterrett, EDAW (SCL consultant)  
Ron Tressler, EDAW (SCL consultant)  
Dan Trochta, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)  
Debbie Wilkins, USFS

**Agenda:**

- Introductions
- Update on project activity since last workshop
- Goals for today's meeting
- Review and discussion of issues/study needs document
- Development of study plans/workgroup meetings in 2008
- Closing comments/next steps

**Meeting Summary:**

Review and discussion of issues/study needs document

- *Comment:* Michele Lynn (SCL): City Light is interested in participants' feedback on the main elements of the proposed studies in the Summary Document. Input provided at today's meeting would not likely be reflected in the PAD, but will be helpful as City Light begins to start drafting the Proposed Study Plan (PSP). Discussions on proposed studies will continue in more detail over the next several months; City Light's goal being is to send FERC a PSP in October that all parties agreed on.

1. Shoreline Erosion Study

- *Comment – Workgroup participants:* This study should include not just shoreline erosion but also erosion related to Project roads, noting that this has been a problem at some locations.

*Response – Michele Lynn:* This would be a worthwhile component to consider adding to the study.

*DRAFT*

- *Comment* – Debbie Wilkins (USFS): All aspects of access should be addressed in a direct manner.  
*Response* – Michele Lynn: Comment noted.
- *Comment* – Doug Robison (WDFW): Is long-term monitoring, into the new license term, envisioned as a component or outcome of this study? Two years of data is unlikely to provide an accurate estimate of long-term erosion rates.  
*Response* – Michele Lynn: The need for long-term monitoring as a follow-up to this study will be evaluated based on whether the study results were adequate to address Project impacts.
- *Comment* – Doug Robison: The proposed study seemed focused only on mass wasting processes; the suggestion was made to look at other types of erosion processes and evaluating potential effects on habitat.  
*Response* – Michele Lynn: The intent of the study is to look at all types of erosion processes.
- *Comment* – Doug Robison and Mike Gerdes (USFS): The length (not just volume) of shoreline affected by erosion as well as affected shoreline configuration are of interest.  
*Response* – Michele Lynn: This information will be included in the data collection.
- *Comment* – Dan Tochta (USFWS): Will City Light also be looking at potential erosion control measures?  
*Response* – Ron Tressler (EDAW): City Light’s intent is to collect the necessary data to identify Project effects. This information in turn will be used to evaluate the need for management measures.
- *Comment* – Doug Robison: When considering what is “Project-induced,” keep in mind that the project may combine with other influences to create erosion.  
*Response* – Michele Lynn: Comment noted.
- *Comment* – Glenn Koehn (USFS): Will SCL keep a photographic record as the erosion study is being conducted?  
*Response* – Ron Tressler: Yes.

## 2. Waterfowl/Waterbird Survey

- *Comment* – Doug Robison: The study should also address the question of Project effects on habitat that would otherwise be suitable for waterfowl/waterbird nesting but is potentially made unsuitable by reservoir operations.  
*Response* – Michele Lynn: This is an intended component of this study but the study will not try to determine habitat conditions that might exist without the reservoir. The study will address how Project operations currently affect habitat suitability near the shoreline.

## 3. Cottonwood Inventory

- *Comment* – Mike Gerdes: The study should also include willow and other riparian obligate plant species. Although cottonwood and willow have different habitat requirements, both species are floodplain dependent and thus potentially affected by reservoir operations. A literature review might be a good way to determine methods to get these species back into a regulated system.  
*Response* – Ron Tressler: Good comment. We will look at revising the study to include other riparian obligate species.

*DRAFT*

- *Comment* – Doug Robison: There should be a clearer link between (or merging of) this study and the Large Woody Debris (LWD) study being conducted as part of the fish and aquatics study program.  
*Response* – Michele Lynn: Comment noted.
- *Comment* – Mike Gerdes: The USFS would like the opportunity to talk about what City Light does with wood that is taken out of the reservoir.  
*Response* – Michele Lynn: Comment noted.
- *Comment* – Dan Trochta: The study should identify areas that may be suitable for recruitment, to provide information useful for identifying potential enhancement opportunities (e.g., planting and/or habitat improvement to foster natural recruitment).  
*Response* – Michele Lynn: Comment noted.
- *Comment* – Mike Gerdes: In addition to identification of existing vegetation cover-types, it would be helpful to map potential climax vegetation cover to facilitate discussion of possible opportunities to improve habitat.  
*Response* – Michele Lynn: Comment noted.

#### 4. Deer/Elk Study

- *Comment* – Doug Robison: Seasonal road closures and road use levels should be taken into account in the study.  
*Response* – Ron Tressler: Good suggestion. Road closures also relate to the issue of access, raised earlier in the meeting.

#### 5. RTE Plant and Wildlife Species Inventories

- *Comment* – Mike Gerdes: USFS Sensitive Species, as well as Management Indicator Species, should be included in the inventories.  
*Response* – Ron Tressler: These species will be included in the inventories.
- *Comment* – Glenn Koehn: Is City Light planning to collect data on conditions at sites where red plants are found?  
*Response* – Ron Tressler: Yes.
- *Comment* – Dan Trochta:
  - The USFWS will need a biological assessment (BA) for federally listed species, the first step of which is to document presence/absence; if a species is not present, then no further information is needed.
  - Some information regarding RTE species is sensitive and should be kept confidential (e.g., bald eagle nest site locations should not be posted on the relicensing website).
  - City Light should rely on the surveys conducted for the Box Canyon Project relicensing to the extent possible, to save time/effort.
  - The USFWS is interested in conflicts between human use and features such as bald eagle nests.

*DRAFT*

- o The RTE species list for federal species is only current for approximately 8 months because of regular updates; therefore, the list should be periodically re-checked to identify any changes to the list.
- o Avian collisions and electrocutions are a concern for the Project transmission lines.

*Response* – Michele Lynn: Comments noted.

- *Comment* – Mike Gerdes: The USFS has many standard protocols that should be considered when designing the study methods.

*Response* – Michele Lynn: The suggestion was made that the study team and USFS discuss the protocols in advance of the next workgroup meeting, to be most efficient in this regard.

#### 6. Impacts of Project-Related Recreation on Wildlife and Habitat

- *Comment* – Jim Eychaner (IAC): The proposed study inaccurately singles out recreation. The focus just on recreation as a potential negative impact was prejudicial against recreation uses at the Project, and moreover was not consistent with FERC's mandate that all resources be given equal consideration. The study seemed duplicative of other proposed studies described in the Summary Document. If the study as currently envisioned remains in the PSP, the IAC would file an official objection with FERC. Several workshop participants agreed with Jim's comments that recreation should not be the only factor evaluated for impact on wildlife, and that this study seems to duplicate aspects of other studies.

*Response* – Michele Lynn: City Light will consider this input and possible changes that might be made to the study proposal. Dan Trochta: It is necessary to evaluate recreation-related impacts on wildlife because some impacts (e.g., disturbance of bald eagle nests) could be in violation of the Endangered Species Act. Susan Rosebrough (NPS): Some recreation-related activities could have a positive effect on wildlife; for example interpretive displays that educate the public regarding wildlife. Jill Sterrett (EDAW): It may be more appropriate and comprehensive to assess all non-operational human activities under this study, instead of just focusing on the recreational aspect.

- *Comment* – Jann Bodie (USFS): Given that access to the reservoir varies depending on who owns the adjacent land, why does the study not address the effects of mixed ownership?

*Response* – Michele Lynn: Comment noted.

- *Comment* – Jann Bodie: The study should include other species, such as nesting birds.

*Response* – Michele Lynn: The intent of the study is to include all wildlife.

#### 7. Bat Surveys and Cave Mapping

- *Comment* – Glenn Koehn (USFS): The USFS would like to see all caves/adits within the zone of reservoir operations mapped. The main interest is in the location of these features, and that specific concerns relate to public safety as well as potential impacts on bats.

*Response* – Michele Lynn: Comment noted.

#### 8. Invasive Aquatic Plants

- *Comment* – Sharon Sorby (Pend Oreille County, Noxious Weed Control Board): Mapping of invasive plant species is best done in the period from approximately the end of June to mid-July when the plants are flowering.

*Response* – Michele Lynn: Comment noted.

Closing comments/next steps

- Workgroup participants were asked to identify any scheduling conflicts with the proposed Terrestrial Workgroup dates (May 24, June 28, August 16 and September 20). City Light will try to schedule work group meetings on dates that work for everyone, but acknowledged that may not be possible in all cases.
- Potential dates for a project tour were discussed (possibly coordinate with the June workgroup meeting).
- *Comment* – Mike Gerdes: The proposed half-day meeting format seemed too brief to cover all the study plan details.

*Response* – Chuck Everett: Though City Light has the same concern, the proposal for half-day / back-to-back workgroup meetings is intended to allow individuals to cover multiple workgroups yet also keep the overall length of the monthly workgroup sessions reasonable.

- *Comment* – Doug Robison: The meetings might be more efficient if the discussion materials were distributed enough in advance to ensure everyone would have time before the meeting to review the materials and get input from others within their organizations if necessary.

*Response* – Michele Lynn: City Light would aim to send out draft materials approximately 10 days in advance, which is probably the best that can realistically be done, given the tight schedule.

*DRAFT*

Recreation, Land Use, Aesthetics, and Socioeconomics

**Attendance:**

Emily Andersen, Long View Associates (LVA) (SCL consultant)  
Jann Bodie, U.S. Forest Service (USFS)  
Chuck Everett, EDAW (SCL consultant)  
Jim Eychaner, Washington Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC)  
Mike Gerdes, USFS  
Carol Graham, International Selkirk Loop  
Josh Hall, Tri-county Economic Development Department  
Paul Hohlt, International Selkirk Loop  
Lonnie Johnson, Seattle City Light (SCL)  
Glenn Koehn, USFS  
Michele Lynn, SCL  
Kevin Lyons, Kalispel Tribe  
Lisa Rennie, SCL  
Susan Rosebrough, National Park Service (NPS)  
Sharon Sorby, Pend Oreille County Noxious Weed Control Board  
Jill Sterrett, EDAW (SCL consultant)  
Ron Tressler, EDAW (SCL consultant)  
Greg Vaughn, Ponderay Newsprint  
Debbie Wilkins, USFS

**Agenda:**

- Introductions
- Update on project activity since last workshop
- Goals for today's meeting
- Review and discussion of issues/study needs document
- Development of study plans/workgroup meetings in 2008
- Closing comments/next steps

**Meeting Summary:**

Update on project activity since last workshop

- *Comment* – Glenn Koehn (USFS): In light of the 2008 effort to look further at shoreline development trends, is City Light considering developing a Shoreline Management Plan (SMP)?  
*Response* – Chuck Everett (EDAW): Based on the apparent trends in shoreline development that may continue into the new license period (30-50 years), City Light will explore shoreline issues and the longer-term need and options for managing shoreline development where it may affect resources within the Project boundary or where access or development may come across the boundary (from a more simple permitting process as is currently allowed, to a more involved SMP). SMPs are more prevalent at East Coast hydropower projects where there is substantial private development along the shoreline.

Review and discussion of issues/study needs document

**Socioeconomics**

- *Comment* – Jim Eychaner (IAC): In response to Lisa Rennie's (SCL) review of the four basic issues in the area of Socioeconomics that are discussed in the PAD, the statutory reference for the state law governing City Light's impact fee agreement with Pend Oreille County was requested.

*DRAFT*

*Response* – Lisa Rennie (SCL): Request noted.

- *Comment* – Glenn Koehn: City Light should conduct an economic baseline study during the formal study phase to ensure the appropriate and sufficient information is available to develop protection, mitigation and enhancement (PME) measures.

*Response* – Lisa Rennie: Because of the close tie between socioeconomics and recreation, it is expected a number of the recreation study elements planned for 2007/2008 will provide information relevant to an evaluation of the Project's existing and future role in the local community.

#### Recreation and Land Use

- *Comment* – Debbie Wilkins (USFS): Will recreational opportunities be identified in any of the proposed studies and if so who will make the decisions about what opportunities to pursue?

*Response* – Lisa Rennie: City Light has had initial conversations with the local community leaders about existing as well as future recreational and tourism opportunities and plans to continue working with them throughout the relicensing process. Chuck Everett: A future Recreation Needs Analysis Synthesis will provide a synthesis of all of the findings of the recreation study elements, and will be conducted following completion of the studies program, which will supply information for the development of proposed PMEs. Stakeholders will be involved in this synthesis discussion where decisions are made about what is needed at the Project over the term of the new license.

#### 1. Recreation Visitor Survey

- *Comment* – Debbie Wilkins: City Light should consider study methodologies that involve local community members.

*Response* – Chuck Everett: One option is to distinguish between information on recreational use and demand/need of the local community and those of visitors from outside the immediate area, possibly by holding one or more focus group meetings with the local community in Pend Oreille County. Or a specific local resident survey could be administered in addition to a broader visitor survey.

- *Comment* – The Workgroup participants brought to City Light's attention a number of recent and planned studies to consider when designing the visitor survey for the Project: 1) two University of Idaho surveys including a 1995 Priest Lake recreation local visitor survey, 2) two Dean Runyan Associates "black box" type surveys, 3) USFS regional exit surveys (NUVM) planned for 2007/2008 (last NVUM conducted in 2003), and 4) a new IAC state-wide tourism survey. Data will be collected in June 2006; the analysis should be completed by the end of 2006.

*Response* – Michele Lynn: City Light will be interested in the information resulting from these studies. Chuck Everett: City Light is aware of most of these surveys, but not all of them.

- *Comment* – Jim Eychaner: "Water-related" should not be limited to activities that occur on the water only.

*Response* – Michele Lynn: Comment noted.

2. Regional Recreation Analysis

- *Comment* – Jann Bodie (USFS) and Paul Hohlt (International Selkirk Loop): Established loops/byways in the area are a significant and valuable resource to the region. Both encouraged City Light to include them in the geographic scope of the analysis. Debbie Wilkins: Tourism development is a significant focus of the local community.

*Response* – Greg Vaughn (Ponderay Newsprint): Enhancing tourism in the area is not necessarily a universal desire of residents of the county, noting that maintaining the timber harvest business is also important to many and may conflict with tourism goals. Michele Lynn: City Light will take this into consideration but noted that it will be continually looking to define the nexus of any issue to the Project.

3. Dispersed Shoreline Recreation Use Area Inventory and Impact Analysis

- *Comment* – Debbie Wilkins: The analysis should address the issue of general access to the reservoir, not limited to recreation.

*Response* – Michele Lynn: Comment noted.

- *Comment* – Jim Eychaner: The limitation on "shoreline" should be removed. The study should be expanded to address all dispersed recreation.

*Response* – Michele Lynn: Comment noted.

- *Comment* – Debbie Wilkins: As part of its overhaul of its Colville National Forest Management Plan, the USFS is reviewing and revising the "travel management" policy, which may result in fewer through traffic roads and more walk-in access.

*Response* – Michele Lynn: Comment noted.

- *Comment* – Susan Rosebrough (NPS): The proposed studies focus on impacts. There needs to be a place where all the studies come together. Also, don't overlook opportunities for enhancements.

*Response* – Chuck Everett: While not a formal data-gathering study per se, a Needs Analysis will be conducted after the various studies are completed. The Needs Analysis will synthesize all the study results, and along with stakeholder and SCL input, will begin to identify existing and long-term Project area needs.

4. Recreation Carrying Capacity Analysis

- *Comment* – Jann Bodie: Will waste management be part of this study?

*Response* – Chuck Everett: Yes, waste management will also be an element of the dispersed shoreline analysis.

- *Comment* – Jann Bodie: The USFS has an existing plan on file for a campground site at Monument Bar. Whether it proceeds with implementing the plan could depend on the outcome of this analysis and also on how the USFS decides to manage the particular parcel in the future.

*Response* – Chuck Everett: City Light is aware of the site plan and the site. The planned study will help define if this site is appropriate or not, with input from the USFS.

*DRAFT*

5. Projected Recreation Use Analysis

- *Comment* – Paul Hohlt: National exposure of the Selkirk Loop has recently been realized, having received the National Scenic Byway designation in September 2005. Experience has shown that, after this type of designation is made, use of byways may increase by approximately 20%, so it could be a few years before its use can be accurately evaluated.

*Response* – Lonnie Johnson (SCL): Agreed with Paul's comment. The county is just beginning to draw in new businesses to the area, a large number of which are focused on recreation and tourism.

- *Comment* – Jim Eychaner: The 2002 Washington State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) clearly identifies the need for more trails in the state and IAC desires hydropower operators to enhance/develop trail systems within their project areas. One trail opportunity related to the Boundary Project is for City Light to consider purchasing the rail line between Box Canyon and Metaline Falls, which could include but not be limited to recreational uses. The recommendation was made that a Non-Motorized Trail Feasibility Study be conducted as part of the formal study phase.

Jann Bodie: It was pointed out that historical evidence suggests that there are remnants of trails (e.g., the Blue Ribbon trail along the ridge of Z Canyon on the east side of the reservoir) that were heavily used pre-project, information which would be overlooked in an evaluation focusing solely on current and future use and demand. This is a rationale for assessing trail feasibility now as part of the study phase.

Greg Vaughn: It is not evident that recreational needs will necessarily be greater during the next license term (i.e., 30 to 50 years); pointing out that Boundary Reservoir is only one of any number of lakes in the region that people could choose to recreate at.

*Response* – Michele Lynn: Nexus to the Project, as well as a definitive need for new trails at the Project, will need to be established before considering a formal Trail Feasibility Study. Chuck Everett: Shoreline trail access is a topic that is somewhat buried within one or more of the recreation study elements. City Light could pull this topic out on its own or more fully highlight it as an element. It may be pre-mature to do a full Trail Feasibility Study now. One can think of this in phases by first defining where access does and does not exist now, and see where gaps may exist.

6. Recreational Creel Survey

- *Comment* – Jann Bodie: Is there a known demand for a recreational fishery in the Boundary Reservoir?

*Response* – Lonnie Johnson: While there has been no formal evaluation, in light of the increased availability of fish resulting from the triploid trout planting program, demand has increased. Also, the small mouth bass that live in the reservoir present a relatively unique fishing opportunity in the region. Chuck Everett: This study will be conducted by the Fish & Aquatics Workgroup, but this Workgroup will have input into the study and the survey instrument.

7. Shoreline Erosion

- General acknowledgment that a joint session with the Terrestrial Workgroup to work out the details of the study design might be warranted.

### Aesthetic/Visual Resources

#### 1. Aesthetic/Visual Resource Assessment

- *Comment – Chuck Everett:* Based on initial discussions with the USFS, City Light and the USFS both agree that while the typical methodology utilized in such assessments has been the USFS Scenery Management System (SMS), or the prior Visual Management System (VMS), a more project-specific approach is more appropriate in the case of the Boundary Project given the relatively close proximity of the Project boundary to the shoreline (i.e., generally the high water line upstream of Metaline Falls and approximately 200 feet beyond the shoreline downstream of the falls).

*Response – Jann Bodie:* The Boundary Project's aesthetic/visual assessment should be fairly well aligned with the process recently used in the revised Forest Management Plan (due out January 2007). This assessment should identify high priority viewing sites and sensitive view corridors in the Project area and should assess Project effects on these locations or resources. Potential solutions to remedy identified Project impacts on these resources should be considered, if practicable.

#### 2006 workgroup meetings

- Workgroup participants were asked to check their calendars and inform City Light of any potential conflicts with the proposed dates for the Recreation, Land Use, Aesthetics and Socioeconomics Resources Workgroup meetings (May 24, June 28, August 16 and September 20) (no conflicts were identified during the meeting).
- The Workgroup agreed that planning a project tour in conjunction with the June workgroup meeting would be beneficial.
- To the extent possible, draft study plans will be provided before meetings.

### Cultural Resources

#### *Attendance:*

Emily Andersen, Long View Associates (LVA) (SCL consultant)  
Judy Ashton, Cutter Theatre  
Josh Hall, Tri-County Economic District  
John Halliday, Seattle City Light (SCL)  
Glenn Hartmann, Western Shore Heritage Services (WSHS) (SCL consultant)  
Lonnie Johnson, SCL  
Steve Kramer, USFS  
Kevin Lyons, Kalispel Tribe  
Jim Marthaller, Pend Oreille County  
Lisa Rennie, SCL  
Greg Vaughn, Ponderay Newsprint

#### *Agenda:*

- Introductions
- Update on project activity since last workshop
- Goals for today's meeting
- Review and discussion of issues/study needs document
- Development of study plans/workgroup meetings in 2008
- Discussion of draft archaeological predictive model

#### *Meeting Summary:*

##### Update on project activity since last workshop/discussion of draft archaeological predictive model

- *Comment* – Kevin Lyons (Kalispel Tribe): It will be important that as workgroup meetings get underway, everyone be aware of restrictions on disclosing culturally sensitive information in various meeting materials (i.e., agendas, meeting summaries, etc.). On some other projects FERC inadvertently posted some confidential information on its website. The recommendation was made that any filings related to the Boundary Project with such information be sent directly to Frank Winchell of FERC with explicit instructions as to treatment of this information.

*Response* – Lisa Rennie (SCL): Acknowledged the importance of a confidentiality protocol for the workgroup. Commented that City Light has established a Public Information Library at their offices in Seattle, which can be accessed by appointment, and culturally sensitive information had been separated out and secured elsewhere.

- *Comment* – Lisa Rennie: City Light has been working on a cultural resources overview and the development of an archaeological predictive model. A summary of the overview will be included as an appendix in the Preliminary Application Document (PAD). A draft description of the predictive model was handed out for discussion (attached).

*Response* – Kevin Lyons: Access to the Tribe's Smith Room, which would presumably be visited for purposes of predictive model development, is available by appointment only with one week advanced notice. The recommendation was made to explicitly state in the description that the model is not intended to replace an inventory of historic properties within the Area of Potential Effect (APE). Glenn Hartmann (WSHS): Concurred. The objective of the model is to 1) develop a basis for the inventory, 2) establish a defensible methodology for the inventory, 3) potentially identify "high probability" areas, and 4) support what is (or is not) found during the inventory. Kevin pointed out that it will be important to distinguish in the model between the "upper" and "lower" pools (i.e., above and below Metaline Falls) in order to accurately define the various "T"

3. Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP) Study

- *Comment* – Steve Kramer: Local ethnic groups in addition to Native American tribes should be consulted in trying to identify any potential TCPs and to evaluate the potential for adverse impacts of the Boundary Project on any such identified TCPs.

*Response* – Glenn Hartmann: City Light has been working to initiate contact with the historic societies located throughout the surrounding communities for this purpose.

- *Comment* – Kevin Lyons: Through funding of the Natural Resources Conservation Services (NRCS) he was currently working to create a database of Kalispel Tribe TCPs for Washington State. The database should be completed by September 2006, available to the NRCS the first year and then available to others through 5-year end-user agreement beginning in September 2007.

*Response* – Lisa Rennie: City Light will be very interested in the database once available.

4. Evaluation of Significance (Eligibility)

- *Comment* – Steve Kramer: USFS is currently drafting a protocol/guidelines related to the Box Canyon Project HPMP for the future evaluation of historic properties (target May 2006) that may be helpful to City Light in the design of its evaluation.

*Response* – Lisa Rennie: City Light is interested in receiving a copy of the protocol/guidelines.

- *Comment* – Kevin Lyons: It will be important to find a technical expert or group of experts with the appropriate skill set to complete a comprehensive evaluation.

*Response* – Lisa Rennie: Comment noted.

5. Identification of Project Impacts

- General agreement that the analysis is a necessary step to developing a HPMP.

2006 workgroup meetings

- It was pointed out that because of the considerable overlap between resource areas on a number of studies, the workgroup meetings were structured to accommodate stakeholders' needs to attend multiple sessions if necessary (e.g., the Recreation workgroup's dispersed shoreline recreation use and impacts study and the Terrestrial Workgroup's shoreline erosion study will need to address some cultural issues).
- Stakeholders were asked to check their calendars and inform City Light of any potential conflicts with the proposed dates for Cultural Resources Workgroup meetings (May 25, June 27, August 17 and September 19) (no conflicts were identified during the meeting).
- The Workgroup agreed that depending on the agenda for a given meeting, a conference call could suffice in place of a face-to-face gathering. Since Frank Winchell (FERC) expressed interest to City Light in participating in the first (May) workgroup meeting (either by phone or in person) to discuss FERC's expectations for the process, it might be good to plan on that one being a face-to-face.
- A draft agenda and PSP annotated outline would be provided to stakeholders mid-May in preparation for the May 25 meeting.

*DRAFT*

- *Comment* – Kevin Lyons and Steve Kramer: Each will contact the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) representative about his availability/interest to participate in future meetings.

*Response* – Lisa Rennie: Comment noted.

- *Comment* – Steve Kramer: Because the Colville's Tribe "area of traditional use" was recently acknowledged to extend north to the Canadian border and east to the Washington/Idaho border, the tribe will likely want to be consulted if any archaeological sites are found.

*Response* – Lisa Rennie: The Colville Tribe has been (and will continue to be) included on all communications. John Halliday (SCL): As general policy, the City of Seattle seeks comments from all groups (federally recognized as sovereign nations and not).

**Item 206**

**Seattle City Light--Boundary Hydroelectric Project--Contacts**

**Contacted:**

- Name: Carl Kitz
- Affiliation: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- Phone: (206) 553-1671.

**Contacted by:**

- Name: Randall Filbert
- Affiliation: Long View Associates
- Date of contact: 2/23/2006
- Email address: RandallFilbert@msn.com
- Reason for contact: Obtain information on EPA actions taken/planned under CERCLA pertaining to Josephine Mine.
- Information provided by contact: Verbal account of proposed remediation actions (see Comments).
- Follow-up action needed: None.
- Comments:

In its 2001 preliminary assessment and site investigation, EPA identified 5 mines and mills with the potential to contaminate the lower Pend Oreille River: Blue Bucket Mine, Oriole Mine, Grandview Mine/Mill, Pend Oreille Mine, and Josephine Mine. Further action under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) was recommended for each site.

Prior to today's call, information pertaining to four of the mines was obtained by R2 Resource Consultants (Blue Bucket Mine, Oriole Mine, Grandview Mine/Mill, and Pend Oreille Mine). Information was still needed for Josephine Mine.

During the call, Carl Kitz provided the following information for Josephine Mine. EPA and BLM evaluated conditions associated with the Josephine Mine. Two mills, Mill #1 and Mill #2, and a section of waterfront property were judged to require corrective action. EPA is currently evaluating clean-up measures for Mill #2 and the waterfront property; in both cases actions would involve on-site institutional controls, i.e., moving tailings to a secure area, thereby preventing them from entering the Pend Oreille drainage. BLM is currently evaluating corrective actions for Mill #2.

**Item 207**

**Seattle City Light--Boundary Hydroelectric Project--Contacts**

**Tracking Number:** 75

**Date of Contact:** 3/8/2006

**Contact Information**

**Contacted By Information**

**Name:** Evan Lewis

**Name:** Alan Olson

**Affiliation:** US Army Corps of Engineers

**Affiliation:** R2 Resource Consultants

**Title:** Biologist

**Phone Number:** (425) 556-1288

**Discipline:**

**Email Address:** aolson@r2usa.com

**Phone Number:** (206) 764-6922

**Email Address:** evan.r.lewis@usace.army.mil

**Reason for Contact:** Get update on status of passage studies at Albeni Falls Dam. Follow-up on email on status sent in September 2005 to Phil Hilgert (R2).

**Information Provided:**

**Information Obtained:** Evan indicated there was essentially no change in the status since the email with Phil in September. They did not partner with Scholz et al. on the proposal to BPA to conduct experimental fish trapping and other studies at the Albeni Falls Project because it was not within their authority. However, should the Scholz et al. proposal get funded, they will attempt to make any future studies sponsored or conducted by the Corps complementary, so that available funding is optimized.

**Follow-up Action Needed:** None required

**Comments:**