



MEETING SUMMARY*
BISHOP CREEK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MEETING
FERC PROJECT No. 1394

DATE: July 13, 2018, 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

LOCATION: Conference Call

**These meeting notes are documentation of general discussions from the meeting held on the above-noted date. These notes are not a verbatim account of proceedings, are not meeting minutes, and do not represent any final decisions or official documentation for the project or agency.*

ATTENDEES:

Tristan Leong, USFS

Sheila Irons, USFS

LeeAnn Murphy, USFS

Steve Parmenter, CDFW

Shawna Theisen, USFWS

Finlay Anderson, Kleinschmidt

Matt Woodhall, SCE

Terra Alpaugh, Kearns & West

1.0 ACTION ITEMS

- 1) [KW] Provide final June meeting summary to TWG members and post to website.
- 2) [KW] Provide draft Oversight Committee meeting summary to TWG members.
- 3) [SCE, KS, KW] Schedule call with USFWS to brief Shawna on the Project.
- 4) [SCE, KS, KW] Provide Annotated Study Plans to TWGs within two weeks (by July 27).
- 5) [TWGs] Provide initial feedback on draft charter and gaps in Annotated Study Plans by August 8 (note: additional time for review and comment on study plans to be provided following the August TWG meetings).

2.0 OBJECTIVES

- Gather feedback on the Technical Working Group (TWG) meetings, materials, and notifications, including suggestions to make the process as efficient and productive as possible
- Confirm that the Charter clearly articulates the TWGs' purpose and process as understood by all participants
- Review initial study titles and next steps
- Establish clear understanding of schedule and next steps

3.0 SUMMARY

3.1 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Finlay Anderson, Kleinschmidt, welcomed meeting participants and introduced the meeting agenda items. He reported that the Relicensing Team (hereafter, “Team”) has been working on annotated outlines for the study plans, which will include study titles, goals and objectives, proposed study area, and a high-level summary of methods. The August TWGs will be an opportunity to discuss these with all the TWG participants.

3.2 FEEDBACK ON MEETINGS/MATERIALS/PROCESS THUS FAR

Finlay asked participants for constructive feedback on what the Team can be doing better. Matt Woodhall, SCE, reiterated that the purpose of these Oversight Committee calls is to give agencies the opportunity to weigh in on the process – the good, the bad, and the indifferent.

USFS noted that the process has been relatively well organized and asked when the agencies will see a final June meeting summary. He was interested in how comments were being presented, i.e. incorporated or added as an addendum. Terra Alpaugh, Kearns & West, reported that the final agency comments were submitted this week, and she is assessing how to best present them as part of the summary. She expects to circulate a final summary to the agencies the week of July 16th and to post it on the website shortly thereafter [ACTION ITEM].

The USFWS representative explained that she is newly joining the process and getting up to speed, so she is trying to understand where her agency fits in. The Team offered to schedule an introductory call to share information about the Project and process thus far [ACTION ITEM].

3.3 TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP CHARTER

Finlay referred the group to the Charter circulated in advance of the meeting. The intent of the Charter is to clearly lay out the purpose and process of the Technical Working Groups. He welcomed comments. Terra asked the group and their staff members to submit any written comments on the Charter by August 8, so that the Team can make revisions in advance of the August TWG meetings [ACTION ITEM]. A discussion of the Charter will be incorporated at the start of each TWG meeting.

3.4 DRAFT STUDY TITLES

Finlay referred the group to the Draft Study Title document distributed in advance of the meeting, which consisted of study titles organized by TWG resource area. The Study Titles are intended to begin sharing SCE’s assessment of the key resource questions and studies needed to address those, in advance of the more detailed Annotated Study Plans that will be provided later this month,

CDFW requested a framework that explains the scope of what SCE is responsible for, i.e. the obligations that these studies need to fulfill. This will help provide context to their recommendations. CDFW noted that they have a few suggestions from a technical perspective. Finlay said that the Team could provide a framework to help clarify [ACTION ITEM], but that in general, the studies are designed to provide the information needed by agencies to manage key resources within the Project Area. He also noted that

FERC will do their own scoping meeting and likely add additional questions and objectives that SCE will need to address.

Finlay asked the group whether, broadly speaking, there are any major study titles missing that agencies anticipated would be included. USFS observed that there does not appear to be anything related to hydrology or project operations. Finlay explained that while those are not specific study titles, there is an operations model incorporated to support other studies. USFS suggested separating a working model of operations as its own study, since it will be necessary to evaluate alternatives across resource areas. Even if SCE does not change operations, there are potential natural changes that could impact resources, e.g. reduced snowmelt. Finlay agreed that there needs to be transparency and robustness as to how that model is developed and what criteria are included.

3.5 SCHEDULE, NEXT STEPS, ACTION ITEMS

Finlay provided next steps for feedback: the Team will provide Annotated Study Plans within two weeks – around July 26th [ACTION ITEM]. TWG participants will have two to three weeks for review before the meeting. Ideally, agencies will provide feedback on gaps by August 8, so the Team can prepare for conversations about those items [ACTION ITEM].