**MEETING SUMMARY***
**BISHOP CREEK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT**
**TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP UPDATES**
**FERC PROJECT NO. 1394**

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATE**: | October 26, 2021, 1:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. |
| | October 28, 2021, 9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. |
| **LOCATION**: | Conference Call/Webinar |
| **TOPICS:** | *Botanical, Wildlife, and Recreation Resources* |
| | *Fisheries, Instream Flows, Sediment/Geomorphology, & Operations* |

**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 participating agencies.*

## 1.0 OBJECTIVES

- Review relicensing process and schedule and role of Effects Meetings
- Outline proposed action
- From FERC's Scoping Documents and Stakeholder Identified Issues:
  - Review scoping questions about potential effects
  - SCE proposed resolution/discussion of potential effects
- Build consensus on Project effects and any limitations of the studies
- Provide TWG members information and context needed to target their review of the Draft License Agreement and begin thinking about appropriate license conditions (for later discussion)

## 2.0 ATTENDEES

**DAY 1, October 26, 2021**
*Botanical, Wildlife, Recreation Studies*

Relicensing Team Members
Calvin Rossi, SCE
Martin Ostendorf, SCE
Matt Woodhall, SCE
Lyle Laven, SCE
Vince White, SCE
Seth Carr, SCE

Technical Working Group Members & Interested Parties
Monty Bengochia, Bishop Paiute Tribe
BryAnna Vaughan, Bishop Paiute Tribe
Brandy Wood, CDFW
Rose Banks, CDFW
Alyssa Marquez, CDFW

Finlay Anderson, Kleinschmidt
Matthew Harper, Kleinschmidt
Kelly Larimer, Kleinschmidt
Shannon Luoma, Kleinschmidt
Tyler Kreider, Kleinschmidt
Michael Donovan, Psomas
Brad Blood, Psomas
Edith Read, E Read and Associates, Inc.

Facilitation Team
Terra Alpaugh, KW
Lindsay Tryba, KW

Patricia Moyer, CDFW
Adam Barnett, USFS
Philip Desenze, USFS
Richard McNeill, USFS
Sheila Irons, USFS
Tristan Leong, USFS
Kary Schlick, USFS
Nathan Sill, USFS
Joseph Swisher, USFW
Lawrence (Larry) Primosch, BLM
Ed Hancock, Water Board

**DAY 2, October 28, 2021**
*Fisheries, Sediment, Operations Studies*

Relicensing Team Member
Martin Ostendorf, SCE
Vince White, SCE
Matthew Woodhall, SCE
Finlay Anderson, Kleinschmidt
Kelly Larimer, Kleinschmidt
Brandon Kulik, Kleinschmidt
Bret Hoffman, Kleinschmidt
Matthew Harper, Kleinschmidt
Shannon Luoma, Kleinschmidt
Tyler Kreider, Kleinschmidt
Brad Blood, Psomas
Michael Donovan, Psomas
Edith Read, E Read and Associates, Inc.

Technical Working Group Members & Interested Parties
BryAnna Vaughan, Bishop Paiute Tribe
Beth Lawson, CDFW
Alyssa Marquez, CDFW
Brandy Wood, CDFW
Tristan Leong, USFS
Kary Schlick, USFS
Jill North, Water Board
Parker Thaler, Water Board

Facilitation Team
Mike Harty, KW
Lindsay Tryba, KW

## 3.0 COMPILED ACTION ITEMS

**DAY 1, October 26, 2021**
*Botanical, Wildlife, Recreation Studies*

- **KW** will distribute a link to the relevant Technical Reports
    - Recreation Facilities Condition (REC2) and Land Use and Boundaries (LANDS 1): Link
        - Note: Because the Recreation Use and Needs study (REC 1) is ongoing, with field data being collected through November, a final report will not be ready until the DLA in January. The Relicensing Team is drafting a memo now about that study that will be included with the Updated Study Report (USR) (which will be filed 11/4).
    - Botanical and Wildlife Reports: Link
        - SCE Avian Protection Plan (APP) can be found in Attachment C of the above Wildlife Report (starting on Pg. 87 link)

- **KW** will distribute Edith Read's 5-year monitoring reports: Bishop Creek Monitoring Reports.
- **KW** will distribute a copy of the Annual Avian Training.
- **Edith Read** will confirm that Site 4.2 is on the Technical Report map; if it is not, it will be added.
- **Kleinschmidt** will follow up with **USFS** re: the spatial data for the cottonwood demographic data and the riparian survey spatial data (not just the data for sensitive and invasive plants).
- **Brad Blood** will send **CDFW** the deer population GIS data that he made using CDFW's data.
- **USFS** will compile a list of questions re: recreation effects within the next two weeks and follow up to schedule a focus meeting with SCE if needed.

**DAY 2, October 28, 2021**
*Fisheries, Sediment, Operations Studies*

- **KW** will invite additional USFS staff to the 11/4 Operations Model meeting (in addition to Tristan and Todd, KW will add Casey, Kary, and Michael).
    - **Relicensing Team** offered to set up an additional meeting with USFS if the 11/4 Ops Model meeting and 11/18 USR meeting do not answer their questions.
- **Relicensing Team** will distribute a brief technical report on the water quality data with the USR report in advance of the 11/18 USR meeting. An annual report (scheduled for release in early 2022 before the Draft License Application) will also contain this data.
- **Relicensing Team** will extend the deadline for comments on the Wildlife reports until Friday, 11/29, to accommodate **USFS's** schedule.

## 4.0 INTRODUCTION & GENERAL QUESTIONS

*Note: The same introductory information, described below, was covered at both the October 26th and October 28th meetings.*

The Kearns & West facilitator welcomed participants and introduced the Kleinschmidt Relicensing Team ("Team"). The meeting was organized around twenty-one discreet scoping questions; those questions originated from the FERC Scoping Document (SD1) and subsequent Technical Working Group (TWG) discussions in which TWG members identified additional management objectives that needed investigation, and the study plans were then designed to address them. Ultimately, FERC will make analysis of these questions in the core of their National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review. The meeting was divided into subject-specific blocks (Botanical, Wildlife, Recreation, Fisheries, Sediment, and Operations Modeling ) in which each Team resource-area lead addressed the scoping questions related to that resource area by providing an overview of the study plans' preliminary findings on project effects. Participants were invited to ask questions throughout.

Finlay Anderson, the Team Lead, provided an overview of SCE's Proposed Action with respect to the Project: SCE is proposing no change in Project facilities or operations as compared to current license conditions. Minor FERC boundary adjustments are being proposed to account for existing activities. The Project Facilities and Operations Plan will include provisions for both routine and as-needed maintenance of mechanical and structural elements, such as maintaining low-level-outlets (LLOs), gates, and intakes. The plan will also define and refine procedures relative to sediment release, as well as any other maintenance activities that have the potential to mobilize sediment or have other

potential environmental consequences. The Plan will be implemented in compliance with existing best management practices.

The presentation slides are available on the project website and are not summarized here. The summary below identifies the effects of each study as identified by the Team resource-area lead and focuses on questions and comments from participants and any action items that resulted from the conversation (all of which are compiled in Section 3.0 above).

***SECTIONS 5.0 TO 8.0 BELOW WERE COVERED AS PART OF THE OCTOBER 26TH MEETING.***

## 5.0 BOTANICAL

### 5.1 RELEVANT SCOPING QUESTIONS & OVERVIEW OF EFFECTS

The following were the relevant scoping questions for the botanical study plans, followed by the Team's high-level assessment of Project effects based on the study results. Reference the meeting slides for more detail.

- (7) Potential impacts to changes in the riparian community as a whole, including black cottonwood.
    - *No Project effects on riparian community from continued Project operations and maintenance identified*.
- (8) Effects of continued Project operations and maintenance on distribution of invasive plants in the Project Area.
    - *Data does not indicate whether the number or abundance of invasive plants (other than Robinia) is related to Project activities.; total of 17 invasive species, including black locust, were observed during the 2019 and 2020 surveys. Continued perennialization of the reach between Powerhouses 4 and 5 from the existing instream flow release program will likely result in an expansion of the invasive tree black locust unless eradicated.*
- (9) Effects of continued Project operations and maintenance on sensitive or special-status plants in the Project Area.
    - *No Project effects from continued Project operations and maintenance identified*.

### 5.2 QUESTIONS & COMMENTS

Edith Read, Relicensing Team Botanical Lead, presented the Relicensing Team's conclusions about Project effects based on the botanical studies. Questions and comments from participants included:

- Question (Q) (USFW): Is the riparian community consistent with a diverse age class/structure. How is Black locust recruited (for the non-botanists) or become established?
    - Response (R) (Relicensing Team): Yes, it is a diverse age class (on the basis of height). Botanists do not know exactly how black locust become established. There are several theories; for example, some botanists think that pods are dropped by migrating birds.
- Q (USFS): Cottonwood grows in alluvial soils and tolerates flooding but also requires sufficient drainage of soils. Do you think that the perennial flows may be inundating the root balls and affecting the populations?

    - R (Relicensing Team): It is possible, but dissolved oxygen content is likely relatively high (because it is sandy, rocky soil), so I would not expect to see a large issue with this.
- Q (CDFW): Is site 4.2 on the Technical Report map?
    - R (Relicensing Team): Yes, it should be, and if it is not, then we will add it.
- Q (USFS): What about the effects of maintaining plant operations in the face of climate change? You keep stating that plant operations will remain the same, but the environment may change.
    - R (Relicensing Team): With warmer climates, we may see changes in the elevation range of various plants. There is a potential for indigenous communities to move plants. The minimum flow requirements are determined in consultation with FERC and other agencies.
- Q (CDFW): Could you go into more detail regarding the physical difference between sites 4.1 and 4.2 from the Final Technical Report?
- R (Relicensing Team): There is a stream meander between the two sites, wherein the left bank (as seen by someone looking downstream) of Site 4.1 has more of a northwest-facing aspect while the same bank at Site 4.2 has a southwest-facing aspect.Q (CDFW): How did you determine that there was no effect on the riparian community?
    - R (Relicensing Team): We did not find any effects that could be directly related to the Project other thanthrough the minimum instream flow release program, which increased abundance of the riparian community between Powerhouses 4 and 5. Prior to the program, those reaches had an ephemeral hydrologic regime .
- Q (CDFW): When can we see the written analysis of the effects?
    - R (Relicensing Team): The first written analysis of the effects will be seen in the Draft License Agreement (DLA).
- Q (CDFW): You mentioned size demographic data. Did you collect that with all study sites? Is that available for review? Is it on the website?
    - R (Relicensing Team): Yes, the reports were submitted to various agencies as part of the FERC process. [5-year monitoring reports available here: Bishop Creek Monitoring Reports].
- Q (USFW): Can we please get the cottonwood demographic data and riparian site spatial data before comments are due?
    - R (Relicensing Team): The 2021 Botanical Technical Reports and shape files for invasive and special status plants can be found on Kleinschmidt's ShareFile at this linked site.
        - Q (USFS): I downloaded all the spatial data I could find, but I did not see the locations for the riparian monitoring sites, just the sensitive and invasive plants survey information.
            - R (Relicensing Team): We will double-check and follow up.

## 5.3 ACTION ITEMS

- **KW** will distribute a link to the relevant Botanical Reports: Link
- **KW** will distribute Edith Read's 5-year monitoring reports: Bishop Creek Monitoring Reports.
- **Edith Read** will confirm that Site 4.2 is on the Technical Report map; if it is not, it will be added.
- **Kleinschmidt** will follow up with **USFS** re: the spatial data for the cottonwood demographic data and the riparian survey spatial data (not just the data for sensitive and invasive plants).

## 6.0 WILDLIFE

### 6.1 RELEVANT SCOPING QUESTIONS & OVERVIEW OF EFFECTS

The following were the relevant scoping questions for the wildlife study plans, followed by the Team's high-level assessment of Project effects based on the study results. Reference the meeting slides for more detail.

- (10) Effects of continued Project operation on riparian and wetland habitat and associated wildlife, including waterfowl and wetland dependent birds.
    - *No Project effects from continued Project operations and maintenance identified.*
- (11) Effects of continued Project construction, operation and maintenance on upland wildlife habitat and associated wildlife.
    - *No Project effects from continued Project operations and maintenance identified. There are no changes in Project Operations or Maintenance from existing practices and no new construction of facilities.*
- (12) Effects of continued operation and maintenance of the Project transmission lines on migratory birds and raptors.
    - *No Project effects from continued Project operations and maintenance identified as the Project transmission lines are constrained to a small footprint and mostly outside of the Project boundary. There are no changes in Project Operations or Maintenance from existing practices, and no deaths to migratory birds or raptors have been reported.*
- (13) Indirect effects (i.e., recreational activities related to the Project) of Project operation and maintenance on wildlife species (mule deer).
    - *No indirect Project effects from continued Project operations and maintenance identified. Over 80 wildlife species were observed at Project facilities during surveys. Mule deer and other wildlife have adjusted activity patterns to the presence of the Project and recreationalists.*
- (14) Effects of Project operation and maintenance on federally endangered species, including Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog. Sierra Nevada bighorn sheep, southern willow flycatcher, southern mountain yellow-legged frog), and designated critical habitat (Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog and Sierra Nevada bighorn sheep).
    - *No Project effects from continued Project operations and maintenance identified. There are no known populations of yellow-legged frogs (confirmed by literature review). No special status amphibians were observed in surveys, and no nesting populations or transient populations of Southwestern Willow Flycatcher were observed. No Project effects occur on critical habitat because (1) there are no proposed infrastructure changes or construction; and (2) routine O&M occurs outside of these areas.*

### 6.2 QUESTIONS & COMMENTS

Brad Blood, Relicensing Team Wildlife Lead, presented the Relicensing Team's conclusions about Project effects based on the wildlife study. Questions and comments from participants included:

- Q (Water Board): Do you have an estimate on the size of the mule deer population?
    - R (Relicensing Team): I do not, but CDFW has data from tagged deer in two herds.

- Q (CDFW): Does the avian protection plan include protection of nesting birds during the nesting bird season from maintenance operations?
    - R (Relicensing Team): Yes, SCE has a rigorous training plan for identifying, reporting, and monitoring nesting birds. This will be distributed to participants following this meeting.
- Q (USFS): Can you explain if SCE has observed any unauthorized OHV use? If so, can you explain how that has been analyzed in the wildlife or botany report? Does the recreation report catalog trails, both authorized and other?
    - R (Relicensing Team): I am not aware of any unauthorized OHV, and unauthorized OHV use was not reviewed in this report. The Recreation Report reviews dispersed use around the reservoirs (user-created trails), but there was not an assessment of all forest system trails in the areas.
- Q (USFS): Is the presence of fish and chytrid the reason we do not find frogs?
    - R (Relicensing Team): That is correct; we assume that the presence of trout and chytrid have precluded the presence of frogs.

### 6.3 ACTION ITEMS

- **KW** will distribute a copy of the Annual Avian Training.
- **Brad Blood** will send **CDFW** the deer population GIS data that he made using CDFW's data.

## 7.0 RECREATION

### 7.1 RELEVANT SCOPING QUESTIONS & OVERVIEW OF EFFECTS

The following were the relevant scoping questions for the recreation study plans, followed by the Team's high-level assessment of Project effects based on the study results. Reference the meeting slides for more detail.

- (16) Effects of continued Project operation on recreational use in the Project area, including the adequacy of existing recreational access and capacity of existing recreational facilities, and (17) Evaluate current recreational use and future recreation needs for the Project.
    - *Because SCE is proposing no changes to facilities, operations, or maintenance activities, no effects of continued operation on recreation have been identified.*
    - *Project induced recreation opportunities are associated with Project reservoirs (Lake Sabrina, South Lake, and Intake No. 2 Reservoir). Recreational opportunities at reservoirs would generally include boating, recreational fishing, shoreline access, photography, and scenic views of the lakes.*
        - *Other non-Project recreational opportunities in the vicinity include established campgrounds, recreational fishing, and other facilities related to wilderness hiking.*
- (18) Accuracy of the current Project boundary, and whether lands should be added to or removed from the Project boundary.
    - *SCE is proposing no changes to facilities, operations, or maintenance activities for its next license.*

### 7.2 QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Matthew Harper, Relicensing Team Recreation Lead, presented the Relicensing Team's conclusions about Project effects based on recreation and lands-related studies. Questions and comments from participants included:

- Q (USFS): The USFS believes that there is a nexus between recreational uses and the Project. Much of the recreation use between Lake Sabrina and South Lake is related to the Project. The USFS requests more discussion to get to a place where we can agree on this.
    - R (Relicensing Team): Once we have finalized the data from the ongoing studies, we can have a deeper conversation about this.
- Q (USFS): Could you explain the data behind the determination that SCE finds a lack of connection between recreation use and the Project?
    - R (Relicensing Team): SCE can provide greater detail after the study results are finalized. The Relicensing Team will also review the original study objectives surrounding the determination of nexus that was determined at the beginning of this process and incorporated into study scope.
- Q (USFS): By changes to project facilities, you mean to say no major project facility changes (operational) or boundary changes, but not necessarily upgrades or recreation features that may be improved, etc.?
    - R (Relicensing Team): Yes, that's correct.

### 7.3 ACTION ITEMS

- There were no action items in this section.

## 8.0 REVIEW SCHEDULE AND UPCOMING DATES

### 8.1 OVERVIEW

Upcoming dates:

- Informal (non-FERC required) comments due back on Technical Reports and memos as follows:
    - Plants/Wildlife Tech Reports - 10/28
    - Lands and Boundary Memo – 12/5
    - Facilities Conditions Tech Report – 12/14
- Upcoming TWG Engagement Meetings:
    - Fisheries, IFIM, Operations Model, Sediment and Water Quality Effects Meeting – 10/28
    - Operations Model Follow up – 11/4
    - Meetings to discuss preliminary license conditions – 12/7 & 12/9
    - Continued preliminary license conditions discussions anticipated 2/15/22 – 4/30/22

Updated Study Report

1. To be filed 11/4/21
    a. USR Meeting – 11/18/21
    b. USR Meeting Summary due to FERC – 12/3/21
    c. Comments due on USR Meeting Summary – 1/3/22*

d. Includes study modification requests and formal disagreements with the Meeting Summary
e. SCE Response to any disagreements or comments received due to FERC – 2/2/22*
f. FERC Dispute Resolution and Decision due – 3/4/22
    i. *If no disputes or study modification requests arise by 1/3/22; USR is deemed approved

Draft License Application due to FERC 1/31/22
Final License Application due to FERC 6/30/22

## 8.2 QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Finlay Anderson, Team Lead, presented the schedule and upcoming dates. Questions and comments from participants included:

- Q (USFS): Regarding the recreational effects, the USFS is ready to discuss and submit informal comments to SCE before going through the formal FERC process. The USFS will work internally to consolidate our questions and then meet with the Relicensing Team.
    - R (Relicensing Team): Yes, we can consider setting up a meeting with USFS to discuss this. Edison is still gathering information from the ongoing studies. There might be time to address these disagreements at the 12/7 and 12/9 PM&E meetings, if not before.

## 8.3 ACTION ITEMS

- **USFS** will compile a list of questions re: recreation effects within the next two weeks and follow up to schedule a focus meeting with SCE if needed.

The Relicensing Team thanked attendees and adjourned the 10/26 meeting.

***SECTIONS 9.0 TO 12.0 BELOW WERE COVERED AS PART OF THE OCTOBER 28TH MEETING.***

# 9.0 WATER QUALITY

## 9.1 OVERVIEW

The following were the relevant scoping questions for the water quality study plans, followed by the Team's high-level assessment of Project effects based on the study results. Reference the meeting slides for more detail.

- (1) Effects of continued Project operation and facilities on water quality in Project reservoirs and Project affected stream reaches.
    - *No Project efforts on South Lake or Lake Sabrina due to operations / facilities. Elevated levels (above basin objectives) of TDS below intake elevation appear to be natural and unrelated to operations/facilities.*
    - *Very limited or no mixing/turnover.*

- *No Project efforts on Bishop Creek due to operations / facilities.*

## 9.2 QUESTIONS & COMMENTS

Michael Donovan, Relicensing Team Water Quality Lead, presented the Relicensing Team's conclusions about Project effects based on the water quality study. Questions and comments from participants included:

- Question (Q) (USFS): Regarding the mixing, is that because you did not see any mixing, or is that due to the time constraints of the study?
  - Response (R) (Relicensing Team): It is a meromictic lake, which means that the layers do not mix.
- Q (USFS): What's the temperature differentiation between those layers?
  - R (Relicensing Team): I am unsure of the exact temperatures off the top of my head. At first, the temperature increases as it gets deeper, which is typical of a meromictic lake.
- Q (SWRCB): Approximately how deep is the lake?
  - R (Relicensing Team): The deepest part is around 240 feet when the lake is close to full.
- Q (Water Board): Were any other basin plan parameters detected at any significant levels?
  - R (Relicensing Team): E. coli was identified. There were very low levels of TDS below the intake elevation, which appear to be natural and unrelated to operations/facilities.
- Q (USFS): Does the report document the volume or depth when you see low dissolved oxygen (DO)? Is this below 2mg?
  - R (Relicensing Team): Yes, it goes below 2mg, but the report does not include the volume, only the depth. The document shows profiles for every transect.
- Q (Bishop Paiute Tribe): Can you please share the E. coli data collected?
  - R (Relicensing Team): Yes, we will distribute a small technical report on the collected E. coli data with the USR report in advance of the USR meeting (on 11/18). An annual report (released in early 2022 before the Draft License Application) will also contain this data.
- Q (USFS): Does the upper layer of the lake mix at all?
  - R (Relicensing Team): We collected samples both above and below the outlet, as well as below the low dissolved oxygen (DO) zone. Water quality was very similar above and below the outlet.

## 9.3 ACTION ITEMS

- **Relicensing Team** will distribute a small technical report on sampled water quality data, including the collected E. coli data with the USR report in advance of the USR meeting (on 11/18). An annual report (released in early 2022 before the Draft License Application) will also contain this data.

# 10.0 INSTREAM FLOW

## 10.1 OVERVIEW

The following were the relevant scoping questions for the instream flow study plans, followed by the Team's high-level assessment of Project effects based on the study results. Reference the meeting slides for more detail.

- (2) Effects of Project operation, including the current minimum instream flow releases and channel maintenance flows on resident fish and aquatic habitat in Project affected stream reaches.
    - *No Project effect under proposed action, absent resource management objectives/overlays.*

### 10.2 QUESTIONS & COMMENTS

Brandon Kulick, Relicensing Team Instream Flow Lead, presented the Relicensing Team's conclusions about Project effects based on the instream flows study.

- There were no questions or comments in this section.

### 10.3 ACTION ITEMS

- There were no action items in this section.

## 11.0 FISHERIES

### 11.1 OVERVIEW

The following were the relevant scoping questions for the fisheries study plans, followed by the Team's high-level assessment of Project effects based on the study results. Reference the meeting slides for more detail.

- (3) Effects of Project operation and facilities on upstream and downstream fish passage, including entrainment and turbine mortality.
    - *No Project effect identified for Project facilities and operations. This issue was not identified by stakeholders but is a standard area of interest by FERC; an entrainment study was conducted during the previous relicensing.*
- (4) Effects of Project operation on fish populations in Project reservoirs and Project affected stream reaches.
    - *No Project effect identified for Project reservoirs. Facilities, as well as operations and management (O&M) activities relating to this resource, are consistent with the identified resource management objectives in the Inyo National Forest Land Management Plan.*
    - *No Project effect identified for Project streams.*
- (5) Effects of Project operation and facilities on the potential spread of invasive mussels to Project reservoirs.
    - *This area of concern was not identified by the TWGs; discussions indicated no concerns with invasive mussels.*
- (6) Effects of continued Project operation on the federally listed endangered Owens tui chub.

- *No Project effect of Project operations under the proposed action on the Owens tui chub. There are no known populations in the Project area.*

### 11.2 QUESTIONS & COMMENTS

Brandon Kulik, Relicensing Team Fisheries Lead, presented the Relicensing Team's conclusions about Project effects based on the fisheries study. Questions and comments from participants included:

- Q (USFS): Do we know where the Owens tui chub is located?
  - R (Relicensing Team): This species is reported in literature as native to the general Owens River basin, and not specifically the Project area. We do not know their exact location; but none were detected in the Project area during the study.
- Q (CDFW): When was the Owens sucker population previously surveyed?
  - R (Relicensing Team): There was not a concern before, but SCE was asked to conduct studies and account for flows that would support their potential habitat suitability in the future.
- Q (USFS): Do you have any previous presence/absence results?
  - R (Relicensing Team): No, we were asked to study this, because it is reasonable to think that the lower reaches (*i.e.* specifically below intakes 5 and 6) of the study area might support them someday.

### 11.3 ACTION ITEMS

- There were no action items in this section.

## 12.0 SEDIMENT/GEOMORPHOLOGY

### 12.1 OVERVIEW

The following were the relevant scoping questions for the sediment/geomorphology study plans, followed by the Team's high-level assessment of Project effects based on the study results. Reference the meeting slides for more detail.

- (7) Effects of Project operation and facilities on recruitment and movement of large woody debris and coarse sediment on aquatic habitat including macroinvertebrates.
  - *No changes in current operations or facilities, therefore, no new impacts would occur. The Technical Report is still in draft stage – therefore findings relative to tracer-rock studies are pending.*
  - *Periodic drawdown of the intake reservoirs for maintenance of the intake structures release water and sediment from the low-level outlets.*
  - *There is minimal LWM that is transported through bypassed reaches, other than a notably higher LWM volume in the stream reach below the confluence of Coyote Creek (upstream of Intake 5).*

### 12.2 QUESTIONS & COMMENTS

Tyler Kreider, Relicensing Team Sediment Lead, presented the Relicensing Team's conclusions about Project effects based on the sediment and geomorphology study. Questions and comments from participants included:

- Q (USFS): I think this discussion would benefit by having more hydrologists in attendance. Can we set up a follow-up meeting with the hydrologists?
    - R (Relicensing Team): Yes, we can set up a follow-up meeting with hydrologists if needed, and we will be covering a lot of this information during the USR meeting.
- Q (USFS): Did you quantify where you see the sediment sources coming from?
    - R (Relicensing Team): We did not see a lot of sediment moving through the reach. Overall, the reaches are relatively stable. With the established riparian community, we are not seeing bank erosion, but we did not specifically source this. We suspect that a lot of this is from overland runoff.
- Q (USFS): Can you explain the 200 cfs operation constraint?
    - R (Relicensing Team): That study was conducted in the 1990s. I suspect that was likely a low-level outlet release. That number may have been nominal.

### 12.3 ACTION ITEMS

- **KW** will invite additional USFS staff to the 11/4 Operations Model meeting (in addition to Tristan and Todd, KW will add Casey, Kary, and Michael).
    - **Relicensing Team** offered to set up an additional meeting with USFS if the 11/4 Ops Model meeting and 11/18 USR meeting do not answer their questions.

## 13.0 REVIEW SCHEDULE AND UPCOMING DATES

### 13.1 OVERVIEW

Upcoming dates:

- Informal (non-FERC required) comments due back on Technical Reports and memos as follows:
    - Plants/Wildlife Tech Reports - 10/28
    - Lands and Boundary Memo – 12/5
    - Facilities Conditions Tech Report – 12/14
- Upcoming TWG Engagement Meetings:
    - Fisheries, IFIM, Operations Model, Sediment and Water Quality Effects Meeting – 10/28
    - Operations Model Follow up – 11/4
    - Meetings to discuss preliminary license conditions – 12/7 & 12/9
    - Continued preliminary license conditions discussions anticipated 2/15/22 – 4/30/22

Updated Study Report

- To be filed 11/4/21
    - USR Meeting – 11/18/21
    - USR Meeting Summary due to FERC – 12/3/21
    - Comments due on USR Meeting Summary – 1/3/22*

- Includes study modification requests and formal disagreements with the Meeting Summary
- SCE Response to any disagreements or comments received due to FERC – 2/2/22*
- FERC Dispute Resolution and Decision due – 3/4/22
    - *If no disputes or study modification requests arise by 1/3/22; USR is deemed approved

Draft License Application due to FERC 1/31/22
Final License Application due to FERC 6/30/22

## 13.1 QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

- Q (USFS): Can USFS review the aquatics section again and then provide comments next week?
    - R (Relicensing Team): Yes, we can accommodate that.
- Q (USFS) Has USFS provided any comments on the Aquatics reports?
    - R (Relicensing Team): No, not yet.

The Relicensing Team thanked attendees and adjourned the meeting.