



**MEETING SUMMARY NOTES\***  
**BISHOP CREEK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT**  
**OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**FERC PROJECT NO. 1394**

**DATE:** April 3 2018, 10:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.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	Finlay Anderson, Kleinschmidt
Shiela Irons, USFS	Nuria Holmes, Kleinschmidt
Nick Buckmaster, CDFW	Kelly Larimer, Kleinschmidt
Heidi Calvert, CDFW	Terra Alpaugh, Kearns & West
Steve Parmenter, CDFW	Janet Thompson, Kearns & West
Matt Woodhall, SCE	

---

## **1.0 ACTION ITEMS**

- 1) [Agencies + NGOs] Confirm availability for June TWG meetings: June 4-5, or June 7-8 or June 4, 5, 7.
- 2) [Agencies + NGOs] Review TWG participants list and confirm/modify and/or identify alternates.
- 3) [Agencies + NGOs] Provide feedback on meeting summary notes from 3/15 by COB Monday 4/9.
- 4) [SCE] Fix maps links on the website.
- 5) [SCE] Distribute draft of existing conditions and references in May, prior to TWG meetings.

---

## **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

- Oversight Committee role and responsibilities (communication plan)
- March 15 stakeholder kick off meeting – initial comments and feedback
- Confirm agency stakeholder representatives on technical work groups (TWGs)
- TWG schedule, June meetings, and site visit
- Answer process, procedure, and regulatory questions

## **3.0 SUMMARY**

---

### **3.1 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

Finlay Anderson, Kleinschmidt, introduced the purpose of the Policy/Oversight Committee as a venue to resolve process questions or disagreements within the Technical Working Groups (TWGs). The Committee, which will meet periodically via phone, is intended to facilitate forward progress. Finlay requested that each agency designate a representative with decision-making authority—ideally whoever will sign their name to documents within the consultation record and someone who is familiar with FERC policies and procedures—to represent them on this committee. Designating an alternate is also a good idea. Finlay clarified that the group will not be making decisions in a vacuum but will include whichever subject matter experts are relevant to the discussion at hand.

Heidi Calvert will serve as the CDFW lead on the committee, with Steve Parmenter and Nick Buckmaster as alternates. Shiela Irons will serve as the Forest Service lead, with Tristan Leong providing advice and support. Matthew Woodhall described his role as SCE project manager; all SCE decisions will come from him, or in his absence, Martin Ostendorf. Kleinschmidt will provide technical consulting services, with Finlay Anderson as the lead.

Finlay updated attendees on outreach to other possible participants in the TWGs: his team is working to find the appropriate contact from SWRCB; they are in the midst of engaging with new CalTrout representatives; they have a contact from the BLM; and they have not interacted with USFWS but continue to reach out. USFS was interested in whether local stakeholders would be involved. Terra Alpaugh, Kearns & West, summarized public outreach to date, including two mailings, multiple email blasts, newspaper ads, and a March public meeting. She described a limited public response thus far but the intent to continue informational outreach as the summer approaches.

Finlay next shared the draft list of TWG participants and the resource area interests they designated interest in at the March 15 Stakeholder Meeting. Participants agreed to edit and provide an updated list of their staff's involvement. They also agree to submit any feedback on the March 15 meeting summary by April 9. The finalized summary will be included in the consultation record.

USFS expressed its support for SCE's effort to engage stakeholders and initiate work on the study plans early via a hybrid ILP. They were curious whether SCE's goal was limited to getting agreement on the study plans prior to filing the PAD or whether they would also try to get agreement on PM&E measures prior to filing the license. Matt and Finlay confirmed that their primary objective is to accelerate the study plan determinations in order to include them in the PAD. Post-PAD, they expect work to proceed along normal ILP timelines; however, the early study plan determinations will give them more time to interpret study results and at that point, it will be a policy call on SCE's part regarding whether to work collectively on the PM&Es.

### **3.2 JUNE TWG MEETING AND SITE VISIT PREPARATION**

Finlay Anderson described the objective of the TWGs as producing study plans to be included in the PAD. He explained that his team has collected all the reference material they could find on each of the resource areas. Given what already exists, the TWGs will be tasked with determining what scoping studies are needed to fill the data gaps and answer outstanding questions. He emphasized that each study must have a clear nexus to the project and its future operations.

He outlined the steps his team will take prior to the June meetings: (1) review feedback and questions from the March 15 breakout sessions; (2) draft preliminary existing environment sections, which will include identifying which questions are answered by existing data and which require additional data gathering, and also categorizing questions by whether they have a clear nexus to the project, need to be reformulated to achieve that nexus, or are not relevant to project operations. The team's goal for the June meeting is to develop a robust list of study plan titles. USFS requested access to existing information in advance of the meeting; Finlay confirmed that those references will be part of the existing environment draft section.

CDFW expressed concern about (a) SCE's intent to use the discussions from March 15 as the basis for their list of resource interests and issues, since all TWG participants were not present and the conversations were informal, and (b) the speed of the proposed schedule which establishes the expectation that, after one June meeting, the TWG will agree on a list of studies. Finlay clarified that while they hope to make significant progress during the June meeting, they do not expect to have a comprehensive list of studies and anticipate revisions. In May, they plan to distribute a report on the existing conditions and questions as they understand them – and intend that to be the start of the conversation, which will be further broadened by the site visit. Adjustments to the calendar can be discussed at the next Oversight Committee Meeting, depending on what progress is made in June. Matt Woodhall clarified that, while SCE's goal is to achieve consensus on the study plans, they understand that they may fall short; at a minimum, they will better understand areas of consensus and disagreement.

Finlay proposed starting the June meeting with a day-long site visit, followed by a day of TWGs, and then concluded by follow-up conference calls a week or so later. He suggested that more remote areas could be visited separately, possibly as part of the August meetings. Other possibilities were considered, including non-consecutive days, to accommodate for USFS' availability. USFS and CDFW supported the idea of starting with the site visit to stimulate conversation and questions. They agreed to confirm their availability for June 4/5, 4/5/7, and/or 7/8.

USFS also requested that SCE fix the link to the project maps on their website, so visitors can better understand how the Project abuts private, Forest Service and BLM lands. SCE also confirmed that their GIS Department has reached out to the Inyo National Forest to discuss sharing GIS layers.