



MEETING SUMMARY*

BISHOP CREEK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP UPDATES

FERC PROJECT NO. 1394

DATE: March 30, 2022, 9:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.
LOCATION: Conference Call/Webinar
TOPICS: Aquatic, Botanical Resources, & Wildlife

**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. OBJECTIVES

- Confirm the Relicensing Team’s understanding of presented plans and goals.
- Address questions and discuss approach.
- Distinguish measures to address effects vs. management objectives.

2. ATTENDEES

Relicensing Team Members

Martin Ostendorf, SCE
Matthew Woodhall, SCE
Calvin Rossi, SCE
Kelly Larimer, SCE
Brandon Kulik, Kleinschmidt
Gabriel Martin, Kleinschmidt
Shannon Luoma, Kleinschmidt
Bret Hoffman, Kleinschmidt
Tyler Kreider, Kleinschmidt
Finlay Anderson, Kleinschmidt
Edith Read, E Read and Associates, Inc.

Technical Working Group Members & Interested Parties

Beth Lawson, CDFW
Alyssa Marquez, CDFW
Nick Buckmaster, CDFW
Brandy Wood, CDFW
Monique Sanchez, USFS
Sheila Irons, USFS
Blake Engelhardt, USFS
Nathan Sill, USFS
Tristan Leong, USFS
Todd Ellsworth, USFS

Michael Donovan, Psomas
Brad Blood, Psomas

Monty Bengochia, Bishop Paiute Tribe

Facilitation Team

Mike Harty, Kearns & West
Terra Alpaugh, Kearns & West
Lindsay Tryba, Kearns & West

3. COMPILED ACTION ITEMS

Action Items from the 3/30 PM&E Meeting:

Sediment and aquatics-related follow-up:

- **Relicensing Team** will reach out to LADWP to discuss options for flushing sediment from the project through their system.
- **Relicensing Team and agencies (e.g., USFS)** will follow up with the Water Board to discuss the sediment supplementation proposal and any water quality concerns.
- **Relicensing Team** will think about adjusting the naming and structure of the Sediment Management Plan so that it appropriately reflects the content.
- **CDFW** will follow up with Nick Buckmaster to clarify his comments at the first PM&E meeting on interest in rainbow trout in the creek and share feedback with Relicensing Team.
- **Relicensing Team** to develop flow objectives by reach to balance various priorities, including agency objectives and SCE constraints, to share with TWG.
- **Relicensing Team** to schedule one or two small group meetings to discuss topics related to PM&E measures for fish populations in the creek, including:
 - Fish growth in Bishop Creek with reference to CDFW's (Nick Buckmaster's) presentation on the Typical von Bertalanffy Growth Model. SCE is interested in seeing the full range of fish growth from data (not just the upper range). **Nick Buckmaster** will distribute the full range of desirable objectives for fish sizes in Bishop Creek.
 - Recreation data with relation to angler experience.
 - Approaches to stocking creek.
 - Potential changes to operations to benefit native species in the creek.
- **Brandon Kulik** to share updated PHAMSIM HSE curves for sucker and dace in Reach 3 with Nick Buckmaster and Tristan Leong, along with a brief methods description; **Nick Buckmaster** to QA/QC, suggest any adjustments and confirm curves are appropriate for use.

Botanical-related follow-up:

- **Relicensing Team** will convene a small group meeting with agencies' botanical representatives (initial invite list: Bret, Edith, Blake, Beth) to discuss the black cottonwood data, vegetation plan, and invasive species plan before the next PM&E meeting. This will include looking at the hydrographs and identifying any reaches within which there are particular concerns about dropping water too quickly for black cottonwood root development.
 - **Relicensing Team** will develop a botanical work plan to address the remaining vegetation-related questions before convening the small group and will update the document as needed. SCE will consider USFS's request to create one document that

combines special status plans and invasive species plans with the vegetation plans to meet general management and safety requirements.

- **Relicensing Team** will distribute SCE’s corporate plans for non-native invasive species to the TWGs.
- **Relicensing Team** will distribute all riparian reports, historical monitoring reports, and current management plans to the TWGs.
 - This link allows stakeholders to access the [5-year monitoring reports and vegetation data](#).
 - This link is where SCE has compiled most of the [existing management plans](#) that are referenced in the proposed management plans. The Vegetation Management Operations Manual (VMOM) is not included in the scope of this plan. After reviewing the VMOM plan, SCE finds it more efficient to copy over relevant sections of the plan and incorporate them directly into the proposed Bishop plans. This will avoid some potential confusion as the scope of the VMOM is well beyond what would be implemented in the FERC license area.

4. INTRODUCTIONS

The DLA has been filed, and the comment period is currently underway. The Relicensing Team (“The Team”) reminded the group that they are not yet at the stage of discussing fully developed PM&E measures but working to coalesce around a general approach in each resource area. The Team stressed that PM&E measures should be focused on addressing project effects; ways to accommodate management objectives as part of a future condition can be considered as well.

5. AQUATICS/FLOW MEASURES

Programmatic goals for flow measures

The Relicensing Team reviewed their programmatic goals for any flow measures, which include:

- Compliance with Chandler Decree
- Operational flexibility
- Sediment management to facilitate O&M requirements and flexibility
- Minimization of generation impacts
- Implementation using existing infrastructure
- Ensuring clarity on measures to address project effects vs management objectives.

Discuss Agency objectives and proposals

The Kearns & West facilitator reminded TWG participants that the Team was responding to the CDFW-USFS presentation from the March 1st meeting. At that meeting, CDFW presented programmatic goals and reach by reach goals; today SCE is going propose programmatic approaches to achieve the goals outlined by the agencies. The Team walked through the agency goals and proposals one-by-one and shared their proposed approach to addressing each goal. See the meeting slides for specifics. Below are the comments and questions that were posed, organized by goal.

Goal 1: Sediment Management and Monitoring: Implementation:

Questions and comments from participants and Relicensing Team members included:

- Comment (C) (Relicensing Team): SCE clarified that they do not want to install new infrastructure to implement sediment management. Therefore, the flow rates need to be managed at a coarse rather than a fine scale; SCE will need to adaptively manage their releases to determine how to translate the calculated flows to actual flows.
 - Question (Q) (USFS): Will the rough capacity of each gate be outlined somewhere?
 - Response (R) (Team): The capacity will be outlined in the Sediment Management Plan. Capacity when the gates are completely open is generally straightforward, but as gates are incrementally closed, there is some variability between calculated and actual flows, as well as constraints with regard to some gates' ability to operate outside full open or shut status. This variability will also be included in the plan.
- C (Team): **[ACTION ITEM]** The Team needs to talk to LADWP about flushing. They do not want to presume anything about the ability to push sediment through LADWP's system below the last powerhouse. The Team anticipates that some mechanical removal may be necessary at Plant 6. In the current flow regime, there is suspended sediment that goes over the spillways; the changes would not be focused on controlling that but rather would focus on mobilizing bulk sediment over the impoundments higher in the system.
 - Response (R) (USFS): USFS would like to understand the overall sediment budget and what the point of sediment management would be if all the sediment gets stuck at the bottom of the system and has to be removed.
- C (Team): The Team acknowledged the interest in sediment flushing monitoring; they need to confirm the proposed objectives before they can design monitoring. They propose having an initial monitoring period to confirm sediment is effectively moving through the system and make any adaptive adjustments accordingly.
 - R (USFS): Applauded the approach SCE articulated. Knowing whether efforts to move sediment are working and whether they can be tweaked is important; trying to track the impacts of sediment management on the system over time is much harder, since flushing events are episodic and there are other variables at play.
- Q (CDFW): Most of sediment is coarse and forms a Gilbert delta at the top of impoundments, rather than stacking up against the dam. Therefore, if an impoundment gate is opened, it will just release fine sediments not bigger gravel. Would SCE be mechanically moving the sediments at the top of the impoundment?
 - R (Team): If there are boulders that drop out in delta, those will not be mobilized by relatively low flows, but the creek will still come through that area and depending on what gets mobilized, SCE can adaptively manage. The exact approach will vary based on the characteristics of the reach.
- Q (USFS): How does the timing of sediment releases from impoundments into Bishop Creek coincide with recreation opportunities; if SCE is flushing sediment, will the Creek get too turbid?
 - C (CDFW): Fishmas is the third Saturday in April and pertains more to reservoirs than the creek; the creek is open year-round; sediment releases would only occur in high water years in which recreation would not be heavy.

- C (USFS): There is probably an appropriate rate of change regarding turbidity.
- C (Team): The Team needs to check in with the Water Board to confirm that they do not have concerns with the proposed sediment management approach. **[ACTION ITEM]**
 - C (USFS): USFS and other agencies will also follow up. It is important to highlight the preference for a programmatic approach to sediment rather than one-off dredge and fill permitting.
- Q (CDFW): How frequently is SCE planning to do these flushes?
 - R (SCE): No more than once a year with up to a 10-year period between sediment flushes, aligning with wet years. There is about a 7-year period between wet period in period of record.

Goal 2: Natural Hydrograph

Questions and comments from participants and Relicensing Team members included:

- Q (Team): What would project effects would SCE be mitigating by implementing ramping and minimizing sharp drop offs?
 - R (CDFW): Significant drop offs result in stranding of fish, impacts to benthic macroinvertebrates, impacts to riparian vegetation if they are timed when the vegetation is developing roots. Which criteria should be used to define a sharp drop off should be considered by the TWG.
 - R (CDFW): If plants' roots are not deep enough to follow a drop in water levels, these are periods during which they are not able to establish. Preventing this might mean ramping down a little more slowly off spill events. The group should talk about reaches where there are problems with cottonwoods establishing and how their locations overlap with the hydrographs.
 - C (Team): There should be a dedicated meeting to discuss reach by reach riparian objectives and if there are concerns in specific reaches **[ACTION ITEM]**. Look at hydrographs and then report back to larger meeting.
 - C (USFS): It is a good idea to have a focused discussion on this topic.

Goal 3: Geomorphic and Peak Flows

Questions and comments from participants included:

- Q (USFS): If all the peak flow and hydrograph info will be included in the Sediment Management Flow, maybe it should be renamed so it is clear its scope extends beyond sediment?
 - R (Team): The Team will consider that suggestion as they finalize what gets placed where. **[ACTION ITEM]**

Goal 4: Recreational and Native Fisheries

Questions and comments from participants and Relicensing Team members included:

- Q (Team): At the last PM&E meeting, CDFW mentioned rainbow trout in the creek; was that a change in prioritized species for Bishop Creek? Or did they mean brown trout?

- R (CDFW): CDFW will follow up with Nick Buckmaster to clarify his comments at the first PM&E meeting on interest in rainbow trout in the creek and share feedback with Relicensing Team. **[ACTION ITEM]**
- Q (Team): Is the proposed flow regime intended to augment the management objectives or address project impacts?
 - R (CDFW): Depending on the reach, CDFW is considering stocking as a measure to supplement the fishery, or they are looking to augment flows to establish self-sustaining fishery.
 - C (Team): IFIM is a tool to prioritize certain life stages by reach.
- Q (Team): One of requests in Reach 3 was to manage that reach to minimize brown trout (e.g., to introduce flows that would dislodge redds), thereby benefiting native fish, including suckers and dace. Is that considered a desired condition or a measure to address a project impact? For FERC purposes, they will look at flow proposals designed to address project impacts on the river, which might not be the same thing as tweaking management for particular fish. As the Team prepares documents for FERC to complete NEPA analysis, they need to be able to articulate that PM&Es are intended to address a certain effect or because they benefit certain resources; the distinction also helps SCE decide between must have and nice to have measures.
 - R (CDFW): The goal of a self-sustaining fishery is not reachable. CDFW will want to see an increase to the SCE stocking agreement. Either SCE needs to manage fish within the project area such that they can grow large enough to meet recreational needs or they can put more fish in.
 - R (Team): Understanding that CDFW's interest is fish populations that meet recreational need is useful.
- Q (SCE): The baseline is the project as it currently exists. What is the effect of the project on fisheries related to fishing effort? CDFW's goal appears to be meeting certain fishing objectives in terms of experience of fisherman. The stocking effort would need to be directly related to that. Are fishermen not catching any fish because of project? How does Bishop Creek fishing compare to fishing on similar rivers? The stocking SCE currently does is related to past entrainment; very few fish are lost every year, so SCE agreed to stock 2,500 every five years. This stocking request seems to be related to management objectives.
 - R (CDFW): Reduced flows in streams are limiting fishery production and limiting fish growth.
 - R (USFS): SCE's baseline approach is very NEPA-centric baseline. Resource agencies all have resource goals and objectives, and impacts on those goals constitute a project effect. It sounds like the Team is interested in better understanding what the objective is that is driving the request for various actions.
 - C (SCE): SCE wants to understand where the line is between SCE and CDFW's responsibilities in terms stocking.
 - R (USFS): If you look back at history of project, there appears to be a clear history in previous relicensings linking changes in flow to angling interests. CDFW is currently stating there are some unmet objectives, specifically a concern that native fish fauna needs are not being met by current operations. Separately, there are different ways to address some of the recreational and fishery objectives. Some reaches are

going to be managed specifically for recreation interests, and some may have dual, multipurpose goals and objectives.

- R (SCE): What does the study say? Are there unhappy fishermen?
- R (CDFW): CDFW is saying stocking responsibilities should be 50/50. Bishop Creek can be compared to Pine Creek which is smaller watershed. When Bishop Creek is compared to other watersheds in the Sierra, fish growth is less.
- C (USFS): If the catchable size density is the issue, can that be addressed through different means? It sounds like stocking or habitat will support better growth, so the parties just need to determine what can be supported.
- C (Team): Agree that it sounds like there may be two approaches.
- C (SCE): SCE clarified that they do not want to stop the stocking agreement, but they do want to understand what the stocking agreement is trying to address and the specifics of what CDFW is thinking. For instance, what is the cost of a 50/50 split? Would it be every year or every several years? SCE would like CDFW to articulate the project effect and what is needed to mitigate it.
- C (CDFW): CDFW suggested a smaller call to discuss these issues, or potentially two calls, one to discuss stocking as it relates to recreation and one to discuss potential changes to operations to assist native populations. **[ACTION ITEM]**
- R (SCE): SCE agreed that there is some overlap, but the topics deserve separate conversations.
- C (Team) The Team is upgrading PHABSIM model to show reach-specific analysis. There was interest in Reach 3 (Bishop Creek downstream of the confluence with Coyote Creek to Plant 4). Initially, the Team was asked to model adult and juvenile brown trout life stages, but then was asked to look at flows to manage instead for native species (sucker and dace) to promote their spawning. The Team went into the model, dropped in incubation and early lifestage criteria for surrogate native species and left brown trout curves as reference. Most of the activity in habitat suitability is in lower level of flow range.
 - Q (USFS): What is the minimum instream flow in this reach? Were there adult curves for dace and sucker?
 - R (Team): Yes, the Team can run those curves as well and drop them into graph. Current minimum instream flows are 5 cfs as released from intake above, but the creek also receives inflow from Coyote Creek (3 or more cfs under normal conditions).
 - C (CDFW): It would be great to share the habitat suitability curves to make sure they reflect what would be anticipated by the biologists. Where did the Team source the get early life stages?
 - R (Team): They used long nosed dace or white sucker criteria.
 - C (CDFW): There are meaningful ecological differences between white suckers and Owens sucker.
 - R (Team): The spawning and incubation criteria would be about the same. The Team considered any substrate at all to be optimally suitable because there is very little vegetation, which probably overestimates the amount of habitat area that is suitable but reflects how hydraulics would react to life stages. The Team will

send data with a brief summary methods section and ask agencies to give feedback and confirm the curves are appropriate for use [ACTION ITEM].

- Q (USFS): Regarding reintroducing dace or suckers, there is a fair amount of uncertainty in terms of what future conditions could be achieved. Is the goal to pick a specific number or to pick a number for now and then be able to adapt?
 - R (SCE): SCE is not interested in picking a number now and then reopening in 10 years. Need to have this discussion in the near future to balance resources.
 - C (USFS): USFS clarified that they do not want to relicense in 10 years. But maybe the parties could agree that in five years they will do monitoring to determine if an action was beneficial to resource objectives; if it was not, they will have already determined that that didn't work, XX is what they will do instead. USFS is interested in a check to make sure we are meeting resource objectives.

Goal 5: Minimum Instream Flows

Questions and comments from participants included:

- C (CDFW): CDFW is looking forward to seeing the new version of the model once it is ready so they can begin to use it.

Goal 6: Riparian Measures

Follow up:

- Clarify "effect" vs management objective.
 - Riparian community appears healthy.
- SCE to conduct additional analysis with existing data to articulate specific mechanisms that could promote cottonwood abundance.
 - Follow up with reach walk to clarify data and observations.
- Align / capitalize with Sediment Management Plan.

Questions and comments from participants included:

- (C) (CDFW): The data shows that there are declines in the black cottonwood. Perhaps the Relicensing Team can convene a small meeting with botanical interest parties to go through this data together. CDFW would like to see this issue associated with the sediment management plan.
 - (R) (Team): The data through 2016 showed a slight decline in black cottonwoods, but the 2019 data showed some recovery, especially around Powerhouse 4. The focus should be to create conditions that are favorable but to avoid a specific quantifiable goal to measure seedlings.
- (C) (CDFW): What will the sensors in the stream channels record?

- (R) (Team): The sensors will monitor stream stage (i.e., the height of the water column flowing in the stream).
- (Q) (CDFW): Could the sensors collect data to show if the banks are scouring?
 - (R) (Team): Not necessarily. The Team would have to look at discharge and recruitment in the channels to gather scouring data.
- (Q) (CDFW): Do you know if the recovery observed in 2019 is associated with the record high runoff that occurred?
 - (R) (Team): Yes, it is likely that the record high runoff contributed, as well as other factors.
- (Q) (USFS): When will the 2019 data be available to review? Can we use this data when we convene botanical small group discussion?
 - (R) (Team): At this time, the Team is not sure when the 2019 data will be available. The Team will need to develop a botanical workplan to address the additional questions proposed today. This workplan can guide the small group discussion.
 - **[Action Item]: Relicensing Team** will convene a small group meeting with agencies' botanical representatives (initial invite list: Bret, Edith, Blake, Beth) to discuss the black cottonwood data, vegetation plan, and invasive species plan before the next PM&E meeting. This will include looking at the hydrographs and identifying any reaches within which there are particular concerns about dropping water too quickly for black cottonwood root development.
 - **[Action Item]: Relicensing Team** will develop a botanical work plan to address the remaining vegetation-related questions before convening the small group and will update the document as needed. SCE will consider USFS's request to create one document that combines special status plans and invasive species plans with the vegetation plans to meet general management and safety requirements.
- (C) (CDFW and USFS): There was a recommendation for the Relicensing Team to continue riparian monitoring in these goals and workplans. The groups should consider reviewing what was done in the past and highlight the areas that can be continued moving forward.

CDFW Presentation: Typical von Bertalanffy Growth Model

Nick Buckmaster, CDFW, presented a graph showing the Typical von Bertalanffy Growth Model. The graph shows the expected length at age of brown trout in Pine Creek, Lower Gorge, Cardinal 1, Sada 3 and Sada 5.

Questions and comments from participants included:

- (Q) (RT): Bishop Creek has a lot of young and yearling brook trout. Did CDFW see the same density of brown trout in Lower Pine?
 - (R) (CDFW): The density of brown trout is not the same in Lower Pine; density of fish varies by watershed.
- (Q) (USFS): What size fish are stocked in Bishop Creek?
 - (R) (CDFW): CDFW stocks 10-inch fish in Bishop Creek.

- (Q) (USFS): Are the fish that are found in the Bishop Creek drainage typically three to four years old?
 - (R) (CDFW): In general, yes.
- (Q) (CDFW): Where are Cardinal 1, Sada 3, and Sada 5 located?
 - (R) (CDFW): Cardinal 1 is upstream of Cardinal Village Resort. Sada 3 is in Reach 4 and Sada 5 is below Intake 5.
- (Q) (Team): What is the range that CDFW aspires to meet? It sounds like this data represents the upper crust of the desirable objectives. Can CDFW also show the lower and mid-level ranges for comparable unregulated reaches?
 - (R) (CDFW and USFS): It is difficult to compare watersheds, and there is not a very close comparison for Bishop Creek; the Owens River might be the closest comparison. There are some similarities to other smaller watersheds, but every system is so different.
 - **[Action Item]:** CDFW will distribute the full range of desirable objectives for fish sizes in Bishop Creek.
- (Q) (Team): Is it fair to say that Bishop Creek is so different from the other watersheds listed in CDFW's comparison that it produces different fish sizes? In other words, it is reasonable to say that the reason why the fish are smaller in Bishop Creek could be due to the natural conditions, not the Project?
 - (R) (CDFW): We should discuss this in the small group discussion. CDFW suggests that the water in the Bishop Creek Project is in the penstock, which means that there is an artificial ceiling that suppresses fish growth in Bishop Creek.
 - **[Action]: Relicensing Team** will discuss fish growth in Bishop Creek to address CDFW's (Nick Buckmaster) presentation on the Typical von Bertalanffy Growth Model during the next small group meeting on fish populations.

Wildlife Resources Management Plan (WRMP)

The WRMP is 90 percent complete and should be done in three weeks. The Team outlined what will be included in the WRMP:

- Update the Implementation for Mitigation of Impacts to Sensitive or Endangered Plant and Wildlife Species from the previous license.
- An updated table of species known to occur, or with potential to occur, within the FERC Project boundary.
- Continued implementation of the Avian Protection Plan (APP).
- Continued implementation SCE's Nesting Bird Management Guidance (NBG) for Small Projects.
- Continued implementation Pre-Activity Nesting Bird and Raptor Surveys during the recognized nesting season, adjusted for altitude across the project.
- Continued maintenance of mule deer and other wildlife crossings and guzzlers.
- Management and protective activities for at-risk wildlife species.
- Continue implementation of pre-activity surveys for special status wildlife.
- Questions and comments from participants included:
 - (Q) (CDFW): Will bat surveys be included in the WRMP?
 - (R) (Team): No, because the initial wildlife surveys did not find special status species bats. If the Team found listed bats, then the WRMP would include future surveys.

Additionally, the language in the SRMP leaves flexibility for future surveys in case the status changes.

- (C) (CDFW): CDFW is working with bat specialists to better understand this issue because there are potential maternal colonies near the project.
 - (R) (RT): The Team works with Mike Morrison. The Team has not found any potential effects.
- (Q) (CDFW): Has the Relicensing Team found Goss Hawks and other raptors on Birch creek? Is there a plan to accommodate changes within special status species?
 - (R) (RT): If there is a potential for special status species to reside in an area with potential disturbances from new projects, then the Relicensing Team recommends conducting pre-construction surveys. The WRMP has language that reflects the potential for changes to special status species, and the language is general in order to allow for flexibility in the future. Also, SCE has yearly meetings with USFS to discuss their planned projects to coordinate any potential disturbances from new projects.

Botanical Resources Management Plan (BRMP)

The BRMP is 90 percent complete and should be done in three weeks. It will update the SEPP to a Rare, Threatened and Endangered (RTE) Species Resource Management. Additional components to the BRMP include:

- An updated table of species known to occur, or with potential to occur, within the FERC Project boundary.
- Measures that could be implemented to avoid impacts
- Measures that could be implemented to minimize impacts, if impacts cannot be avoided
- Management and protective activities for at-risk botanical species
- Continued implementation of the existing Vegetation Management Operations Manual
- Questions and comments from participants were asked following the Invasive Species Management Plan (ISMP) below.

Invasive Species Management Plan (ISMP)

The ISMP is 75 percent complete and should be done in three weeks. It will describe measures to achieve desired conditions for invasive species including information on the treatment or management of the spread of these species. Plan components will include:

- A list of invasive species known to occur within the FERC Project Boundary, a brief summary of the life history of each that is relevant to control or eradication, and a priority rank for each (e.g., control vs. eradication vs. limiting dispersal);
- A “watch” list of plant and animal invasive species not presently known to occur within the FERC Project Boundary but known to occur in the region, and a brief summary of the life history of each that is relevant to preventing their introduction;
- Description of SCE’s current practices for preventing the introduction and dispersal of invasive species; and
- Measures for control or eradication at specific target areas, e.g., populations of black locust (*Robinia pseudoacacia*).

- Questions and comments from participants included:
- (Q) (CDFW): Are invasive mussels a concern in Bishop Creek?
 - (R) (Team): No, invasive mussels are not a major concern in Bishop Creek. SCE has a corporate plan for invasive mussels, which directs management for all SCE projects.
- (Q) (USFS): How does SCE plan to address future invasive species in these plans?
 - (R) (Team): The BRMP has language that addresses flexibility for management of future invasive species. The Relicensing Team has regular conversations with the Operations Team and SCE to understand best practices and management plans.
- (Q) (CDFW): Are SCE's practices for non-native plant species the same as from the last relicensing? Can we review the corporate plans? Are the corporate plans listed on the website?
 - (R) (Team): The corporate plans are fairly general. The corporate plans are not listed on the Bishop Creek website, but the Relicensing Team can distribute the plans to the TWGs.
 - **[Action Item]: Relicensing Team** will distribute SCE's corporate plans for non-native species to the TWGs.
- (Q) (CDFW): When will future surveys occur?
 - (Q) (Team): The Relicensing Team is drafting language that will explain when surveys occur; typically, surveys occur when project disturbances (like construction) are proposed.
- (Q) (CDFW): Are all riparian reports available on the relicensing website?
 - (R) (RT): The Team can distribute the historical monitoring reports and send out the current management plans.
 - **[Action] Relicensing Team** will distribute all riparian reports, historical monitoring reports, and current management plans to the TWGs.
 - This link allows stakeholders to access the [5-year monitoring reports and vegetation data](#).
 - This link is where SCE has compiled most of the [existing management plans](#) that are referenced in the proposed management plans. The Vegetation Management Operations Manual (VMOM) is not included in the scope of this plan. After reviewing the WMOM plan, SCE finds it more efficient to copy over relevant sections of the plan and incorporate them directly into the proposed Bishop plans. This will avoid some potential confusion as the scope of the VMOM is well beyond what would be implemented in the FERC license area.
- (Q) (CDFW): On other projects, the vegetation management plan can overlap with the invasive species plan. Perhaps the Relicensing Team can show how these plans overlap and think about how this relates to the protection of rare species during this work. Can the Relicensing Team explain why there are two separate plans?
 - (R) (Team): SCE integrates the plans for anyone who requests to do work within the FERC boundary.
 - (C) (CDFW): There is a concern that if the vegetation management and invasive plans are separate, then some management will be lost and not planned for adequately. CDFW suggested coordinating these plans. For example, the current vegetation management plan does not address measures to meet safety requirements. So far, the plans only reference special status plants and invasive species, but neglect other vegetation management needs.

- **[Action Item]:** SCE will consider USFS's request to create one document that combines special status plans and invasive species plans with the vegetation plans to meet general management and safety requirements.
- (Q) (USFS): Can the Relicensing Team create a list of documents that USFS is asked to review?
 - (R) (Team): USFS can reference Appendix A in the DLA, which lists all plans. The Relicensing team has not committed to anything that was not listed in the DLA. Appendix A contains the following plans: Minimum Instream Flow Measures, Gaging Plan, Sediment Management Plan, Stocking Plan, Wildlife Resources Management Plan, Botanical Resources Management Plan, Invasive Species Management Plan, Recreation Resources Management Plan, Historic Properties Management Plan, and Invasive Mussels Prevention Plan.

The Relicensing Team thanked participants for their continued engagement and adjourned the meeting.