

MEETING SUMMARY*
BISHOP CREEK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT
AQUATIC TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP
FERC PROJECT No. 1394

DATE: February 27, 2019, 9:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

LOCATION: Conference Call & Webinar

**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:

Sheila Irons, USFS

Ashley Blythe-Haverstock, USFS

Greg Haverstock, BLM

Matt Woodhall, SCE

Audry William, SCE

Finlay Anderson, Kleinschmidt

Shelly Davis-King, Consultant

Lynn Compas, HRA

Heather Miller, HRA

Terra Alpaugh, Kearns & West

1.0 ACTION ITEMS

- SCE to research land ownership of area immediately around the plants.
- USFS to provide the INF/BLM protocol for NAGPA.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

- Review the timeline for study plan development and revisions
- Identify outstanding concerns about cultural study plans and ways to address them
- Agree on process and venue for resolving outstanding issues/questions

3.0 SUMMARY

3.1 DISCUSS CULTURAL STUDY PLANS

The Relicensing Team (hereafter, the “Team”) plans to make major structural changes to the two current study plans.

- Rather than a Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP) Plan, there will be a Tribal Resources Study Plan; any TCPs will be added into the archeological and architectural study plans.
- The Tribal Resources Study Plan will have a broader focus.
- The archeological and architectural study plans will remain part of the Cultural Resources Study.
- There will be more clarity about how the Cultural Resources TWG will work with the Team throughout the relicensing process to reassess and redirect the study plan efforts as needed. This may benefit from meeting more frequently than the typical annual study plan meetings.
- All the comments provided by USFS and BLM are very clear and will be addressed in the study plan revisions.

In some FERC relicensing processes, applicants execute a PA; in others, they do not. BLM explained their understanding of the difference: if the project effects and therefore, the area of project effects (APE) are uncertain, a PA is appropriate; however, if the project effects are well understood and the Team is confident in the APE, they execute an MOA. Finlay suggested they ask FERC about their preference and change the document language to be flexible.

Participants noted that the HPMP will address all issues that have not been addressed elsewhere. A programmatic document can designate the HPMP as the reigning document for any outstanding cultural questions.

There is some confusion over the ownership of the land on which the SCE plants lie due to overlap on the ownership maps. SCE believes they either own the land or use it via a historical fee authorization. They committed to researching to provide clarity as part of the Project Boundary, Lands, and Roads Study Plan. While it does not impact study plan implementation, which relies on the FERC boundary regardless of land ownership, it could be important down the line.

USFS committed to providing the INF/BLM protocol for NAGPA.

The Team will reorganize study plans, address comments, and recirculate to the TWG for a quick review before filing. It will also identify whatever additional post-PAD filing consultation is necessary and on what timeline.