

---

---

# Rocky Reach Meeting Minutes

---

---

**To:** Distribution List  
**From:** Michelle Smith  
**Date:** August 20, 1999  
**Subject:** Recreation/Aesthetics and Land Management/Socioeconomics Working Groups  
**Attendees:** Refer to Sign-Up Sheet  
**Location:** Chelan PUD Conference Room, Chelan, Washington

---

## RECREATION

After introductions, Michelle Smith, Chelan PUD (PUD) stated that the goal of the meeting is to look at the issues and determine study titles and methodologies for addressing those issues.

Michelle (PUD) explained that the working group members are responsible for developing the study plans. The working group members will also give updates and finally make a proposal to the full Relicensing Team. She then reviewed the working group schedule and Gregg Carrington (PUD) commented that if no substantial comments are received during the draft periods of the study plans, we will go directly to final.

The group began reviewing the Recreation Issues. Michelle (PUD) mentioned that as a baseline study, we are conducting a Recreation Use Assessment Study at Rocky Reach and it will be conducted for one full year. Michelle received an update and currently they are doing 16 instantaneous car counts during the peak season and 12 during the off season. They will be conducting on-site surveys 8 days during the peak season, 8 boat runs and 6 additional boat runs during the off season. The study is described in detail in the Recreational Use Assessment Study Plan. Barbara Jackson, Wenatchee National Forest asked how the study will help determine use outside of the project boundary. She indicated that the Forest Service is trying to determine recreational use on adjacent lands and dispersed land. Gregg (PUD) stated that this use assessment is just within the project boundary but we will also be collecting existing data for dispersed sites. Gregg continued by stating that if while the surveys are being done, if a lot of activity is seen on dispersed sites they will conduct interviews, and if it was determined that the land was being used all of the time they would make that a new site and try to determine why people were there. Jim Fisher, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) stated that there are a lot of informal boat launches, and to him it indicates there is a use pattern or a demand/lack of facilities. Gregg (PUD) added that the PUD limits it's geographical scope for FERC relicensing and we try to concentrate on project related sites.

Review of issues (see table). Gregg (PUD) stated that inventory of the recreational sites will include the study of developed and undeveloped as well as private and public land. He added that mitigation lands would also be considered in the inventory. Frank Rains, Boating Club of Wenatchee commented that one of the biggest landowners adjacent to the project boundary is the railroad. He commented that he has never seen them represented at any of the meetings. Gregg (PUD) replied by stating that we need to take into consideration that we don't want to overlap recreation with land management. However, the PUD has tried contacting them and they are high on the distribution list. Frank continued by saying that the reason he brought up the railroad is because there are many areas that people use for recreation that is railroad property, and the Inventory Study will show that people are using that property. Gregg (PUD) stated that those sites would be addressed under the undeveloped site category. Ardis Bynum, Forest Service (FS) added that uses, accessibility and conditions of the sites should be considered in the Inventory Study.

Gregg (PUD) stated the next step would be to develop a Recreation Plan. References that will be used to determine needs are, SCORP, Recreation Use Assessment, IAC State Assessment, and the Entiat Survey. Gregg (PUD) pointed out that the purpose of the study is to help lead to the recommended enhancement measures. Gregg (PUD) asked Barb

Jackson (FS) if they do any surveys or any assessment as to why visitors go to the Entiat area. Barb stated that they are hoping that the campground hosts will begin to collect the recreational use data, but currently only the trail rangers conduct interviews. Gregg asked if possibly the rangers would ask a question during their interviews that could be used for our study. Jim Fisher (BLM) stated that currently BLM does not conduct surveys.

Frank Rains added that regarding the inventory of existing parks is that quality of the recreational facility is an issue, particularly milfoil. He feels that milfoil is a significant issue and should be addressed. Gregg (PUD) agreed, and stated that as a part of the aquatic habitat mapping is an inventory of all milfoil locations that will be done by infrared photography. Frank replied by saying that he agreed with mapping the areas, but his concern is how to solve the problem. Gregg (PUD) stated that the PUD has a milfoil harvesting program for the State Parks and PUD Parks, but does not include the private property. Frank continued by saying that if the group is going to look at long-term water quality on the Columbia, milfoil needs to be studied. Gregg (PUD) recommended that the working group add milfoil as one of the recreation issues. Frank concluded by stating that the reason he felt it was so significant to have the railroad involved is because they own such a substantial amount of land, and their support would help benefit the other private land owners along the pool. Gregg (PUD) responded by stating that they are on the Stakeholder list and receive mailings. Frank thinks that the PUD Board of Commissioners should try and contact them, and should not be left alone because they haven't responded. Gregg (PUD) agreed and stated that a lot of times in relicensing, agencies don't get involved until they know that they may be affected by changes.

Gregg (PUD) went on to discuss economic issues. He stated that socioeconomic issues would be discussed in the afternoon session of the meeting and suggested that the group discuss issues regarding recreation, such as fees, operation and maintenance costs. Ardis (FS) asked about the Sternwheeler proposal and what it's affect is. John Huselton, Entiat Focus Group explained that about 5 years ago a group wanted to put a Sternwheeler in the Entiat Park. Studies were done on water flow on the Entiat and Rock Island pools and the study showed the Entiat is slower than Rock Island pool and was determined that Entiat would be a better place for a Sternwheeler. The community supported it, but the financial backing fell through due to the long process. The opportunity is still their and the community is still in a support, but the issue is that the interest is regained and making it happen. Gregg (PUD) asked if this is a socioeconomic issue or a recreation issue. John responded by saying that it is a combination. The Sternwheeler would be a recreational/tourist destination, and the Entiat Focus Group feels the opportunity is still there and does not want to see it lost. The focus group hopes that through the relicensing project, and if the city is going to continue to operate the Entiat Park, that they will be given more latitude of what they can put in it, both commercially and otherwise. Gregg (PUD) stated that the control comes from FERC in Washington D.C. because the park is considered an Exhibit "R" sites and the federal control prohibits the PUD from allowing development at will. Gregg (PUD) said that what he has found that through the relicensing process is that we can put together a review group and if all of the resource managers are in agreement with the proposal and the advisors can present that to FERC and the proposal can be approved through this type of forum. Gregg (PUD) continued by saying that the power behind this working group will allow us to be in control of our own destiny, and agreed that this is the right forum to begin discussion to start the process.

Recreational Issue	Study Title
Supply and demand	Inventory and Recreation Use Assessment
Carrying Capacity	Inventory
Landscape aesthetics	Inventory
Effects on adjacent lands	Inventory and Recreation Use Assessment
Access to the reservoir	Inventory and Recreation Use Assessment
Potential need for increased access	Inventory
Economic issues	Recreation Plan
Influence of recreation on wildlife and habitat	Recreation Plan
Safety	Inventory and Recreation Plan
ADA Compliance	Inventory and Recreation Plan
Opportunity for tourism enhancement	Recreation Plan and Socioeconomic Study
Maintenance operational and development	Inventory & include condition of facilities and O&M costs.
Education Opportunities	Recreation Plan
Milfoil	Literature Review

In conclusion, Michelle (PUD) stated that the 1<sup>st</sup> draft of the study plan will be out by September 1, and comments are due by September 15.

## **SOCIOECONOMICS AND LAND MANAGEMENT**

### **Meeting Overview**

Following introductions, Michelle, Chelan PUD (PUD) stated that the purpose of today's meeting is to review the issues associated with Land Management and Socioeconomics for the Rocky Reach Relicensing Project and to determine study titles and methodologies. Michelle (PUD) continued by pointing out the schedule and wanted to show the relicensing timeline that will hopefully give a general sense of how the working group schedule fits into the full relicensing team meetings. She stated that the purpose of the working group is to get all interested parties involved to work out solutions to the issues and update the full relicensing team and determine if there are any overlaps.

The working group is responsible for the work and advocating the recommendations. Gregg (PUD) added that the goal of the working group is to prepare and propose future enhancement measures for future license conditions and will be presented to the full relicensing team, who will work on the balance of all the issues from all of the working groups. Prior to the presentation, Gregg stated that we have to have factual basis for those recommendations and in order to accomplish that we will need to collect and document the data to support the management recommendations. Gregg (PUD) explained that the working group would select a spokesperson from the group whom would make the recommendations to the full relicensing team, not necessarily someone from the PUD.

John Huselton, Entiat Focus Group mentioned there are groups in Entiat that have expressed an interest in being involved but would not be able to attend the meetings. He asked how their thought and issues could be brought to the table. Gregg (PUD) stated that we could focus our presentation on their interests, and then send someone from the working group to give them a presentation. He also suggested that the groups could write letters that would be distributed to all working group members and ensure that their issues are considered. Gregg (PUD) asked John to identify the interested groups and then we could decide the best way to proceed. One suggestion was to send them the Relicensing quarterly newsletter that would provide the groups with updates. The newsletter contains updates from all working groups. Gregg (PUD) said that currently the newsletter is sent out to all of the stakeholders.

### **Review of Socioeconomic and Land Management Issues**

- **Law Enforcement**

The first issue discussed was Law Enforcement. Gregg (PUD) suggested putting this into a category that would be considered in the Land Management and Socioeconomic Plan. The group came to the conclusion that this issue may be who enforces the rules and regulations. Bob Whitehall, City of Entiat felt this is more of a recreation issue. Jim Fisher, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) suggested that it could also have to do with anything that has restrictions, whether water or land management and that the recommendations would have to tie to something that is enforceable.

- **Executive Order**

Gregg (PUD) continued reviewing the issues and stated that the Yakima's brought up the Executive order issue. Jim (BLM) stated that environmental justice states that when any plans are done, all facts must be considered by all equally so that the plans are not discriminatory or culturally offensive.

- **Economic Effects**

Gregg (PUD) brought up the issue of economic effects due to loss of the project. The group continued the discussion and concluded that it will be considered, however it will be stated that at this time it is not a reasonable alternative at this time until all pros and cons are determined. Gregg (PUD) stated that he proposes that issues 6 & 7 be addressed by the Engineering Group.

The group discussed power rates. Gregg (PUD) stated that the PUD will look at long term debt and cost of power. Michelle (PUD) asked if this is an Engineering issue. The group discussed that the reason the Socioeconomic Group should be concerned because if after relicensing the cost of power doubles then that will impact certain residents of Chelan County that can not afford a doubling of power rates. As other groups are developing plans that are going to impact the cost of power the Socioeconomic Group will need to consider those costs as well. Groups that were listed as potentially effected are agriculture, health, high tech, public organizations and industry. Although these impacts would be in the future, however it needs to be addressed. The group discussed developing a Project Economic and Regional Socioeconomic Study Plan and say that these are issues that need to be considered in the future, but we will have to wait until the enhancement measure proposals come back.

The final issue that the group wanted to address was the local (Entiat) socioeconomic issue and figure out the socioeconomics of project related operations. The group discussed a Socioeconomic/Local Economic Study specifically for the town of Entiat. The group decided that the major categories for the study would be Entiat and the current status of the economy, identify the potential impacts were due to projects, and enhancement opportunities. John, Entiat Focus Group added that he would also like for the study to look at ways to increase the tax base. He continued by saying that there has been a tremendous loss of tax based revenue to both the Town of Entiat and Entiat School District. Gregg (PUD) suggested possibly having BST Associates or another consulting firm make a presentation to the working group to listen to their suggestions on what to consider for the Economic Study for Entiat. John, Entiat Focus Group indicated that he has a concern that he would like addressed. His issue is lost opportunity due to changes of allowed land uses over last 40 years compared to what might be able to be done today might have taken away the economic opportunity within the city. He suggested looking at that, because if the waterfront had been there, opportunities may have been lost in terms of waterfront development. The group agreed and will add “lost opportunities” as an issue under Socioeconomics.

**Land Management and Socioeconomic Issues**

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Study Title</b>
Law enforcement	Consider in final Land Management Plan
Executive Order	Land Management Plan
Surplus/needs for lands	Inventory – will include State, Federal, PUD and private
Effectiveness of management of mitigation lands	Recreation Inventory & Wildlife
Effect on local/regional economy due to loss of project	Inventory & Existing Information
Interaction of project with the system river	To be considered by Engineering group
Relationship of RR to mid-Columbia hourly coordination, PNCA and systems operation review	To be considered by Engineering group
Impact of PME measures on power rates and affect on local/regional economy	Project Economic & Regional Socioeconomic Study Plan (future plan)
Outstanding obligation (if any associated with project lands)	Inventory (if all obligations in Exhibit “R” are met)
Local (Entiat) economics – lost opportunities	Local Socioeconomic Study & Land Management

In conclusion to the meeting, Michelle (PUD) will send out the outline from the study titles that were developed at today’s meeting by September 1, and comments are due back by September 15. Gregg (PUD) added that detailed study plans would be developed at a later date.

Reference materials are posted on the web site, [www.chelanpud.org/relicence](http://www.chelanpud.org/relicence). Please contact Rosana Sokolowski, (888)663-8121, Extension 4290, if hard copies are required.

- ✓ Draft Aesthetic Resources Assessment Study Plan
- ✓ Sign-up Sheet
- ✓ Distribution List