

## Rocky Reach Meeting Minutes

**To:** Distribution List  
**From:** Michelle Smith  
**Date:** August 15, 2001  
**Subject:** Rocky Reach Social Sciences Issues  
**Attendees:** Refer to Sign-Up Sheet  
**Location:** Retail Operations Conference Room, Wenatchee, WA  
**Time:** 1:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.

### Meeting Purpose

- 1) Continue discussion of cumulative impacts.
- 2) Review and discuss the second draft Project Lands Management, final Recreation Inventory, second draft Inventory Appendix A and second draft Recreation Needs Forecast and Analysis.

### Cumulative Impact Analysis (see handout)

Gregg Carrington, Chelan PUD (PUD), mentioned that the working group began cumulative impact discussion at both the March 20 and May 15 working group meetings. He provided a brief overview of cumulative impacts. Gregg explained that a Cumulative Impact Assessment (CIA) is one of the requirements for the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) and a requirement for relicensing. Cumulative impacts are the effects of multiple activities that add up incrementally that affect resources of regional or national significance. A CIA considers and assesses the effects of past, present and reasonably foreseeable future activities.

Gregg (PUD) continued by explaining that the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) has published a set of guidelines for assessing cumulative impacts. However, the guidelines are very generic, and one thing that the PUD noticed was that they were set up to analyze new projects and new impacts. Therefore, the PUD developed a flow chart (page B-3 of the handout) using an existing flow chart from a Snake River project as a model. The flow chart was developed to help guide the resource groups through cumulative impact considerations.

In general, the PUD will:

- Analyze Project-induced impacts
- Consider existing information
- Focus on resource needs that are truly meaningful
- Focus on things that you can actually impact
- Determine what should be included in a Cumulative Impact Assessment
- Avoid speculation; will not speculate on "what might have been"

Gregg (PUD) followed up on two outstanding issues from the May 15 meeting. He mentioned that Karin Whitehall, U.S. Forest Service (USFS), had asked what the baseline conditions were for considering Cumulative Impact Assessment. Gregg (PUD) pointed out that at the May 15 meeting, a copy of the EWEB (Eugene Water and Electric Board) case was provided, which is the most recent summary of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth

Circuit Court. The court ruling specified what baseline conditions are. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) has continually ruled that the existing Project, as it is today, is the baseline condition, and that matches the court's opinion. Gregg (PUD) stated that the PUD would also use existing information.

The second issue discussed was Jim Eychaner's, Washington State Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC), comment on recreational resources within the entire mid-Columbia region. Specifically, what was done through Rocky Reach relicensing should also consider the effects on both the Douglas PUD and Grant PUD projects. Gregg (PUD) stated that he agrees that both PUD projects need to be considered in Rocky Reach planning, but he wondered if there were other issues that needed to be included in a CIA. Jim (IAC) responded by saying that after reviewing the Needs Forecast and Analysis, second draft, there does not appear to be as much displaced recreation occurring as he originally thought. He continued by saying he is now less inclined to include recreation in a CIA, but instead address it at the Project level.

Bill Fraser, Washington State Parks, informed the group that the state is not going to develop Chief Joseph State Park and is selling it back to Douglas PUD. The money that the state receives for the park would be used for off-site recreation improvements. He stated that Douglas PUD does not want to develop on-site recreation because they want to enhance the reservoir for wildlife habitat.

Gregg (PUD) suggested that public awareness could also be a way to address recreation and the effects on Douglas and Grant PUDs, possibly in a combined effort. Jim (IAC) commented that it would be worth discussing.

The working group concluded by agreeing that any of the discussed issues could be addressed at the Project level. Therefore, a CIA was not needed.

#### **Review of Study Reports (see handout)**

Michelle Smith (PUD) reviewed the summary of changes made to the study reports. She pointed out that the only comments received were from IAC. Barb Jackson (USFS) stated that the USFS would be providing official comments.

#### **Recreation Needs Forecast and Analysis, second draft**

The revisions made to the second draft were based on discussions at the May 15 working group meeting and IAC comments. The group discussed the timing of surveys and how local evening users would not have been represented (Section 7.3, page 7-2). It was suggested to conduct spot checks in order for the report to be accurate. The group discussed potential times and locations for the checks. It was agreed to conduct spot checks twice per day (7 a.m. - 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. - 8 p.m.) at three parks (Daroga, Entiat and Lincoln Rock). Jim (IAC) also requested a comparison of number of public docks versus private docks.

Michelle (PUD) stated that comments on the Needs Forecast study report would be due by Sept. 2. Additional information from spot check and dock information will be added in an addendum.

#### **Recreation Resources Inventory, final, and Appendix A, first draft**

Michelle (PUD) mentioned that the Recreation Inventory report was finalized on Aug. 2, however comments can still be made through Sept. 2.

Dan Haas, National Park Service (NPS), commented that an inventory of trees should also be included, as well as a need for a tree management plan.

Jim (IAC) suggested changing the name of Appendix A to Public Recreation Resources Inventory.

#### **Project Lands Management, second draft**

Michelle (PUD) stated that although the only comments received were from IAC, there were a lot of changes/additions made to the report. All of the changes are listed in the summary handout. She pointed out that the map included in the first draft was accidentally left out of the second draft, but it would be inserted back into the final.

The working group reviewed Section 6. Michelle (PUD) explained that the section contains example wording, and ultimately the working group would need to develop language that would identify any inconsistencies in the comprehensive plans listed in the matrix. Gregg (PUD) stated that as part of relicensing, the PUD has to make sure proposals are consistent with the relevant comprehensive plans. Beyond relicensing, the PUD will also identify any major inconsistencies between the plans if the working group would want those identified. He explained that for Lake Chelan, identifying those conflicts was part of the scope of work.

### **Other Business**

Gregg (PUD) mentioned that a need identified in the socioeconomic study for Entiat was to develop an overall plan for the city and park system. The PUD has agreed to help develop the plan.

Gregg (PUD) asked the working group if there was a need for any additional studies and group members present did not identify any.

### **Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be scheduled for either Sept. 27 or 28. One of the objectives for the meeting will be to begin identifying social sciences measures.

### **Action Items**

Michelle will contact Debby Howe regarding the need for spot checks.

Michelle will check to see if a dock inventory was conducted.

Michelle will work with Debby Howe to include tree management information in the Recreation Inventory.

Michelle will change the title of Recreation Inventory Addendum, Appendix A to Public Recreation Inventory Addendum.

Gregg and Michelle will discuss with Lisa Fortney how to summarize Section 6 of Project Lands Management report.

Comments due on all study reports by Sept. 2.

Reference materials are posted on the Web site, [www.chelanpud.org/rr\\_relicense](http://www.chelanpud.org/rr_relicense). Please contact Rosana Sokolowski, (888) 663-8121, Extension 6371, if hard copies are required.

Sign-up sheet

Distribution list

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidelines

Social Sciences WG cumulative impact considerations dated May 15

Summary of changes made to second draft study reports