



Plenary Group Meeting

Date:

Time:

Location:

Directions

Agenda

Attendees

Final Summary

Handouts, Attachments & Presentations

Directions to SMUD's Customer Service Center

SMUD has two four-story buildings located adjacent to Highway 50 on the north side, between 59th Street exit and 65th Street exit. The Customer Service Center (CSC) is the newer building of the two located at 6301 S Street, and houses the Rubicon Room, Forestview 1,2, & 3, Sequoia 1,2,& 3, Timberline 1,2, & 3, and the HRL Conference Room located on the third floor (Northwest wing). The Headquarters building is located at 6201 S Street, directly west of the CSC. It houses the Headquarters' Customer Center (HCC), the Auditorium and several other conference rooms.

The Field Reporting Facility (aka FRF) is located behind the SMUD Headquarters building: go under the Light Rail overpass, then to the left about 150 yards.

Directions:

Heading East: From downtown Sacramento, head east on Highway 50, exit at **59th Street**. This exit will take you up-and-over Highway 50. Go straight at the first intersection, travel about a half mile. On your left (north) is the SMUD Headquarters building, the next building is the Customer Service Center.

Heading West: From Placerville, take Highway 50 to Sacramento and exit at **65th Street**. Go straight about one block after the first intersection. The Customer Service Center is the four-story building on your right (north).

You should be able to find parking spaces for visitors located in the area between the two buildings. There is also parking available in a parking lot on Folsom Blvd. behind the SMUD complex.

If you need assistance to find the Rubicon Room, Timberline 1,2,& 3, Sequoia 1,2,& 3, Forestview 1,2, & 3, and the Hydro Relicensing's Conference Room located on the third floor of the Northwest wing, see the guard at the lobby desk. The Headquarters Customer Center (HCC) room is located in the Headquarters building opposite the board of directors Auditorium in the first floor. Drive Safely.

Note: Downloadable maps can be found at www.smud.org/relicensing/meetings/meet_loc.htm

**PLENARY GROUP MEETING
UPPER AMERICAN RIVER PROJECT RELICENSING
JANUARY 9, 2002
8:30 A.M. TO 12:00 NOON**

These minutes summarize the discussions at the Plenary Group meeting for the Upper American River Project (UARP) relicensing, held on January 9, 2002, at the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) offices in Sacramento, California. The meeting summary is presented in two parts; the first part includes meeting highlights and action items, and the second part includes a summary of each agenda topic. A list of attendees (and their affiliations) is included as Attachment A.

MEETING HIGHLIGHTS

- The Plenary Group discussed the recommendations of the Policy/Legal Subcommittee for how to deal with issue questions that were placed in the Policy/Legal Parking Lot (Attachment C).
- Plenary Group participants signed the Communications and Process Protocols.
- The Plenary Group discussed whether meeting summaries are necessary for the Internal Focus Group (IFG) or other subcommittee meetings.
- An information flow matrix for the Aquatics Technical Working Group (TWG) was presented for Plenary Group review.
- An overview of the water year to date was provided.
- Status updates were provided on (1) the memorandum of understanding (MOU) between Pacific Gas and Electric Company and SMUD, (2) the socioeconomics IFG, and (3) TWG progress.

AGREEMENTS AND ACTION ITEMS

- The group approved the December 5, 2001, Plenary Group draft meeting summary.
- Lonn Maier (SMUD) will send an e-mail to the Aquatics and Terrestrial TWGs to update both groups on the status of overlapping issues.
- The group approved the recommended deletion of Policy/Legal Parking Lot issue question number 1. Issue questions 2 and 3 were sent back to the Policy/Legal Subcommittee to resolve. The Policy/Legal Subcommittee will meet on Friday, February 8, 2002, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon.

- The Plenary Group agreed that the need for a meeting summary would be determined when a subcommittee is initiated. Meeting summaries will include action items, agreements, topics of discussion, and a list of attendees. Such meeting summaries will be prepared for future Socioeconomics IFG meetings.
- Plenary Group participants are to review the draft information flow matrix (Attachment D) and provide comments or suggestions at the February 6, 2002, Plenary Group meeting.

1.0 WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND SAFETY MESSAGE

Dave Hanson (SMUD) began the meeting by welcoming all participants and providing a message about electrical safety in homes.

2.0 REVIEW AGENDA AND MEETING GUIDELINES; APPROVE DECEMBER 5, 2001, PLENARY MEETING SUMMARY

Marie Rainwater, Tetra Tech EM Inc.(TtEMI) facilitator, reviewed the meeting agenda (see Attachment B) and distributed a set of meeting guidelines.

Joe Davis (SMUD) noted an attachment added to the December 5, 2001, Plenary Group meeting summary. The group accepted the December 5, 2001, Plenary Group meeting summary with no additional revisions.

Resolution and Action: *The December 5, 2001, meeting summary was accepted without further revision. SMUD will post a final copy of the meeting summary on the website (<http://www.smud.org/relicensing>).*

3.0 STATUS UPDATES AND SUMMARIES

The following status updates and summaries were provided to the Plenary Group.

Memorandum of Understanding

Dave Hanson (SMUD) stated that the MOU between SMUD and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) is nearly final. SMUD and PG&E legal counsel are negotiating the final revisions of the document.

Resolution: *PG&E and SMUD will continue development of the MOU.*

Internal Focus Group Update

Marie Rainwater explained that the second IFG meeting was held on December 19, 2001, at SMUD, to discuss socioeconomic issues in dispute. SMUD and El Dorado County have met

several times outside of the IFG and are working on a proposal for resolving IFG issues. SMUD and El Dorado County are planning to have a draft proposal for the IFG to review by the next IFG meeting, scheduled for February 1, 2002.

Technical Work Group Updates

Representatives of each of the five TWGs presented a brief summary of their progress since the December 5, 2001, Plenary Group meeting.

Recreation and Aesthetics. Harry Williamson (National Park Service) summarized the recent recreation and aesthetics TWG activities. They last met on January 7, 2002, and discussed issues focused on the 20-mile reach below Chili Bar, including a straw man of the proposed white water study, the interface between recreation and aquatics proposed studies, a supply/demand study, tradeoffs, and land and recreation management activities. The U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service (USFS) is currently developing a presentation on their new hydropower rapid assessment methodology. The USFS is drafting a white paper on the subject and will share it with the Plenary Group upon completion. The following questions were raised regarding the hydropower rapid assessment methodology:

Question: Why was the UARP selected to use the new USFS methodology?

Answer: Rich Platt (USFS) explained the new methodology is being tested at various projects nationwide and that the timing is right to implement the methodology for the UARP.

Question: Did the Bureau of Land Management attend the TWG meeting?

Answer: Yes. Jim Horn attended.

The next Recreation and Aesthetics TWG meeting is scheduled for January 16, 2002.

Socioeconomics. Tom Cumpston (El Dorado County Counsel) reported that the socioeconomics TWG met on December 6, 2002. Study plans discussed included land use and public safety and services. The socioeconomic study plan is currently on hold until the IFG resolves the issues being considered. The meeting scheduled for January 18, 2002, has been cancelled. The next scheduled meeting is February 14, 2002.

Aquatic Resources, Water Quality, Geomorphology, and Hydrology. Beth Paulson (USFS) explained that the Aquatic Resources, Water Quality, Geomorphology, and Hydrology ("Aquatics") TWG met on December 20, 2001. At the meeting, the group discussed in-stream flow studies and provided updates on study plan development. SMUD also provided a review of hydrology and limnology information for the UARP. The meeting originally scheduled for January 10, 2002, was cancelled. The next aquatics TWG meeting is a 2-day meeting, scheduled for January 24 and 25, 2002; agenda items for the meeting include study plans for water quality, temperature, and macroinvertebrates, an update on overlapping issues with the terrestrial TWG, and definition of the project reach.

Action Item: *An e-mail will be sent to the aquatics and terrestrial TWG to update both groups on the status of overlapping issues.*

Terrestrial. Lonn Maier (SMUD) explained that the terrestrial TWG met on December 21, 2001. At the meeting they approved the following study plans:

- Bald Eagle and Osprey Study
- Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle Study
- Mule Deer Study
- Coast Horned Lizard Study
- Northern Sagebrush Lizard Study

The group has decided to hold off on discussing study plans related to aquatic meadow areas and riparian areas to enable more people to provide input. The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, January 11, 2002, at the USFS. Agenda topics include discussion of study plans for vegetation mapping, special status plants, and invasive-noxious weeds.

Cultural. Lonn Maier (SMUD) explained that the cultural TWG met on November 28, 2001. The group is currently working on a draft archaeology and historic resources study plan. The TWG recently received Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) approval to interact directly with the State Historic Preservation Office. The group was also notified recently that a representative of a Native American tribe would attend the next meeting, scheduled for January 15, 2002.

4.0 POLICY/LEGAL SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Marie Rainwater explained that a Policy/Legal Subcommittee met in the afternoon following the last plenary meeting on December 5, 2001. The subcommittee discussed the three issue questions in the “policy/legal parking lot,” and developed a recommendation for disposition (Attachment C).

The Plenary Group participants discussed the subcommittee recommendations for each issue question. Several participants expressed concern that the wording of questions 2 and 3 limits how gathered information is used. Dave Hanson (SMUD) explained that SMUD does not want participants to have the impression that the information can be used as a basis for mitigation of original Project construction impacts, as supported by FERC case law.

Resolution/Action: *The group approved the deletion of issue question number 1. Issue questions 2 and 3 were sent back to the Policy/Legal Subcommittee to resolve. The Policy/Legal Subcommittee will meet on Friday, February 8, 2002, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon.*

5.0 COMMUNICATIONS AND PROCESS PROTOCOLS

Marie Rainwater explained that the Plenary Group agreed at the December 5, 2001, Plenary Group meeting to sign the communications and process protocols document. The protocols are a living document that may be amended, as necessary. Signing the protocols is a good faith effort to demonstrate protocol support. The group was given time to sign the protocols.

The following individuals or organizations signed the communications and process protocols, or provided the signature page to SMUD after the meeting:

- American River Recreation Association, Bill Center
- California Outdoors, Nathan Rangel
- California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, Jerry Mensch
- California Water Resources Control Board, Harry M. Schueller
- Friends of El Dorado County, Bernard Carlson
- National Park Service, Harry Williamson
- Placer County Water Agency, Einar Maisch
- Sacramento Municipal Utility District, David Hanson
- U.S. Forest Service, John Berry

6.0 SUBCOMMITTEE/IFG MEETING DOCUMENTATION

Chris Williams (El Dorado County Water Agency) expressed concern that the discussion at IFG meetings is not being recorded in meeting summaries or minutes. He suggested that recording of discussions at future meetings would be useful. The Plenary Group discussed the usefulness of providing meeting summaries of IFG and other subcommittee meetings.

***Recommendation 1:** Meeting summaries should be prepared for all IFG meetings. Speakers quoted in meeting summaries should be given a chance to review the meeting summary for accuracy.*

***Recommendation 2:** When the Plenary Group initiates a subcommittee, the need for a meeting summary will be determined. Meeting summaries will include action items, agreements, topics of discussion, and a list of attendees.*

***Resolution/Action:** The Plenary Group reached consensus on implementing recommendation number 2. When the Plenary Group initiates a subcommittee, the need for a meeting summary will be determined. Meeting summaries will include action items, agreements, topics of discussion, and a list of attendees. Such meeting summaries will be prepared for future Socioeconomics IFG meetings.*

7.0 INFORMATION FLOW MATRIX

Jim Lynch (Duke Engineering) explained that development of matrices to represent the flow of information for each TWG was suggested by the Plenary Group at the November 2001 meeting. A sample matrix has been developed for the aquatic resources TWG, included as Attachment D. An additional matrix being developed will show how all study plans relate to each TWG.

***Action:** Plenary Group participants are to review the draft information flow matrix (Attachment D) and provide comments or suggestions at the February 6, 2002, Plenary Group meeting.*

8.0 WATER YEAR OVERVIEW

Lonn Maier (SMUD) provided an overview of the water year to date. According the California Department of Water Resources (DWR), the state snow pack is currently at 139 percent of the average for the year-to-date (YTD). At this time last year, the snow pack was at 58 percent of the average. In the Sierra Nevada Mountains, the snow pack is about 160 percent of average YTD. Crystal Basin has received 27.9 inches of precipitation at Fresh Pond, which is 22 percent greater than the average YTD. Last month, precipitation in the Crystal Basin was at 56 percent for a normal water year.

The water content in the snow pack is also above average. UARP reservoirs are at 50 percent of their combined total capacity, compared with 17 percent at this time last year. The historical average total capacity of the reservoirs is 52 percent.

Question: What is the average volume of runoff into the reservoirs during a normal water year?

Answer: Lonn Maier (SMUD) explained that he would research this question and provide this information at the next Plenary Group meeting.

Question: Is SMUD experiencing problems with their gaging stations?

Answer: Lonn Maier (SMUD) answered no. Bruce McGurk (PG&E) explained that the U.S. Department of the Interior was recently ordered to shut down their web sites because some confidential accounting records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs was accessible to the public. Because of this shutdown, there was a period of time recently that USGS real time data from SMUD and other gaging stations were not available on the web. The gaging station data are currently accessible. Bill Center (American River Recreation Association) explained that the Chili Bar gage operated by PG&E has had some problems recently; however, those problems have since been fixed. Bruce McGurk (PG&E) added that the wet weather often causes circuits to fail at gaging stations.

9.0 WRAP-UP AND ADJOURN - NEXT MEETING AGENDA

The following agenda items were identified for the February 6, 2002, agenda:

- **Meeting Summary Approval:** The January 9, 2002, Plenary Group meeting summary will be reviewed for approval.
- **Study Plan Review and Approval.** The group will begin review of draft study plans for Plenary Group approval.
- **MOU Update:** An update on the SMUD and PG&E MOU will be provided.
- **TWG Updates:** TWGs will brief the Plenary Group on progress.

- **SMUD Operations Presentation:** SMUD will provide an overview of the economics of their operations, depending on staff availability.
- **IFG Update:** An update on the progress of the IFG will be provided.

The group discussed the possibility that the next Plenary Group meeting be a half-day. Depending on how many study plans are available for review, the next meeting may be a full or half day. The meeting was adjourned at about 12:00 noon on January 9, 2002.

ATTACHMENT A

**ATTENDEES AND AFFILIATIONS
PLENARY GROUP MEETING
UPPER AMERICAN RIVER PROJECT RELICENSING
SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA
JANUARY 9, 2002**

**ATTENDEES AND AFFILIATIONS
PLENARY GROUP MEETING
UPPER AMERICAN RIVER PROJECT RELICENSING
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA
JANUARY 9, 2002**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Nathan Rangel	California Outdoors
Bill Center	Camp Lotus/ARRA
Jerry Mensch	California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
Nancee Murray	DFG
James Lynch	Duke Engineering, SMUD Consultant
Jon Ochs	Eureka Software, SMUD Consultant
Li Ochs	Eureka Software, SMUD Consultant
Tom Cumpston	El Dorado County Counsel
Ron Corso	Mead & Hunt, El Dorado County Water Agency Consultant
Chris Williams	Attorney at Law, El Dorado County Water Agency Counsel
Mike Henry	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Bernard Carlson	Friends of El Dorado County
Hank White	Georgetown Divide Public Utility District
Harry Williamson	NPS
Bruce McGurk	Pacific Gas & Electric Company
Marie Davis	Placer County Water Agency
Ed Horton	Placer County Water Agency
Joe Davis	SMUD
David Hanson	SMUD
Lonn Maier	SMUD
Carol Szuch	SMUD
Sharon Stohrer	SWRCB

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Art Marinaccio	Taxpayers Association, El Dorado County
Rick Johnson	United States Bureau of Reclamation
Gary Bilyeu	USFS
Beth Paulson	USFS
Rich Platt	USFS
Marie Rainwater	Tetra Tech
Joanna Canepa	Tetra Tech

Acronym List

ARRA	American River Recreation Association
DFG	California Department of Fish and Game
SMUD	Sacramento Municipal Utility District
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
Tetra Tech	Tetra Tech EM Inc.
USFS	US Forest Service

**ATTACHMENT B
AGENDA
PLENARY GROUP MEETING
UPPER AMERICAN RIVER PROJECT RELICENSING
JANUARY 9, 2002**

Notice of Meeting
Upper American River Project Relicensing

Plenary Group
January 9, 2002

SMUD Customer Service Center, Sacramento, California

Rubicon Room

Meeting Objectives: 1) collect signatures to the communications and process protocols; 2) decide whether to approve the Policy/Legal Subcommittee's recommendation on how the Plenary should address the policy/legal parking lot issue questions; and 3) decide on the level of formal documentation for meetings of subcommittees and internal focus groups.

AGENDA

<u>TIME</u>	<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>LEAD</u>
8:30 – 9:00 am	Arrival and morning refreshments	
9:00 – 9:10 am	Welcome / Introductions / Safety Message	Facilitator
9:10 – 9:15 am	Review Agenda / Meeting Guidelines	Facilitator
9:15 – 9:20 am	Approve December 5 Plenary Group Meeting Summary	Facilitator
9:20 – 9:50 am	Status Updates and Summaries (30 minutes) <i>To inform Participants of key activities since last meeting.</i> <i>Process: Presentation and Q & A</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ SMUD and PG&E memorandum of understanding (5 min.)▪ Socioeconomics IFG (5 min.)	SMUD/PG&E Facilitator

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TWG Updates (< 5 min. each) 	Spokesperson or SMUD
9:50 – 10:15 am	<p>Policy/Legal Subcommittee Recommendation <i>Goal: Provide opportunity to discuss Policy/Legal Subcommittee’s recommendation on how the Plenary should address the following three issue questions -- Recreation No. 48, Terrestrial No. 23 and Cultural No. 10.</i> <i>Process: Discussion and consensus agreement.</i></p>	Facilitator
10:15 – 10:30 am	BREAK (15 minutes)	
10:30 – 10:45 am	<p>Communications and Process Protocols <i>Goal: Provide time for participants to turn in signed original Acknowledgement page.</i></p>	SMUD
10:45 – 11:00 am	<p>Subcommittee/IFG Meeting Documentation <i>Goal: Discuss and agree on level of formal documentation for meetings of subcommittees and internal focus groups.</i> <i>Process: Discussion and consensus agreement.</i></p>	SMUD
11:00 – 11:15 am	<p>Information Flow Matrix <i>SMUD to distribute an Information Flow table that indicates a cross reference of information from a particular study plan to a particular study plan.</i></p>	SMUD
11:15 – 11:30 am	<p>Water Year Overview <i>SMUD to brief the Plenary on how the water year is looking so far.</i></p>	SMUD
11:30 – 11:45 am	Next Meeting Agenda	Facilitator
11:45 – 12:00 pm	Wrap-up and Adjourn	Facilitator

ATTACHMENT C

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE POLICY/LEGAL SUBCOMMITTEE
TO THE UARP RELICENSING PLENARY GROUP
JANUARY 9, 2002**

**RECOMMENDATION FROM THE POLICY/LLEGAL SUBCOMMITTEE
TO THE UARP RELICENSING PLENARY GROUP
January 9, 2002**

The Policy/Legal Subcommittee met on December 5, 2001, to review three issue questions that were categorized in the policy-legal parking lot and to develop a recommendation on how the Plenary Group should address them.

The issue questions and the subcommittee's recommendations are:

ISSUE QUESTION: *What recreational opportunities have been displaced by the project facilities and have those been adequately accommodated in the region (Recreation No. 48)?*

Recommendation: The issue question should be deleted because the question has overlap with questions being addressed by the cultural and recreation TWGs and the historical part of the question is highly speculative.

ISSUE QUESTION: *What are the impacts (pre-project versus ongoing) on terrestrial resources (habitat loss) of inundation by project reservoirs, especially in the riparian areas (Terrestrial No. 23)?*

Recommendation: The issue question should be revised to read as follows: "What were the historical terrestrial resources (such as habitat, riparian, and vegetation) in the project area, including the reservoir inundation zones? Develop information using existing maps, drawings, photos, and literature descriptions." Given this change, the question should be sent to the terrestrial TWG, and SMUD will compile existing historical maps, photos, and documents and provide the information to the terrestrial and aquatic TWGs for their evaluation and use solely for the development of desired future conditions and not for the development of mitigation measures.

ISSUE QUESTION. *What is the impact on cultural sites (e.g., farm sites) and historical grazing associated with the inundation of land by UARP reservoirs and Stumpy Meadows Reservoir? Can there be a complete literature survey of this impact, including under the reservoirs (no drainage required) (Cultural No. 10)?*

Recommendation: The issue question should be revised to read as follows: "What are the impacts on cultural sites (e.g. farm sites) and historical use (including grazing) associated with the inundation of land by UARP reservoirs? Can there be a complete literature survey of this impact, including under the reservoirs (no drainage required)?" Given this change, the question should be sent to the cultural TWG, and SMUD will compile existing historical maps, photos, and documents and provide the information to the cultural TWG for their evaluation and use solely for the development of desired future conditions and not for the development of mitigation measures.

ATTACHMENT D

**AQUATIC RESOURCES INFORMATION FLOW MATRIX
UPPER AMERICAN RIVER PROJECT RELICENSING
JANUARY 9, 2002**

AQUATIC RESOURCES
Flow of Information among study plans for SMUD's relicensing of the Upper American River Project.
 This table was last updated on 12/18/01 by CAT.

		GEOLOGY				WATER							AQUATICS												
		<i>Information From</i>				<i>Information To</i>																			
		Channel Morphology	Cumulative Effects on Geologic Resources	Geology-Related Information Requests	Project Sources of Sediment	Aquatic Bioassessment (was CSBP)	Coordination of UARP Operations with Others	Cumulative Effects on Water Resources	Hydrology	Water Balance Model	Water Quality	Water-Related Information Requests	Water Rights	Water Temperature	Amphibians/Aquatic Reptiles	Aquatic-Related Information Requests	Cumulative Effects on Aquatic Resources	Desired Conditions/Management Species	Effects of Ramping Rates	Entrainment	Fish Passage	Fish Surveys	Instream Flow	Reservoir Habitat	
GEOLOGY	Channel Morphology	●			●				●	●															
	Cumulative Effects on Geologic Resources	●	●		●				●																
	Geology-Related Information Requests			●																					
	Project Sources of Sediment				●																				
WATER	Aquatic Bioassessment (was CSBP)	●			●	●			●	●	●			●									●	●	
	Coordination of UARP Operations with Others	●				●	●			●													●		
	Cumulative Effects on Water Resources	●			●	●	●		●	●	●			●										●	
	Hydrology							●	●																
	Water Balance Model								●	●			●				●	●		●			●	●	
	Water Quality	●			●	●		●	●	●	●			●										●	
	Water-Related Information Requests										●	●													
	Water Rights												●	●											
Water Temperature									●	●		●	●												
AQUATICS	Amphibians/Aquatic Reptiles	●			●	●				●	●			●	●							●		●	
	Aquatic-Related Information Requests														●	●									
	Cumulative Effects on Aquatic Resources	●			●	●				●	●			●	●	●						●	●	●	
	Desired Conditions/Management Species															●	●					●		●	
	Effects of Ramping Rates	●				●			●	●				●	●	●						●		●	
	Entrainment								●										●	●				●	
	Fish Passage																		●	●	●			●	
	Fish Surveys										●									●	●	●			●
	Instream Flow	●							●	●	●			●	●		●			●	●	●	●		
	Reservoir Habitat				●	●			●	●	●			●	●				●				●	●	