MEETING SUMMARY*
BISHOP CREEK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MEETING
FERC PROJECT NO. 1394

DATE: February 11, 2019, 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
LOCATION: Conference Call

**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:

Tristan Leong, USFS
Sheila Irons, USFS
Diana Pietrasanta, USFS
Scott Wilson, CDFW
Steve Parmenter, CDFW
Trisha Moyer, CDFW
Bryanna Vaughn, Bishop Paiute
Finlay Anderson, Kleinschmidt
Kelly Larimer, Kleinschmidt
Matt Woodhall, SCE
Terra Alpaugh, Kearns & West

1.0 ACTION ITEMS

- **CDFW** (Nick and Steve) to propose written rationale for requested study plan modifications (in response to Finlay's email).
- **Finlay** to schedule a call for BryAnna, Tyler, Finlay, & Matt to discuss Bishop Paiute's concerns about the geomorphology/sediment scope (target Thurs before 9am or 12-1pm, or Wed)
- **SCE** to build into plans a process/schedule to address specific study plan methodology in the first 6 months post-PAD filing and to focus now on establishing agreement on study plan title, rationale, nexus, scope, and study area.
    - **KW** to follow up with SWRCB to ensure they also endorse this approach.
    - **Finlay/Terra** to draft a description of the proposed process going forward.
- **SCE** to propose a schedule of late-February webinars as touch-points for study plans that require more discussion/issue resolution.
- **KW** to schedule late March in person TWG meetings.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

- Report on status of study plans and comments and establish anticipated timeline for remaining comments
- Agree on process and venue for resolving outstanding issues/questions

- Discuss next steps

3.0 SUMMARY

3.1 STATUS OF NOVEMBER STUDY PLANS

Finlay Anderson, Kleinschmidt, explained that the draft study plans have not been changed substantially since they were last distributed in November and December. Finlay provided the following updates on comment submissions:

- CDFW has provided comments on the study plans. The Relicensing Team (hereafter "Team") feels that CDFW's feedback will be relatively straightforward to incorporate into the plans with the exception of the requests regarding the IFIM study. For those, the Team has requested that CDFW provide a written rationale for the requested modifications. CDFW committed to providing that rationale [ACTION ITEM]. Finlay is also corresponding with Tristan Leong, USFS, regarding the IFIM plans in case USFS wants to provide input on those discussions.
- BryAnna Vaughn, Bishop Paiute, recently asked about the whether any of the studies included an assessment to determine the necessary flow to move sediment that is transported below Plant 6 all the way to the Owens River. Finlay responded via email and reiterated at the meeting that the area below Plant 6 is outside the project boundary and therefore, extensive investigation in that area may be outside the scope of the study plans. BryAnna observed that the studies should produce information relevant to downstream stakeholders. Finlay proposed scheduling a call with the Team's geomorphology lead to discuss how the sediment and geomorphology study plan could be modified to meet the Bishop Paiute's information needs [ACTION ITEM]. BryAnna agreed and confirmed that her water quality staff have no additional comments.
- Finlay reported that he has talked with USFS since the end of Federal Government shutdown to update them on progress over the past month and a half but has not received study plan comments from them. He would like to set a schedule for responding to comments. USFS staff confirmed that they are at least a month behind and cannot currently commit to a schedule for comment submission. USFS provided the comment status to date: there are no further comments on the aquatic plans; there will be written comments on the botanical plans but no further discussion is needed; the cultural plans still need review; they anticipate additional input and potentially discussion needed for the IFIM, geomorphology, and recreation and land use plans. Some of the study comments will likely not be ready until summer, after SCE has already filed its PAD.

3.2 PROCESS FOR RESOLVING OUTSTANDING ISSUES/QUESTIONS

Finlay reported that the Team recently had a call with FERC to confirm their intended PAD filing and accelerated study plan timeline. At that time, FERC did not convey that there would be delays or changes in schedule due to any residual effects of the government shutdown.

SCE reiterated their hope that all the agencies participating in the TWGs will be able to support the submitted study plans, so that FERC will consider accelerated approval. Issues can continue to be resolved after the filing of the PAD and study plans; SCE expressed their hope that they can address significant issues before the filing deadline and establish a process to resolve additional, smaller concerns within the first six months after filing. SCE explained that in the past they have made the methodology language in the study plans flexible, so that they can work with the TWGs to develop more

detailed methods after filing. USFS approved of this approach, explaining that they are generally in agreement with the framework of the studies but that they want the ability to build more detail into certain studies before implementation. They expect that their areas of greatest interest will be land use and recreation.

Finlay proposed that prior to the filing date the TWG agencies focus on establishing agreement on study plans' title, rationale, nexus, scope, and study area. The study plans will then also include a schedule for ongoing consultation and periodic reporting on methods to resolve additional details.