DRAFT MEETING NOTES*

LEE VINING, FERC PROJECT NO. 1388

TECHNICAL REPORT REVIEW STAKEHOLDER MEETING

MAY 14, 2024, 9:00 AM–2:00 PM

**These meeting notes are documentation of general discussions from the meeting held on the above-noted date and focus on stakeholder questions and comments. These notes are not a verbatim account of proceedings and do not represent any final decisions or official documentation for the project or participating agencies.*

1.0 OBJECTIVES

- Review Technical Study Reports
- Address stakeholder questions
- Preview the Draft License Application

2.0 ATTENDEES

Relicensing Team Members
Martin Ostendorf, Southern California Edison (SCE)
Matt Parulo, SCE
Matt Woodhall, SCE
Seth Carr, SCE
Angela Whelpley, Kleinschmidt
Carissa Shoemaker, Kleinschmidt
Finlay Anderson, Kleinschmidt
Kelly Larimer, Kleinschmidt
Shannon Luoma, Kleinschmidt
Allison Rudalevige, Psomas
Brad Blood, Psomas
Steve Norton, Psomas
Edith Read, Edith Read and Associates
Heather Neff, Stillwater Sciences (SWS)
Matt McKechnie, SWS
Noah Hume, SWS
Lynn Johnson, TEAM Environmental

Technical Working Group Members & Interested Parties
Adam Cohen, State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
Andrew Lyons-Gould, US Forest Service (USFS)
Anne Mankowski, US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
Ashley Blythe-Haverstock, USFS
Bartshe Miller, Mono Lake Committee (MLC)
Beth Lawson, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
Bryan Muro, SWRCB
Bryant Luu, CDFW
Chad Mellison, USFWS
Daniel Anderson, CDFW
Dannon Dirgo, USFS
Dean Tonenna, Mono Lake Kutzedikaa Tribe
Graham Meese, CDFW
Jameisha Washington, USFS
Mary Meagher, USFS
Michael Weise, USFS
Robbie DiPaolo, MLC

Sheila Irons, USFS
Tristan Leong, USFS

3.0 COMPILED ACTION ITEMS

- Share Operations Model with stakeholders / TWGs: June 5 and June 27
- Recreation TWG near end of field surveys (October)?
- Tioga Lake inlet elevation (south end) is 2,943 meters
- Stakeholder comments due on Technical Reports June 11, 2024

4.0 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Matt Woodhall, SCE, welcomed attendees to the meeting and went over the safety evacuation plan for the Lee Vining Community Center. Audry Williams, SCE, presented the land acknowledgement. Shannon Luoma, Kleinschmidt, asked meeting attendees to all introduce themselves; she went over the rules of engagement, provided an overview of the agenda, meeting objectives, discussed the regulatory look back and look forward, described the No Action and Proposed Action Alternatives, and gave an overview of the studies conducted.

5.0 AQ-5 OPERATIONS MODEL

Bret Hoffman, Kleinschmidt, presented the Operations Model study and results.

- Question (Q) Beth Lawson – How do we want to develop metrics? Should we provide comments or have a back-and-forth conversation?
    - Response (R) Bret Hoffman – We prefer a back-and-forth conversation, but you can document it with official comments. What metrics are you interested in?
    - (R) Shannon Luoma – Because of the timeline, having an actual discussion is preferred.
- (Q) Beth Lawson – We (stakeholders) need to have an internal discussion about who is interested in what and at what time scale. Do we get to have a copy of the model now?
    - (R) Matt Woodhall and Finlay Anderson - Yes, we can make the model available soon like we did with the Bishop Creek operations model. We can have a call to go through it together and release the model following that discussion.
    - (R) Beth Lawson – It doesn't have to be perfect.
    - (R) Bret Hoffman – We will put in some metrics that can be adjusted.
    - (R) Finlay Anderson – Let's set up a time later today to get you (Beth and Bret) together and put dates on the calendar for a meeting.
    - (R) Beth Lawson – There are two steps, what resource specialists want and the mechanics of the model itself. These can be independent of each other.
- (Q) Tristan Leong – Maybe if we understand the opportunities to resolve / simplify the consultation requirements, we can establish more clear-cut operations to submit to FERC to reduce or automate or avoid the consultation efforts that is twice a year. Can we get more simplified thresholds to reduce the need for consultation.
    - (R) Matt Woodhall – Well, it's only twice a year and sometimes we do want to tweak the thresholds, so we would likely want to keep the twice a year consultation at this point.

  - (R) Tristan Leong – We can look at the history to see if the decision is the same over and over depending on parameters, maybe it can be more automated.
  - (R) Matt Woodhall – Sometimes we have work to do and make the adjustments, so it might be impossible to capture all of the variables, and we would still need to get USFS concurrence for any variances of the normal.
  - (R) Shannon Luoma – It sounds like there is potential for streamlining the process, but we would need to look at the history to be sure.
  - (R) Tristan Leong – Is there a way to parameterize it? There are significant time commitments for stakeholders to come out for the consultation. Maybe we can get a range of acceptable numbers. These would be pre-determined to make changes under a range of circumstances.
  - (R) Matt Woodhall – It does require a letter to the USFS district ranger and SCE managers.
  - (R) Tristan Leong - Do you think, Bret, that we can hone-in on these questions in the Operations Model?
  - (R) Bret Hoffman – We need to see what has driven the decisions. This brings us back to the metrics, flexibility and buffers that fit within historical norms. "Variance" is interpreted differently by different people and by FERC. For example, this snow course looks like it is this way this year, according to this equation it should be this way this year.
  - (R) Shannon Luoma – This should be part of the smaller meeting discussion that we talked about with Bret and Beth; Bartshe Miller and Mono Lake Committee would like to be included in the conversation too.
- (Q) Beth Lawson – You have three water year (WY) types in model, is that enough? Do we need to consider the really wet years and really dry years separately to model accurately?
  - (R) Matt Woodhall – The low water is already very low at 6 cubic feet per second (cfs).
  - (R) Bret Hoffman – What would we use, would the low be 7 cfs and lower be 4 cfs? This comes back to the consultation process.
  - (R) Matt Woodhall – We won't be able to get away entirely from the consultation efforts.
  - (R) Beth Lawson – I'm talking about the targets for drawing down the reservoirs too. Are the WY types sufficient for minimum instream flows (MIFs) and how you draw down the reservoirs throughout the year?
  - (R) Bret Hoffman – The flow targets we have now are achievable as they are, parsing it out into finer WY types might not have a specific benefit. Three to 5 cfs wouldn't be super complicated, but we would need a benefit.
  - (R) Matt Woodhall – So essentially, we're only talking about Saddlebag Lake, will it be full or not full? We don't really have the ability to carry water over.
  - (R) Finlay Anderson – Remember that we don't have the flexibility, year to year, to make decisions about the final pool elevation; the sales agreement requires the storage to be used. That limits, somewhat, the usefulness of defining extra year-types because there is not a lot to do with that information.

Isha Deo, Kleinschmidt, presented the Intra-Day portion of the Operations Model study and results.

- (Q) Noah Hume – Are the highest stages of velocities closer to Poole Powerhouse?
    - (R) Isha Deo – Each line represents a cross section. Higher depths don't necessarily correspond with higher cross-sections. Attenuations of the peak, yes, this is a short channel section, so we focused on specific cross-sections. The shape of each cross-section is different.
- (Q) Robbie DiPaolo – Is that reflecting the full range of data you're seeing?
    - (R) Isha Deo – This is focused on the cross-sections we did have data for, so it is pretty representative of what we are seeing. Responses can vary.
    - (R) Robbie DiPaolo – The possible maximum and minimum would be captured?
    - (R) Isha Deo - Yes, it's pretty close.
- (Q) Beth Lawson – Is most the public use captured in this segment that you modeled?
    - (R) Shannon Luoma – We haven't been able to conduct the Recreation Use and Needs survey yet, so we are unsure.
    - (R) Graham Meese – There is lots of recreational use in this segment.
- (Q) Dannon Dirgo – Did the model take into account stream channel morphology and large woody debris (LWD)?
    - (R) Isha Deo – We did our best with morphology, but it's a snapshot in time and can't show changes in the channel. Debris was a base model parameter on general hydraulic parameters, but not specifically LWD.
- (Q) Dannon Dirgo - If morphology did change and scour an area, would that take it into account?
    - (R) Isha Deo – No, it wouldn't.
- (Q) Tristan Leong – Does it show the response time with a lag between each site? They look stacked. What is the attenuative capacity downstream?
    - (R) Isha Deo – These are all in a relatively small reach and timescale, it is more clear in the model results that they are slightly staggered. We don't have data for everything downstream.
    - (R) Tristan Leong – It is relevant in my experience, when water is released and if there is a safety concern, how much time to the people downstream have to know that it is coming and what the velocities would be? Is there bi-modal peak for operations, or is there a peak once a day?
    - (R) Isha Deo – The safety component wasn't a goal of this study, but we are thinking about it.
- (Q) Tristan Leong – Does California Independent System Operator (CAISO) have control?
    - (R) Seth Carr – No. The peaks are based on demands, so they can be anytime, it's the "duck curve" basically. This time of year, we are trying to move water and are staying up to meet runoff.
- (Q) Tristan Leong – Can an estimated lag time be generated?
    - (R) Isha Deo – We could look into this, but are not currently doing that.
    - (R) Matt Woodhall – Since we haven't seen any conditions that are unsafe, we didn't dig into it further. Looking at the numbers, the peaks don't create an unsafe conditions.
- (Q) Beth Lawson – As the market gets away from curve, bi-modal peaks, is that when you go to multiple daily peaks?
    - (R) Seth Carr – In the morning and afternoon, if demand changes. Most of the time we do have two daily peaks.

  - (R) Beth Lawson – The algorithm is capturing that?
  - (R) Isha Deo – Yes, especially when the peaks are sharp.
- (Q) Robbie DiPaolo – This is based on the morphology not the log jams?
  - (R) Isha Deo - Yes.
  - (R) Robbie DiPaolo – Log jams are possibly a result of the hydro-resource optimization. It would be good to look at those compared to flow and stage.
- (Q) Robbie DiPaolo – Is this showing the reach from Poole Powerhouse to Big Bend Campground or to the LADWP diversion, and why?
  - (R) Isha Deo – This is a shortened area of interest for the model because we had a limited ability to collect cross-sections, so we focused upstream, where it was going to be the sharpest changes in flow, rather than spread out and not know what is in between. Looking at "worst case" recreation effects.
  - (R) Robbie DiPaolo – There are lots more campgrounds below that stream reach and it would be relevant to look at those.
- (Q) Heather Neff – Why do you think log jams are not related to high spring flows?
  - (R) Robbie DiPaolo - The 2015 peaking started then we started to see more log jams right after. More regular short peaking has created more jams in a couple reaches. It has been observable, and they are sustained. It would be relevant to understand how the stage changes with these.

6.0 WQ-1 WATER QUALITY

Noah Hume, Stillwater Sciences, presented the Water Quality study and results.

- (Q) Beth Lawson – What is the elevation of the Tioga Lake inlet? The chart is interesting where DO is hanging out at 15.
  - (R) Noah Hume – I will need to look that up… The elevation at the south end of Tioga Lake is 2,943 meters
- (Q) Bryan Muro – What month where these profiles taken?
  - (R) Noah Hume – Summer, not fall.
- (Q) Bryan Muro - What is the threshold for mercury?
  - (R) Noah Hume – The California Statewide mercury objective is 0.2 mg/kg in edible fish tissue as an annual mean. Separately, the OEHHA established a screening threshold of 0.08 mg/kg which is exceeded in a couple of the fish.
- Comment (C) Beth Lawson - 500 NTU turbidity is really high.
  - (C) Bartshe Miller – Glacial flour can happen up here sometimes by Saddlebag Lake.
- (Q) Dannon Dirgo – Why are mercury levels higher in certain species?
  - (R) Noah Hume – It depends on eating habits of each species.
  - (R) Heather Neff – Mercury bioaccumulates and creates exponential curve in the larger fish.
  - (R) Noah Hume – If there was less food in the supply or modification in the chain, the mercury could go lower.
- (Q) Dannon Dirgo – Can you find mercury in macroinvertebrates?
  - (R) Noah Hume – Yes, you can detect it.
- (Q) Bartshe Miller – What are the skin contact thresholds for fecal coliform bacteria?

  - (R) Noah Hume – They are the same for accidental ingestion, I think. We were well below the threshold.
  - (R) Bartshe Miller – Sampling was late in 2022 and that was a huge time for recreation, the peaks could be from a surge. How many sites were sampled?
  - (R) Heather Neff – They were dry years after human use, and at least three sites.
- (Q) Adam Cohen – How and when were you monitoring turbidity upstream?
  - (R) Noah Hume – In 2023, we had rented Sondes and deployed them for 24-48 hours to see if there is a snowmelt influence on turbidity.
  - (R) Heather Neff – It is difficult to access the sites. Matt McKechnie did hike into the inlet of Saddlebag Lake and we did capture all three seasons at some of the sample sites.

7.0 AQ-6 CHANNEL MORPHOLOGY

Heather Neff, Stillwater Sciences, presented the Channel Morphology study and results.

- (Q) Beth Lawson – Were most of the lost PIT tags on smaller rocks?
  - (R) Heather Neff – Yes, smaller rocks were lost more often, we suspect they were blown out. Some sample sites were close to campgrounds and the rocks might have been taken because they were brightly colored.
- (Q) Allison Rudalevige – How far did the farthest rocks travel?
  - (R) Heather Neff – The farthest were 70-90 feet.
- (Q) Robbie DiPaolo - How were the rocks recovered?
  - (R) Heather Neff – We did attempt to use a PIT tag receiver, but it didn't work, so we had a crew snorkel to find them. We think they were transferred really far. Some were in pools and those were hidden under fines.

8.0 AQ-4 AQUATIC INVASIVE PLANTS

Heather Neff, Stillwater Sciences, presented the Aquatic Invasive Plants study and results.

- (Q) Adam Cohen – When was this survey?
  - (R) Heather Neff - September 2023.
- (Q) Bartshe Miller – I wanted to make a point that there is actually lots of *Didymo* up there, outside of the boxes you surveyed, but is not present in big water years.
  - (R) Heather Neff – That is a good point that it could have been scoured out with high flows.
  - (R) Bartshe Miller – In 2022, several stream reaches were coated in green algae.
  - (R) Heather Neff – It is possible that there could be blooms in consecutive dry years.
- (Q) Chad Mellison – Did you look at other methods to survey like eDNA?
  - (R) Heather – We did not propose eDNA in the study but is a potential option, the *Didymo* genome is in the database.

9.0 AQ-3 AQUATIC HABITAT MAPPING AND SEDIMENT CHARACTERIZATION

Matt McKechnie, Stillwater Sciences, presented the Aquatic Habitat Mapping and Sediment Characterization study and results.

- (Q) Dannon Dirgo – Did you do any hydrologic conductivity sampling?
    - (R) Matt McKechnie – We did pebble counts for each spawning gravel patch. Some get a poorer quality over others with presence of fines, embeddedness, etc.

10.0 AQ-2 STREAM FISH POPULATIONS

Matt McKechnie, Stillwater Sciences, presented the Stream Fish Population study and results.

- (Q) Tristan Leong – Were there any other fish species observed besides the trout mentioned?
    - (R) Matt McKechnie – Historically, Lahontan redsides have been documented, but they were not observed in this study.

11.0 AQ-1 RESERVOIR FISH POPULATIONS

Heather Neff, Stillwater Sciences, presented the Reservoir Fish Population study and results.

No questions were received from stakeholders.

12.0 TERR-1 BOTANICAL RESOURCES

Allison Rudalevige, Psomas, presented the Botanical Resources study and results.

- (Q) Bartshe Miller – Did you key out the willow species?
    - (R) Allison Rudalevige – We did our best, yes. We had a lot of *Salix orestera* and *eastwoodiae*. Willows are difficult to identify to species when they do not have reproductive structures.

13.0 TERR-2 WILDLIFE RESOURCES

Steve Norton, Psomas, presented the Wildlife Resources study and results.

- (Q) Mary Meagher – Did you conduct willow flycatcher surveys too?
    - (R) Steve Norton – We did willow flycatcher habitat surveys but not focused surveys.
- (Q) Bryant Luu – Yosemite toad was the only focused survey?
    - (R) Steve Norton – The acoustic bat surveys were focused too, but the rest of the survey was pedestrian to look at everything else. We did flip rocks for herps; one interesting find was a lot of Sierra garter snake.
    - (R) Matt Woodhall – Note that we did not observe breeding evidence at all of the Yosemite toad sampling locations.
    - (R) Steve Norton – We observed all four life stages at the pool south of Saddlebag Lake. We heard breeding calls at southern end of Tioga too. We did not see any tadpoles or any eggs in those areas. In meadow below Slate Creek there were tadpoles but no toadlets or eggs. We tried to minimize foot traffic impacts.

- (Q) Bartshe Miller – If you have evidence of tadpoles, you can assume there is breeding.
    - (R) Matt Woodhall – Not necessarily because hybridization is a big question. Can't say that they are Yosemite toad by just seeing the tadpoles. We have DNA collected but no results yet.
- (Q) Bartshe Miller – Are western toads documented in Tioga Pass area?
    - (R) Matt Woodhall – Yes, in the general area, and specifically at entrance gate of Yosemite National Park.
- (Q) Tristan Leong – You said there was potential breeding at Tioga Lake, but you only heard the adults calling?
    - (R) Steve Norton – Yes, correct. We presumed they were breeding there, when there were broadcast calls we presumed breeding was present.
    - (R) Tristan Leong – Does the Tioga Lake water elevation fluctuate into the toad habitat?
    - (R) Steve Norton – Tioga Lake did stay at same elevation and didn't alter the breeding habitat.
- (Q) Matt McKechnie – Can you differentiate the species by their calls?
    - (R) Steve Norton – Because hybridization is also an issue, no, there is not a definitive way to distinguish between the species by calls at this time.
- (Q) Beth Lawson – The breeding calls you heard at Tioga, was at the lake or in the wet meadow?
    - (R) Steve Norton - It was upstream of the lake and one area in the margins of the lake.
- (Q) Beth Lawson – Is the area downstream of the lake good habitat?
    - (R) Steve Norton – There are no records in that area and we did a quick observation; we didn't see any activity there so we wrote it off.
- (Q) Dannon Dirgo – Since there are fish in the same area, would that impact the populations of the toads?
    - (R) Steve Norton – We believe that toads don't taste good to fish. There is no scientific evidence saying there is no predation.
- (Q) Chad Mellison – The toads mostly breed in fish-less areas and they don't taste good. The breeding habitat is mostly fish-less. Then they become fully terrestrial, which is different than yellow-legged frogs that stay in tadpole state for multiple years.
    - (R) Steve Norton – The garter snake is a bigger issue as a predator for toads.
    - (Q) Matt Woodhall – The bigger question is if there are operational impacts, and we should note that we are not seeing those here.
- (Q) Tristan Leong – Are Yosemite toad riverine, or where do they spawn?
    - (R) Steve Norton – They spawn in shallow and still waters, not moving water.

14.0 CUL-1 AND TRI-1 CULTURAL AND TRIBAL RESOURCES

Audry Williams, SCE, presented the Cultural and Tribal Resources study and results.

- (Q) Dean Tonenna – How much of the Tribal report and results will be confidential or public?

  - (R) Audry Williams – Any locational information will be confidential, as is the archaeology. Results of the study will be considered public unless someone specifically asks for it to be confidential.
- (Q) Dean Tonenna – Just asking so the group understands.
  - (R) Audry Williams – Yes, the Tribes may disclose information for the study that the public does not need to know.

15.0 REC-1 RECREATION USE AND NEEDS

Angela Whelpley, Kleinschmidt, presented the Recreation Use and Needs study, preliminary results, and 2024 study plans.

No questions were received from stakeholders.

16.0 REC-2 FACILITIES CONDITION ASSESSMENT

Angela Whelpley, Kleinschmidt, presented the Recreation Facilities Condition Assessment study and results.

- (Q) Tristan Leong – Did you look at the number of available parking spaces?
  - (R) Angela Whelpley – Yes, we did. The capacity assessment will be part of the REC-1 study.
- (Q) Tristan Leong – What is an acceptable condition description?
  - (R) Angela Whelpley – We ranked the conditions from "poor" to "good" condition.
- (Q) Chad Mellison – For the user-created trails, will the trails at Tioga Lake be analyzed further?
  - (R) Angela Whelpley – The Tioga Lake trail is outside of the FERC Project Boundary so we will not look at that one any closer. At Saddlebag Lake, yes, we will have trail counters around the Yosemite toad habitat because this is inside the FERC Project Boundary.

17.0 LAND-2 AESTHETIC RESOURCES

Angela Whelpley, Kleinschmidt, presented the Aesthetic Resources study and results.

- (Q) Bartshe Miller – Are there really no transmission lines in the Project boundary?
  - (R) Shannon Luoma – There are distribution lines, but no transmission lines.
  - (R) Sheila Irons – USFS had SCE paint the lines for another project.
- (Q) Dean Tonenna – Is Lee Vining Creek eligible to be a scenic river?
  - (R) Angela Whelpley – Lee Vining Creek is on the list but is not currently designated.
  - (Q) Dean Tonenna – If it is designated, how would that change how its treated?
  - (R) Angela Whelpley – It depends what category it falls in, stipulations are different depending on category.
  - (R) Tristan Leong - Is it all of Lee Vining Creek that is on the list for designation?
  - (R) Bartshe Miller – Certain segments of the creek are eligible for the recreation category.
  - (R) Angela Whelpley – Yes, the creek from Saddlebag Lake to the junction of 120 is proposed for listing under the recreation designation and from the junction of 120 to

the tailrace below Poole Powerhouse is proposed for listing under the scenic designation.

18.0 LAND-1 PROJECT LANDS AND ROADS

Shannon Luoma, Kleinschmidt, presented the Project Lands and Roads study and results.

- (Q) Tristan Leong – Which way does the access road go to Tioga Dam, does it cross the creek or just go down to the creek?
    - (R) Shannon Luoma – It goes down to the creek coming from the highway.
- (Q) Tristan Leong – For the private SCE parcel, was there material used from there to construct the dam or what was it used for?
    - (R) Matt Woodhall – It is not used at all now.
    - (R) Audry Williams – There was a historic construction camp there.
- (Q) Mary Meagher – Did Allison's botanical surveys cover the new additions to the Project Boundary?
    - (R) Allison Rudalevige – Yes, Saddlebag Lake area definitely, we surveyed it in 2023 per Richard McNeill's request. Tioga Dam and the SCE parcel, yes, for both 2022 and 2023 years.
- (Q) Dannon Dirgo – Do you anticipate any recreational use at the Tioga Dam section addition?
    - (R) Shannon Luoma / Matt Woodhall – There is an SCE gate there at the highway pull off, so there shouldn't be much, no public vehicles can get in.
    - (R) Bartshe Miller – The pull off itself there is used by the public to park and play in the big snow berm that accumulates there at the gate.

19.0 SCHEDULE, NEXT STEPS, FINAL Q&A

Shannon Luoma, Kleinschmidt, presented the Project schedule and next steps.

- (Q) Beth Lawson – For any PME proposals, is it a good time to discuss those now so they can go into the DLA? Do we want to start talking about PMEs now or when is good?
    - (R) Shannon Luoma – Yes, we do want to talk about these now and can also have focused TWGs for those discussions. We do want to set a date for the Operations Model discussion.
    - (R) Beth Lawson – It seems like it's that time, to start PMEs.
- (Q) Tristan Leong – For the process schedule, given we have numerous other projects in the basin, where do we find the time to sit down (post-DLA or pre-FLA), to hold the PME discussions?
    - (R) Shannon Luoma – Sooner than later, definitely pre-DLA. We can pick calendar times today hopefully. But remember that we won't have Recreation Use study data until the fall.
    - (R) Tristan Leong – Maybe in September for recreation at least?
    - (R) Shannon Luoma – I think the consultation for Operations Model and others can be June/July.
    - (R) Tristan Leong – It would be helpful for USFS staff to block of time in our calendars soon.

  - (R) Finlay Anderson – We might say things are a good ideas in the discussion but might not include everything in the DLA. We want to start pulling the list of ideas together as soon as possible.
- (Q) Tristan Leong – What is your drop-dead deadline that we need to know for the DLA?
  - (R) Shannon Luoma - We want to be pens down on DLA in mid-June.
  - (R) Matt Woodhall – We have the same Operations and Maintenance activities proposed going forward, so if there are some PMEs that you have now, let us know.
  - (R) Tristan Leong – I don't really have anything right now.
  - (R) Finlay – By the regulations, the deadline would be December 2, 2024, but hopefully we have the PME conversations well ahead of that.
  - (R) Finlay Anderson – For the DLA, FERC has a strange mode of consultation on things, for license applications now there will be a lot more focus on Operations and Maintenance actions.
  - (R) Shannon Luoma – If there are specific resource area that you want to talk more about it, we can set a TWG to meet and discuss.
  - (R) Tristan Leong – For recreation, yes. Further Yosemite toad discussion, maybe. Operations Model, yes, for refinement of the model.
- (Q) Bartshe Miller – Does SCE expect that hydropeaking below the Poole Powerhouse (since 2015) is expected to continue, sometimes twice a day, at that same magnitude?
  - (R) Matt Woodhall - Yes, we do expect that. We are reacting to the needs of CAISO, we see that it is in the range of current operations and can continue into the future. There is no obvious indication that it will change, but 10 years from now I can't answer that, it's hard to say.
- (Q) Shannon Luoma – Can we propose a few dates for open discussion?
  - (R) Tristan Leong – Yes, put some dates out there so we can lock them into our calendars.
- (Q) Graham Meese – Revisiting the fish stocking agreement would be a good idea to do with CDFW.
  - (R) Matt Woodhall - At this point, SCE is good with continuing what we are doing now, unless you have other ideas.
  - (R) Shannon Luoma – If it wasn't clear, the existing SCE management plans are proposed to continue with the Proposed Action.

Shannon Luoma, Kleinschmidt, summarized the meeting action items and next steps.

The Relicensing Team will send out the PowerPoint presentation and the list of meeting attendees to this group. Meeting summary notes and the PowerPoint will be posted to the website when they are finalized. A compiled list of action items is included at the top of the meeting notes.

The Relicensing Team adjourned the meeting.