



**MEETING SUMMARY\***  
**BISHOP CREEK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT**  
**TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP UPDATES**  
**FERC PROJECT NO. 1394**

**DATE:** May 3, 2022, 9:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.  
**LOCATION:** Conference Call/Webinar  
**TOPICS:** Recreation

*\*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 participating agencies.*

**1. OBJECTIVES**

- Confirm stakeholder recreation objectives.
- Establish data needs.
- Provide update on USFS/SCE discussions on recreational facilities and planning.

**2. ATTENDEES**

Relicensing Team Members

Martin Ostendorf, SCE  
Matthew Woodhall, SCE  
Seth Carr, SCE  
Lyle Laven, SCE  
Finlay Anderson, Kleinschmidt  
Shannon Luoma, Kleinschmidt  
Matthew Harper, Kleinschmidt  
Brandon Kulik, Kleinschmidt  
Michael Donovan, Psomas  
Brad Blood, Psomas

Technical Working Group Members & Interested Parties

Alyssa Marquez, CDFW  
Nick Buckmaster, CDFW  
Sheila Irons, USFS  
Tristan Leong, USFS  
Dannon Dirgo, USFS  
Adam Barnett, USFS  
Savannah Downey, SWRCB  
Philip Meyer, SWRCB

Facilitation Team

Mike Harty, Kearns & West  
Lindsay Tryba, Kearns & West

## Action Items

- **SCE** will propose additional language to capture USFS's recreation concerns (i.e., an adaptive management plan) within the resource management plan.
- **CDFW** will meet internally to identify CDFW's specific stocking requests; CDFW will share with SCE as soon as possible.
- **USFS** will meet internally to identify USFS's specific recreation requests; USFS will share with SCE as soon as possible.
- **All** will discuss stocking/flows and remaining recreation/parking issues at the 5/25 PM&E meeting.

## 4. INTRODUCTION

This Protection, Mitigation, and Enhancement (PM&E) Measures meeting focused on recreation resources and provided brief updates on management plan development for the other resource areas. The Bishop Creek Relicensing Team ("Team") resource-area leads addressed the status and schedule of management plans and provided a summary of the PM&E Measures to address project effects.

The presentation slides are available on the project website and are not summarized here. The summary below identifies the status updates of each plan as identified by the Team resource-area lead and focuses on questions and comments from participants.

## 5. SUMMARY OF RECREATION STUDIES

Matt Harper, Recreation Resource Team Lead, provided an overview of the recreation study reports. The discussion below captures SCE's update on the status and focus of resource plans and participant discussion; please reference the slides for greater detail.

### ***Rec 1 Angler Surveys***

The recreation study reports are available at [www.sce.com/bishopcreek](http://www.sce.com/bishopcreek). The Use and Needs Study (REC 1) was distributed with the Draft License Application and outlines key findings and how these findings will be used in developing the Recreation Resource Management Plan (RRMP). Additionally, the Facility Condition Assessment (REC 2) was distributed in Fall 2021 and outlines key findings and how these findings will be used in developing the RRMP.

Matt provided a presentation on the Rec 1 Angler Surveys. The summary below references the questions and comments from participants; please see the slides for greater detail.

Questions and comments from participants included:

- Comment (C) (CDFW): To clarify a comment you made in your presentation, CDFW may not be able to provide all stocking information for the full TWG because some stocking information is proprietary. That said, CDFW will look into the possibility of disclosing some information without making it public.
- Question (Q) (USFS): What is the range of catchable fish that can be transported using the CDFW truck?
  - Response (R) (CDFW): Approximately 2,000-4,000 catchable fish at a half pound each, and CDFW stocks roughly every week.
- (C) (CDFW): If CDFW increased stocking, we would see more people at Bishop Creek because more people would fish in Bishop Creek.

- (C) (CDFW): I am concerned that these sessions are not productive because we have not agreed on key data and the allocation of responsibilities. If we are unable to agree on the project effects and data, then we should consider moving these conversations to email or using the FEFC channels.
  - (R) (Team): Thank you for expressing your concern. We have time today to discuss areas of disagreement further. What are CDFW's primary goals? From SCE's perspective, we want to reach a plan that is implementable, and SCE wants to quantify the cost.
- (C) (USFS): Here are a few questions that we should consider as we discuss stocking needs: Is the stocking plan adequate? What goals are not being met? How much stocking is needed (for recreation, water supply, etc.) in both the reservoirs and bypassed reaches? What areas provide room for compromise?
- (C) (CDFW): CDFW is interested in increasing flows in some reaches to improve fish conditions, but SCE proposed stocking rather than increasing flows. So, if we're not increasing flows, then we should reconsider stocking.
- (Q) (USFS): Geographically, what is the lowest point in which CDFW stocks fish?
  - (R) (CDFW): CDFW stocks below Intake 2, near the campgrounds.
- (Q) (SCE): What would CDFW like SCE to do? Does CDFW want SCE to stock fish annually? SCE stocks every five years. Would CDFW want SCE to pay CDFW every year for stocking responsibilities? SCE would like CDFW to provide specific requests.
  - (R) (CDFW): Currently, direct reimbursement is not CDFW's preferred approach.
- (C) (CDFW): When CDFW worked with agencies and the Relicensing Team to design these studies years ago, we did so in a way that did not scrutinize every request. It appears that SCE no longer wants to operate in that way. Additionally, CDFW believes the Bishop Creek creel data are lacking. We may need to gather more data to make specific requests and compromises.
  - (R) (Team): SCE would like to better understand what CDFW wants. From SCE's understanding, CDFW stocks reservoirs based on paid fishing licenses (i.e., CDFW uses the revenue from fishing licenses to fund stocking and predict stocking needs). CDFW is asserting that the Project is increasing the stocking need beyond what the fishing licenses fund, but the Team has not seen evidence to support this claim. To move forward, SCE needs to understand CDFW's specific requests.
    - (R) CDFW: Based on the data, CDFW believes that SCE should pick up roughly 80% of the stocking needs because there is an 80% increase in stocking needs in Bishop Creek compared to comparable watersheds due to the Project impacts.
      - (Q) (Team): Is the quantity of fishers the same in all reaches?
        - (R) (CDFW): CDFW did not find a statistical difference. There is variance in the angler data.
      - (R) (Team): SCE would need to see further data to support the claim of an 80% stocking increase. How does CDFW collect data on the quantity of fishers?
        - (R) (CDFW): CDFW counts the number of cars in the fishing areas, which is not the most robust data. CDFW is not asking for SCE to meet 80% of the stocking needs. That percentage was used because three watersheds that are comparable to Bishop Creek, but do not have a Project, do not require as much stocking.
      - (Q) (Team): So, if CDFW is not asking for SCE to meet 80% of stocking needs, what is CDFW's suggestion for stocking?

- (C) (CDFW): CDFW will discuss stocking requests internally and come up with options.
- (Q) (Team): Does CDFW believe that the data CDFW provided SCE for “Current CDFW stocking” is adequate?
  - (R) (CDFW): Yes, it is adequate.
- (C) (CDFW): Perhaps we should convene a small group to discuss stocking needs between CDFW, USFS, and the Team. Or perhaps this discussion can occur at the 5/25 Bishop Creek PM&E meeting.

**Rec 1 and Rec 2 Surveys**

Matt Harper, Recreation Resource Lead, presented on the Rec 1 and Rec 2 surveys (please reference slides for details).

- Anticipated to include (for recreation)
  - RRMP that describes the process for developing a comprehensive plan to address key elements from study results, including:
    - Timelines
    - Consultation
  - Stocking Plan

Questions and comments from participants included:

- (Q) (USFS): Do we understand the Bureau of Land Management’s (BLM) recreation ability? What is the management paradigm downstream on BLM lands?
  - (R) (Team): The only BLM lands within the Project are within the lower plan area. The Team is not aware of fishing downstream on BLM land. There is not a need for significant management on non-USFS land because nearly all recreation-related activities occur on USFS land.
- (C) (USFS): USFS would like to point out that if SCE is considering closing a road (i.e., near Little Egypt climbing access), then USFS would be required to receive permission to close a road from USFS’s designated land manager.
- (C) (USFS): No matter where we decide to build the parking lot, people will try to find a way to park closer. USFS agrees that Little Egypt climbing is not a Project effect, but USFS and SCE will need to work together to figure out a way to mitigate the parking issue.
- (C) (Team): SCE does not want this to become a maintenance issue (i.e., SCE does not want to maintain facilities, like restrooms).
  - (R) (USFS): USFS is not asking for SCE to take on a significant maintenance role; USFS wants to work with SCE to mitigate parking in a way that works for both parties.
- (C) (USFS): USFS would like to note that there are recreation activities at Intake 2 during the winter, including ice hockey and sledding.
- (C) (USFS): USFS will meet internally to identify USFS’s specific requests.
- (C) (Team): SCE will propose different language to capture this information (i.e., an adaptive management plan) in the resource management plan.

The next Bishop Creek PM&E meeting will occur on Wednesday, May 25<sup>th</sup> from 9 am to 12 pm PDT.