

---

**From:** Scott Kreiter  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 06, 2008 11:07 AM  
**To:** Andy Lampe; Bill Fraser; Bill Towey; Bob Clubb; Bob Dach; Bob Fateley; Brenda Crowell; Chris Parsons; David Turner; Dennis Beich; Diane Priebe; Gail Howe; George Brady; Gordon Brett; Jean Hardie; Jim Eychaner; Jim Harris; John Devine; Lee Webster; Mary Hunt; Mary Mayo; Michael Linde; Mike Nickerson; Mike Palmer; Neal Hedges; Pat Haley; Pat Irle (pir461@ecy.wa.gov); Patricia Leppert; Robert Easton; Sally Sovey; Scott Kreiter; Shane Bickford; Susan Rosebrough; Tony Eldred  
**Subject:** Wells Relicensing: Recreation RWG draft meeting notes  
**Attachments:** Recreation\_RWG\_Notes\_022908.pdf

Recreation RWG members,  
Please find attached the draft meeting notes from the February 29 meeting. Please provide any comments on the meeting notes by March 13.

Thank you!  
-Scott

Scott Kreiter  
Douglas County PUD  
509-881-2327

# Draft Meeting Notes

## Recreation Resource Work Group

Wells Hydroelectric Project Relicensing  
Douglas County PUD  
February 29, 2008

**Meeting Coordinator:** Scott Kreiter (509) 881-2327

**Meeting Objective:** To provide an update on the Recreation Needs Evaluation and the Recreation Access Study.

### Wells ILP Update

Douglas PUD provided an update on the upcoming ILP schedule. Douglas PUD is in the study phase of the ILP. Data collected during the two-year study phase will be used in developing the Draft License Application (DLA) which is due on December 31, 2009.

### Recreation Needs Analysis Study Update

Kelly Bricker from Devine Tarbell & Assoc, provided a progress report on the Recreation Needs Analysis (see Attachment A below).

The RWG identified additional literature that may be relevant to the Needs Analysis Study. The RWG also discussed methods for addressing Section 6.1, Step 2 of the Study Plan (*Collect unmet Project Area recreation demand information from visitor surveys, community leaders, and current research*). The primary focus of this step is to address potential use that may not have been collected in the Recreation Use Assessment.

Actions include:

- Reviewing relevant literature;
- Interviewing community leaders identified by each of the Cities;
- Providing questionnaires at the Bridgeport Community Fair on April 26;
- Collect input at a Pateros Parent Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting;
- Collect input at a Brewster PAC meeting.

### Recreation Access Study Update

Douglas PUD provided a progress report on the Recreation Access Study (see Attachment B below). Bathymetry collection at each of the boat launches is complete. The backwater analysis, which will be used to evaluate how reservoir operations impact boat launch access, is nearly complete. Next steps include analysis of aquatic plant growth at public access sites, and development of maps showing water depths in the reservoir. The RWG discussed potential options for water depth maps that could be used to improve boater experience on the reservoir.

Action Items:

**Action:** Douglas PUD will schedule an RWG meeting in June or July to provide another study update prior to the October 30 study report meeting.

**Action:** Douglas PUD will provide the Water Trail contact information to Kelly Bricker.

**Action:** Jim Eychaner and Jim Harris will provide the relevant documents to Kelly Bricker for use in the Recreation Needs Assessment.

**Action:** Kelly Bricker will send the questionnaire to Jean Hardie and Patti Leppert.

**Action:** Lee Webster will provide the Brewster Recreation Study results to Kelly Bricker.

**Action:** Douglas PUD will be sure to address non-motorized boat use in the Recreation Access study.

**Action:** The recreation season used for the Recreation Access Study will be May - November

Items of Agreement

None

Items of Disagreement

None

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be scheduled for late June or early July.

## **ATTACHMENT A**

### **Wells Recreation Needs Evaluation Progress Report**

February 29, 2008

The goal of this study was to research, describe, and quantify recreation and access needs in the Wells Project that should be addressed over the term of the next 50-year FERC license. Specific objectives included:

- Summarizing study findings to evaluate recreational use and demand within the Wells Project. This summary was based on results of the 2005 Wells Project Recreation Visitor Use Assessment and existing information from FERC Form 80s for the Wells Project, Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation outdoor recreation participation survey, WDFW fisherman surveys, WDFW hunter surveys, City of Bridgeport's Marina Park information and other relevant recreational survey information.
  - Assessing the adequacy of existing Wells Project recreation facilities to accommodate current and future recreation demand.
  - Assessing the adequacy of public access and safety at Wells Project recreation facilities.
  - Assessing the adequacy of operations and maintenance at Wells Project recreation facilities.
  - Developing a prioritized list of potential actions to address Wells Project recreation issues. The list included criteria such as demand, effectiveness, feasibility and cost.

- 1) Abstract
  - a) Add additional information when demand study completed
- 2) Section 1.0- Introduction
  - a) Completed
- 3) Section 2.0- Goals and Objectives
  - a) Completed
- 4) Section 3.0- Study Area
  - a) Completed
- 5) Section 4.0- Methodology
  - a) Completed
- 6) Section 5.0- Results
  - a) 5.1- Assess Existing Unmet Demand (Section 6.1 in Study Plan)

- i) 5.1.1- Statewide and Regional Unmet Recreation Demand (Section 6.1, Step 1 in Study Plan)**
  - (1) 5.1.1.1- Statewide Unmet Recreation Demand**
    - (a) Completed**
    - (b) Sources Used:**
      - (i) 2002- 2007 SCORP**
      - (ii) SCORP Local Government Survey**
      - (iii) Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation's (IAC) Statewide Outdoor Recreation Participation Survey**
  - (2) 5.1.1.2- Regional Unmet Recreation Demand**
    - (a) Incomplete- specific regional information not readily available**
- ii) 5.1.2- Project Area Recreation Demand Information from Visitor Surveys, Spot Count Observations, Community Leaders, and Current Research (Section 6.1, Step 2 in Study Plan)**
  - (1) 5.1.2.1- Project Area Recreation Demand Information from Visitor Surveys**
    - (a) Completed**
    - (b) Sources Used:**
      - (i) 2005 Recreation Visitor Use Assessment**
  - (2) 5.1.2.2- Project Area Demand Spot Count Observations**
    - (a) Completed**
    - (b) Sources Used:**
      - (i) 2005 Recreation Visitor Spot Count Surveys**
  - (3) 5.1.2.3- Interviews with Local Community Leaders**
    - (a) Incomplete- in progress**
  - (4) 5.1.2.4- Interviews with Fish and Game Officers**
    - (a) Incomplete- in progress**
  - (5) 5.1.2.5- Research in Hispanic Recreation Needs**
    - (a) Completed**
    - (b) Sources Used:**
      - (i) Peer-reviewed research and journal articles**
- iii) 5.1.3- Potential Recreation Activities with High Unmet Demand within the Project Area (Section 6.1, Step 3 in Study Plan)**
  - (1) Partially Completed**
    - (a) High latent demand activities identified for Washington state**
    - (b) Will add Project specific information when previous sections of 5.1 complete**

- (2) Sources Used to Date:
  - (a) Washington SCORP
  
- b) Section 5.2- Assess Future Recreation Demand (Section 6.2 in Study Plan)
  - i) 5.2.1- Review of Existing Recreation Use Trends (Section 6.2, Step 1 in Study Plan)
    - (1) Completed
    - (2) Sources Used:
      - (a) Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Fishermen Survey (Michael, 2004)
      - (b) Washington Fishing License Sales (communication with Justin McCarron; Southwick Associates, Inc., 2007)
      - (c) Washington Fishing Guide Activity Washington ORV Green Sticker Sales (communication with Carol Turcotte)
      - (d) Washington ORV Green Sticker Sales (Motor Vehicles)
      - (e) Washington Boating Vessel Registrations (DOL Vessel Registration System)
      - (f) Great Washington State Birding Trail Brochure Distribution (communication with Christi Norman)
      - (g) Recreation Equipment Sales Trends (Southwick Associates Inc., 2007; Outdoor Industry Foundation, 2006)
  
  - ii) 5.2.2- Existing Population and Recreation Activity Participation Projections (Section 6.2, Step 2 in Study Plan)
    - (1) Partially Completed
      - (a) Estimated activity participation trends and projections for the Project area
      - (b) This section under construction
  
  - iii) 5.2.3- Reasonably Foreseeable Events That May Influence Future Use (Section 6.2, Step 3 in Study Plan)
    - (1) Incomplete- Kelly Bricker still discussing with Douglas
  
  - iv) 5.2.4- Estimate of Future Recreation Use Over the License Period (Section 6.2, Step 4 in Study Plan)
    - (1) Completed
    - (2) Sources Used:
      - (a) Historical Trends
      - (b) Future Growth Projections
  
- c) Section 5.3- Regional Uniqueness and Significance Assessment (Section 6.3 in Study Plan)
  - i) 5.3.1- Visitor Questionnaires (Section 6.3, Step 1 in Study Plan)
    - (1) Completed
    - (2) Sources Used:
      - (a) 2005 Recreation Visitor Use Assessment

- ii) 5.3.2- Regional Recreation Opportunities (Section 6.3, Step 2 in Study Plan)
      - (1) Completed
      - (2) Sources Used:
        - (a) Douglas PUD
        - (b) 2005 Recreation Visitor Use Assessment
    - iii) 5.3.3- Uniqueness of Project-related Recreation Opportunities (Section 6.3, Step 3 in Study Plan)
      - (1) Partially Completed
        - (a) Review of activities offered at Wells and similar locations
        - (b) This section under construction
          - (i) Refine activities available at other locations
          - (ii) Discussion of project area uniqueness
  - d) Section 5.4- Public Access Analysis (Section 6.4 in Study Plan)
    - i) Incomplete
      - (1) To collect this information on site in Washington
  - e) Section 5.5- Needs Assessment (Section 6.5 in Study Plan)
    - i) 5.5.1- Project-related Recreation Opportunities at Recreation Resource Areas (Section 6.5, Step 1 in Study Plan)
      - (1) Partially Completed
        - (a) Visitor assessment of facilities completed
        - (b) Need DTA team evaluation of facilities
      - (2) Sources Used:
        - (a) DTA Team
        - (b) 2005 Recreation Visitor Use Assessment- facility questions
    - ii) 5.5.2- Summary of Major Recreation Issues (Section 6.5, Step 2 in Study Plan)
      - (1) Partially Completed
        - (a) Visitor responses completed
        - (b) Need responses from community leaders
        - (c) Need field evaluation of facilities based on inadequacies identified by visitors and officials
        - (d) Add description about adequacy of existing facilities over the license period
      - (2) Sources Used:
        - (a) 2005 Recreation Visitor Use Assessment
        - (b) Community Leaders
        - (c) Field Evaluations
    - iii) 5.5.3- Actions to Address Project-related Issues (Section 6.5, Step 3 in Study Plan)
      - (1) Partially Completed
        - (a) Summary of Hispanic issues completed
        - (b) Need to identify and discuss specific actions
        - (c) This section under construction

**iv) 5.5.4- Relicensing Consultation (Section 6.5, Step 4 in Study Plan)**

**(1) Incomplete**

**(a) To be completed at the end of the study**

**7) Section 6.0- Discussion**

**a) To be completed after field evaluation and additional data collection completed**

**8) Section 7.0- Acknowledgements**

**a) Need to add.**

**9) Section 8.0- References**

**a) Complete unless add additional sources during completion of the study**

**10) Appendices**

Literature review of Hispanic recreation needs



## **ATTACHMENT B**

### Evaluation of Public Access to the Wells Reservoir as it Relates to Reservoir Fluctuations, Aquatic Plants, and Substrate Buildup

Progress Report  
February 29, 2008

**Contractors:** Jacobs (Rolf Wielick, lead); GeoEngineers (backwater analysis); Erlandsen and Associates (drawings and bathymetry)

#### **Goals and Objectives**

The goal of this study is to evaluate whether Wells Project recreation facilities (public access facilities) such as docks, boat launches and swimming areas, can be reasonably utilized under various reservoir operating scenarios and conditions. Specific objectives include:

- Evaluate accessibility to boat docks and launches during low reservoir elevations.
- Evaluate how reservoir elevations affect on-water boating experiences.
- Evaluate the effect of aquatic plant growth on accessibility to boat docks, launches and designated swimming areas within the Wells Project (reservoir and tailrace).
- Evaluate whether river substrate is restricting access to boat docks, boat launches and designated swimming areas within the Wells Project (reservoir and tailrace).
- Develop a map showing general types of aquatic plants and where they occur.
- Develop a map showing areas of the reservoir that may be inaccessible during low reservoir elevations.
- Identify measures to improve boat docks and launches and swimming areas as they relate to reservoir fluctuations, aquatic plants and substrate buildup.

#### **Tasks**

Task 1: Evaluate Access Related to Reservoir Fluctuations (15% complete)

- Review and summarize hourly elevation data from the Wells forebay to determine how often fluctuations occur in the Wells Reservoir. Develop headwater duration curves for the years 2003-2007 to better understand the relationship between reservoir fluctuations and elapsed time.
- Document and evaluate accessibility to boat docks and launches. Evaluate depths at boat launches and docks to determine at what elevations access sites could become inaccessible due to low water. (Note that the evaluation of the effects of substrate buildup

on access to the reservoir and water related public facilities in these areas will be conducted in connection with this task).

- Using GIS and the existing reservoir bathymetry data, identify potential shallow areas during low reservoir operations. Utilize these maps to evaluate how reservoir fluctuations may affect on-water boating experiences.
- Identify and describe potential options to improve access.

Task 2: Evaluate Access Related to Substrate Buildup  
(See Task 1)

Task 3: Evaluate Access Related to Aquatic Plants (5% complete)

- Conduct a field survey during August 2008 to evaluate the density and distribution of aquatic plants in relation to specific sites to determine if and how aquatic plants in these areas adversely impact access to the Wells Reservoir and use of public use sites. The field survey shall consist of rough mapping of the extent of any aquatic weed growth at each of the sites using hand-held GPS equipment or other appropriate methods to establish general locations of aquatic plants near the sites. Plant identification shall be accomplished using a line and grapple to allow sampling at each site to assess general plant types.
- Identify and describe potential options to improve access.