

**HANFORD REACH NATIONAL MONUMENT
FEDERAL PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Final Meeting Summary: Session #3
Thursday, October 25, 2001
Columbia Basin College, Pasco, WA**

The Hanford Reach National Monument Federal Planning Advisory Committee met Thursday, October 25, 2001 from 9:00 am to 4:00 pm in the Administration Building Board Room of the Columbia Basin College in Pasco, Washington.

The purpose of the meeting was two-fold: 1) to begin preliminary issues identification around the Committee's charge of providing recommendations to the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department of Energy on the long-term preparation of the Comprehensive Conservation Plan and associated environmental impact statement for the Monument and, 2) to present information to the Committee regarding the valid existing rights of electric utilities and irrigation districts as named in the Monument Proclamation:

The establishment of this monument is subject to valid existing rights. Nothing in this proclamation shall interfere with the operation and maintenance of existing facilities of the Columbia Basin Reclamation Project, the Federal Columbia River Transmission System, or other existing utility services that are located within the monument. Existing Federal Columbia River Transmission System facilities located within the monument may be replaced, modified and expanded, and new facilities constructed within the monument, as authorized by other applicable law. Such replacement, modification, expansion, or construction of new facilities shall be carried out in a manner consistent with proper care and management of the objects of this proclamation, to be determined in accordance with the management arrangements previously set out in this proclamation.

Welcome and Introductions

Greg Hughes, Designated Federal Officer and Project Leader, Hanford Reach National Monument, opened the meeting and welcomed Committee members and alternates, the public, and officials and staff from both U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Department of Energy. Mr. Hughes turned the meeting over to Committee Chairman, James Watts.

Alice Shorett, facilitator, overviewed the day's agenda describing that the morning would be spent discussing the parallel processes of the CCP development and the FACA Committee work, working with constituencies and identifying preliminary critical issues. Ms. Shorett explained that the afternoon would be dedicated to hearing from the Bonneville Power Administration, Northwest Energy, Benton County Public Utility District and the South Columbia Basin Irrigation District on their valid existing rights.

Jim Watts put forth some additional meeting ground rules for streamlined functioning of the Committee. He asked that each person prop his/her name card up on its side when wanting to make comments. He clarified that on any given issue all those wishing to speak will be called upon before any individual has a chance to speak twice. He stated that he would be maintaining a list of whose cards are raised first and call on people in the same order.

Mr. Watts indicated that the meetings will start on time. He asked that there be no side conversations while the Committee meeting is underway. He said that primary members will sit at the table and the alternates will sit behind. If the member wants the alternate to speak they can switch seats. He indicated that when a vote is called he will first offer time for the alternates and members to caucus before voting.

He indicated that public comment is limited to five minutes but that there would be accommodation for people to speak more, time permitting. He stated the intent is not to limit anyone but to streamline the comments. It was asked and confirmed that all media statements offer a place to submit written comments to the Committee.

The Committee approved the additional ground rules as presented by Mr. Watts.

Meeting Summary from Session #2

Ms. Shorett requested comments or changes on the meeting summary from the Committee's second meeting, October 11, 2001. There were no changes and the meeting summary was approved as presented. Ms. Shorett clarified that at each meeting, the Committee will amend and approve the draft meeting summary from the previous meeting and then they will be made final and available to the public.

ACTION: Committee adoption of Session #2 Meeting Summary.
--

CCP Process/FAC Process Integration

Ms. Shorett explained an overhead and handout (Attachment A) describing the integration and parallel processes of the Comprehensive Conservation Plan development process with the Federal Advisory Committee's ongoing work. She clarified the CCP steps and indicated when preplanning would begin, where the processes overlapped and how the Committee would give input (during public scoping, vision and goal development, advice about alternatives and how to select the preferred alternative).

She further clarified that the NEPA environmental impact analysis process would be part of the planning process and integrated into the plan.

Jim Watts explained that the federal government is nearing the end of the fiscal year and awaiting appropriations. The FWS is advertising for a planner. The Committee's role now, he indicated, is to get going on issue identification so they will have something of value to give to the planner when that person comes on board.

Preliminary Issues Discussion

Alice Shorett reviewed the Committee's purpose as outlined in the Charter and gave three instructions for the Committee to contemplate and respond to:

1. Think about what you've seen and learned on the land and boat tours and heard from your constituents,
2. Review the Committee's purpose in the Charter, and
3. Identify issues within the Committee's scope that you feel need to be addressed in order for the Committee to fulfill its charge of providing advice to FWS and DOE on the CCP and EIS.

She asked that each member, with his/her alternate and other members if they so wished, take about ten minutes to discuss the instructions and come up with key issues from their own and their constituency's perspective.

Q: How do the proclamation resources fit in with the NWRS mission? Is there a hierarchy of values?

Greg Hughes replied that in the meetings time has been taken to go over background information on refuges. In doing so, main refuge system policies were highlighted, focusing on "the big six" public uses; but there is room in the refuge system for all the values mentioned in the proclamation – historic, paleontologic, biologic, scientific, etc. There are examples of historic preservation all over the country in other refuges. All these things are included within the

purview of the NWRS. With the Proclamation, there is probably a little bit of a broader scope that the typical refuge.

Q: Is there a protocol for the hierarchy of National Wildlife Refuge System policy versus the Proclamation?

The Proclamation trumps the NWRS policy. For example FWS could allow grazing on a refuge, but the Proclamation does not allow it.

Q: Proclamation does not mention refuge. Where did FWS decide to use the refuge system to manage these lands?

The Proclamation directs FWS to manage the lands and the Secretary of the Interior's letter makes it a unit of the refuge system. [Editor's note: The CLUP ROD preferred alternative states that the lands should be managed by the FWS under the NWRS. The Proclamation directs FWS to manage the lands under existing agreements with DOE. The existing agreements state that the lands are managed as units of the NWRS.]

[Committee Members: See Attachment B for Draft Issues Categories and Transcribed Flip Charts]

Mr. Watts pointed out that Native American interests were not represented at the table and directed the facilitators to phone the representatives and get their concerns added. He indicated that a placeholder will be there for Native American interests. When a member feels there is an issue important to his/her interests but cannot be at the meeting for discussion around it, s/he will be contacted for additional input.

Q: How can committee address budget needs in the proper manner. Is it within their purview to investigate the cost of what they will advise the FWS to do?

Mr. Watts replied affirmatively stating that when the Committee gives advice it can be coached in terms of budget. The success of this Committee in giving advice adds credence to how the Congressional delegation listens to the advice.

The Committee discussed the merits of categorization, understanding that the goal was to group the issues listed, not eliminate any. Committee members will each group their own issues as put forth within the following four categories that can be changed and added to in the future:

1. Access and Uses
2. Resource Protection
3. Compatibility
4. Administrative

Per the request of the Committee, the facilitators will create a comprehensive handouts bibliography, put titles as much as possible on each handout, and minimize use of acronyms. Triangle will send out an acronyms list with the next meeting notes.

Working with Constituencies

Alice Shorett explained that each Committee member is responsible for representing his/her constituency as defined by the seat at the table.

Michele Gerber, scientific/academic seat, has put together a letter and sent it to a comprehensive list of historians across the state and invited their input and attendance at an initial scoping meeting. She asked for assistance with "keeping in touch," mailing and other associated costs.

Lunch

The Committee recessed for lunch and reconvened at 1:00 pm.

Afternoon Presentations

Irrigation

Shannon McDaniel, Manager, South Columbia Basin Irrigation District (SCBID), informed the Committee of facilities that are operated in the Monument under contract. The Columbia Basin Project works as a unit, from Grand Coulee Dam into Banks Lake thru main canal and feeds Quincy and East Districts come into Potholes Reservoir, which then comes to SCBID and finally returns into the Hanford Reach.

SCBID worked very hard to ensure that their rights were written into the Proclamation. Other sites they want to identify as existing rights are two clay pits.

Mr. McDaniel distributed copies of his presentation and maps of the area which indicated SCBID's operations.

Mr. McDaniel and Mr. Bill Grey, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, responded to a question period with the Committee members. Mr. McDaniel closed by saying that the facilities are important to irrigators throughout the Columbia Basin. He thanked the Committee for having him speak at the session and offered to come back to provide additional information or give tours of SCBID's operations. He stated that he would consider assigning someone from SCBID to a subcommittee if asked and could supply a substantial amount of documentation as needed.

Utilities

Doug Coleman, Manager of Performance Assessment and Regulatory Programs, Energy Northwest provided a presentation of existing operations and maintenance. Mr. Coleman distributed copies of his presentation. He agreed at the close of his presentation to return to talk to the Committee again and work with the Committee as they go through the process.

Mr. Coleman responded to Committee members' questions related to his presentation. Rich Steele indicated that Energy Northwest has been "a good neighbor" and thanked Mr. Coleman for that. Committee members asked questions regarding details of the presentation as well as issues related to permitting and relicensing.

Richard Coila, Bonneville Power Administration, also gave a presentation of existing rights and clarified their financial and physical separation from Energy Northwest and the two entities' relationship.

He offered to arrange tours for the Committee members and provide information as needed. Mr. Coila distributed copies of his presentation and took questions from Committee members. Committee members asked about using existing corridors for new transmission lines and permitting of BPA facilities. Mr. Coila asked that if Committee members discussions and alternatives development look like there might be impacts on BPA operations, to let them know to engage in conversation and information sharing.

Gary Long, Director, Benton County Public Utility District began by helping distinguish among the roles of Energy Northwest (generation), Bonneville Power Administration (transmission) and Benton County PUD (responsibility to serve electricity). Mr. Long distributed a map of their facilities and other pertinent information to the Committee members.

Mr. Long stated that much of his presentation was similar to Mr. Coila's and therefore went through his slides briefly in order to give Committee members more time for questions. He stated that they only use one chemical to treat their poles to keep brush from accumulating there and showed slides of fire-damaged poles. He talked about the routes that repair and work crews use to access the lines, some

heading straight up the face of Rattlesnake Mountain as well as their interest in maintaining some roads that provide safe access in the winter months. He indicated that when they receive requests to construct new lines that the process begins with conversations with DOE and FWS, then easements are designated and lines built.

Committee Business

Jim Watts asked members to start thinking of legal-type questions for the next Committee meeting, such as from DOE on the reach, tribal rights, legal boundaries, DOE interaction with FWS, etc. He indicated his interest in having the Committee get questions to the presenters in advance of the meeting. He further asked that Committee members submit suggestions for speakers.

It was also stated that FWS will be looking to the Solicitor's office for interpretation of existing rights. Committee members asked that someone involved in writing the Proclamation be a speaker to the Committee. Committee members also indicated their interest in having additional clarity on some of the sideboards relating to policies of the FWS so that the Committee's recommendations do not "miss the mark" and then can not be used because of legal ramifications.

Alice Shorett distributed the Draft Issues Groupings and reminded Committee members to review the preliminary draft and to comment within a week to ten days to Triangle Associates, Inc.

Public Comment

Joyce Olson, District Director from Rep. Doc Hastings Office, made brief comments to the Committee stating that the Hanford Reach is of great interest to the Representative. She indicated that she had been to the previous two meetings and would be attending others in the future.

Closing Remarks

The Committee members went around and made closing remarks on the day's events and progress.

Greg Hughes, DFO, thanked the Committee for donating their time. He stated that he saw the group starting to gel and that the time spent with the Committee has raised his respect for members in the planning process. He further thanked Pasco and Columbia Basin College for their hospitality for the meeting.

Committee members' comments were positive, stating:

- We're happy to get to the issues
- Would like to move to start forming subcommittees
- This was a really good meeting and important progress had been made
- Liked Michele's work on the constituency and it helped provide good insight
- Chemistry of the groups learning to work together as a team was inspirational
- Pleased where the Committee's work stands today
- Certain issues seem to be important to all of us
- Issues that we brought up were good
- Morning format was great

James Watts thanked all the presenters and indicated that the Committee appreciated their information and handouts. He thanked them for the presentations that were well devised and provided clear information for everyone.

Greg Hughes closed the meeting at 4:00 pm.

Meeting Minutes Certified by:

Greg Hughes, DFO

Jim Watts, Chair

MEETING ATTENDANCE:

Committee Seat	Member	Alternate
K- 12 Education: Cities	Karen Wieda Chris Jensen	Royace Aikin
Conservation/Environmental Counties	Rich Leaumont	Mike Lilga Frank Brock
Economic Development	Jim Watts	Harold Heacock
Outdoor Recreation	Rich Steele	Mike Wiemers
Public-at-Large	Kris Watkins	
Scientific/Academic	Michele Gerber Gene Schreckhise David Geist	Ed Rykiel
State	Jeff Tayer	Ron Skinnerland
Tribal		
Utilities/Irrigation		Nancy Craig
Designated Federal Officer	Greg Hughes	

Participants and Invited Speakers

South Columbia Basin Irrigation District	Shannon McDaniel, Manager
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	Bill Grey
Energy Northwest	Doug Coleman, Manager of Performance Assessment and Regulatory Programs
Bonneville Power Administration	Richard Coila
Benton County Public Utility District	Gary Long, Director
U.S. Department of Energy	Bob Rosselli, Deputy Manager for Business Services

Facilitators

Triangle Associates, Inc.	Alice Shorett	Melanie Emerson
---------------------------	---------------	-----------------

Meeting Support

Observers

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Don Voros
U.S. Department of Energy	Dana Ward
Congressman Hastings Office	Joyce Olson
Yakama Nation	Wade Riggsbee
Bonneville Power Administration	Mary Hollen
KVEW TV	Dave Zimmerman
Tri-Cities Herald	Mike Lee
Benton County	Adam Fyall
Benton County PUD	Harlan Scher
Benton County PUD	Mark Hay

DISTRIBUTED MATERIALS

Committee's Packet of Materials

Meeting Agenda (October 25, 2001)

Committee Groundrules: As Revised and Adopted (October 11, 2001)

Draft Meeting Summary: Session #2 (October 16, 2001)

Triangle Associates, Inc.

FACA Committee Meetings/CCP Process (chart)

Draft Issues Groupings (10/25/01)

South Columbia Basin Irrigation District

Activities Required Within the Boundaries of the Hanford National Monument (outline)

Wasteways Map (hand-drawn map, untitled)

Columbia Basin Project: Farm Unit and County Road Location Map (1982)

Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Columbia Basin Project (map, January, 1995)

Energy Northwest

Presentation to Hanford Reach National Monument Federal Planning Advisory Committee (D. Coleman)

Bonneville Power Administration

Transmission System: Hanford (presentation)

Benton County Public Utility District

Hanford Reach National Monument Advisory Committee (outline sheet, October 25, 2001)

MSDS for Weed Blast 4-G Weed Killer (5/99)

Customer List (10/22/01)

Hanford Area BPUD Facilities & Related Access Roads (map, 10/22/01)