



**DRAFT MEETING NOTES\***  
**LEE VINING, FERC PROJECT NO. 1388**  
**PROTECTION, MITIGATION, AND ENHANCEMENT MEASURES STAKEHOLDER MEETING**  
**JUNE 11, 2024, 9:00 AM–10:00 AM**

*\*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 proposed protection, mitigation, and enhancement (PME) measures
- Address stakeholder questions

**2.0 ATTENDEES**

---

Relicensing Team Members

Matt Woodhall, SCE  
Martin Ostendorf, SCE  
Audry Williams, SCE  
Carissa Shoemaker, Kleinschmidt  
Finlay Anderson, Kleinschmidt  
Shannon Luoma, Kleinschmidt

Dannon Dirgo, USFS  
Graham Meese, CDFW  
Jameisha Washington, USFS  
Mary Meagher, USFS  
Michael Weise, USFS  
Robbie DiPaolo, MLC  
Sheila Irons, USFS  
Tristan Leong, USFS  
Kyle Cox, Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians  
Nathan Sill, USFS  
James Erdman, CDFW  
Greg Reis, MLC  
Wilfred Nabahe, USFS  
Raymond Andrews, Bishop Paiute Tribe  
Karyn Spears, Mono County

Technical Working Group Members & Interested Parties

Adam Cohen, State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)  
Andrew Lyons-Gould, US Forest Service (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

### 3.0 COMPILED ACTION ITEMS

---

- The Relicensing Team will look to see if any spoils are still on site and where.
- The Relicensing Team will find out what happens to hazardous tree's root wads and stumps.
- The Relicensing Team will send out this PME list and existing management plans.
- The Relicensing Team will schedule another PME meeting for next month (July).
- Tristan Leong, USFS, will send the 4(e) Appeal document.

### 4.0 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

---

Shannon Luoma, Kleinschmidt, welcomed attendees, introduced the meeting.

- Question (Q) Nathan Sill – Is the best way to provide Tech Report comments to send to you directly?
  - Response (R) Shannon Luoma – Yes, send us the whole PDF.

### 5.0 PME DISCUSSION

---

#### PME-1 Minimum instream flows

- Comment (C) Beth Lawson – We will have questions about the flows later, but not right now.
- (Q) Nathan Sill – Who does SCE meet with at USFS to discuss the flows?
  - (R) Matt – In April, the annual meeting is with the USFS District Ranger, Sheila Irons, and any other staff/officers that they identify. USFWS and BLM are invited as well. There is a second annual meeting in August with the District Ranger and Sheila to discuss again.

#### PME-2 Reservoir level requirements

- (C) Tristan Leong – In an Appeal document resolving 4(e) conditions, it also mentions operating levels at Tioga Reservoir of 6.5 feet below the crest of the dam. Was determined for visual? And this also mentions recreation the week of July 4, which seems to be a few week difference than what you're showing.
  - (R) Shannon Luoma – We don't appear to have that on in the table. Our text is right out of the license. Can you send us that document?
- (C) Tristan Leong – I was looking at how people determined the various conditions, not saying changes were made. Yes, I can send you this document.

#### PME-3 Fish Stocking at Ellery Lake

- (Q) Nathan Sill – Is the \$2,400 you pay annually adjusted for inflation?
  - (R) Matt Woodhall – Yes, it is adjusted.

#### PME-4 NEW LV Management Plan

- (C) Dannon Dirgo – For the hazard tree removal, does that include the root wad too? Are you leaving the stump and if so, does it specify the stump height?
  - (R) Shannon Luoma – Operations does have info about hazard trees in their plans, we will need to look and see how much of the tree is kept.

- (C) Tristan Leong – Can we get a copy of the existing plans (e.g. Vegetation Management Plan) to see what needs to be updated.
  - (R) Shannon Luoma – Yes, we will work on getting those to you.

#### **PME-5 HPMP**

- No comments received.

#### **PMEs/Plans developed to incorporate**

- No comments received.

#### **Existing PME that we are not carrying forward**

- (C) Tristan Leong – For the excess spoils, are they still on site, and are they described in any of the reports? If we're going to eliminate a plan, we should know about the conditions, where they are located, and if remediation is outstanding or not.
  - (R) Matt Woodhall – We can find out. The spoils may be on the SCE parcel that we're removing from the FERC boundary. We will find out from Operations.

#### **SCE Corporate Plans that apply and incorporated by reference**

- No comments received.

### **6.0 SCHEDULE AND NEXT STEPS**

---

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

A summary of the schedule and next steps is as follows:

- Recreation Use surveys are starting this week
- June 27 – Second Operations Model meeting
- Mid-July – Second PME meeting
- End of August/early September - DLA filing
- End of September/early October - Recreation TWG meeting
- December 2 – Stakeholder DLA comments are due
- January 2025 - FLA filing

Because this is a TLP, there is no updated study report or any other formal meetings, as they are not required by FERC.

### **7.0 FINAL Q&A**

---

- (C) Mary Meager – Is whitebark pine included or excluded from hazard tree plan?
  - (R) Shannon Luoma – Whitebark pine will be discussed in the sensitive species portion of the management plan. If removal is needed, consultation with agencies would be needed before that would occur.
- (C) Mary Meager – What is the rationale for removing the riparian vegetation monitoring component?

- (R) Shannon Luoma – SCE has been doing the monitoring every 5 years during the current license, all studies are pointing to successful vegetation/riparian communities, so we don't see a need to continue the monitoring.
- (C) Nathan Sill – Can you clarify in the PME list doc which 4(e) conditions you are not bringing forward. Highlight those.
  - (R) Shannon Luoma – Yes, we can add that.
- (C) Beth Lawson – The agencies have had some time to get together and have started to create a list of issues, this is not finalized yet, but we do have a list to discuss like little modifications to the project to support species better or run the Project better, like automating of flow releases, fish stocking, etc. How do you propose we move forward?
  - (R) Shannon Luoma – We would love to see your list as soon as possible and we can have more meetings to discuss the issues. Let's get those dates on the calendar.
  - (R) Matt Woodhall – We might be able to cover some of the items quickly.
  - (R) Finlay Anderson – Our ability to make lots of changes now for the DLA is fairly limited but if we can make incremental changes that would be feasible. The DLA represents a static point in time, regardless of when and how we respond to your list it may be independent from the DLA, but ending towards the FLA that will accommodate everyone's needs.
- (C) Tristan Leong – Where do we categorize potential PMEs that we know we need but don't have information yet, like a Recreation Management Plan. Will there be a placeholder for a TBD Recreation Management Plan in the DLA?
  - (R) Shannon Luoma – We are not currently proposing a Rec Plan since there aren't any recreation facilities associated with Project. But because of the DLA timeline, when we get your list to focus on, through consultation, we can include placeholders for the items you're looking at.
  - (R) Finlay Anderson – We understand the agencies want to talk about additional issues, the DLA will include a consultation section that includes placeholders that warrant further discussion. That way, FERC can see that record and the path forward.
- (C) Beth Lawson – The DLA is our chance to comment on PME measures so you can update in your FLA. So that is still an appropriate time for us to still be discussing. If agencies and SCE don't come to agreement, agencies file further comments even after the FLA. The real target is before we need to comment on the FLA.
  - (R) Shannon Luoma – SCE has a tight turn around between the end of the DLA comment period and FLA filing.
- (C) Dannon Dirgo – SCE is not proposing a Recreation Management Plan, because there is no infrastructure, but the whole area is used for recreation. There should be some planning or monitoring looking at it and potential effects. That way if we notice changes going forward we have the documentation to back it up.
  - (R) Shannon Luoma – Yes, recreation use is going to be discussed in the Recreation Use survey report too.
  - (R) Finlay Anderson – Dannon, if you're making a list to discuss later, please include that comment so we can discuss it further.
- (C) Beth Lawson – We should meet again in about a month, like July 15 week. That way agencies have about three weeks to get you a list of issues.

- (R) Shannon Luoma – Carissa will send out an outlook poll for a meeting time the week of July 15. Stakeholders will get us a list before then.

## **8.0 NEXT STEPS**

---

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

- We will look to see if any spoils are still on site and where.
- We will find out what happens to hazardous trees root wads and stumps.
- We will send out this PME list and existing management plans.
- Tristan Leong will send us the 4(e) Appeal document.
- We will schedule another PME meeting for next month (July).

The Relicensing Team adjourned the meeting.