

4.0 CONSULTATION UNDER ALTERNATIVE LICENSE PROCESS

SMUD chose FERC's Alternative Licensing Process (ALP) in mid-2001 to maximize stakeholder and public involvement in the development of technical studies and to attempt to reach global settlement on as many resource management measures as possible prior to filing the License Application at FERC. Applicable regulations include: 18 CFR § 16.6 (*Notification procedures under Section 15 of the Federal Power Act*), § 16.7 (*Information to be made available to the public at the time of notification of intent under section 15(b) of the Federal Power Act*), § 4.34(i) (*Alternative procedures*), and § 4.41 (*Application for License for Major Unconstructed Project and Major Modified Project*). The major consultation activities undertaken by SMUD to comply with FERC regulations as well as to comply with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), the State of California's Endangered Species Act (CESA), the Clean Water Act (CWA), the National Historic Preservation Act, and other federal and State of California statutes are described in the Relicensing Process section of the License Application.

In general, the ALP provides an applicant an opportunity to conduct scoping during the pre-filing consultation and to substitute a preliminary draft EA for Exhibit E of the relicensing application.

For the past four years, SMUD – with active participation by resource agencies, Native American tribes, citizens groups, businesses, other organizations and members of the public – developed goals, identified issues, designed and conducted scientific studies, issued technical reports, and made a good-faith effort to develop a consensus on appropriate measures to protect, mitigate, and enhance resources affected by the UARP and the Iowa Hill Development. The Record of Consultation, described in Section 4.2, documents the more than 300 Plenary Group, Technical Working Group (TWG) or other public meetings, and contains copies of more than 320 written communications and other information relative to the UARP relicensing process.

4.1 Approval by FERC of Alternative Licensing Process

After consulting with resource agencies, Native American tribes, and non-governmental agencies (NGO), SMUD filed a request with FERC to use the ALP on July 13, 2001. FERC noticed the request in the Federal Register on July 19, 2001. No party opposed SMUD's request, and on August 29, 2001, FERC approved the request. In late 2001, SMUD and interested parties developed objectives and process protocols for the UARP ALP.

4.2 Establishment of UARP Relicensing Web Site

Since the beginning of the relicensing process in mid-2001, SMUD has maintained a Relicensing Web site (<http://hydrorelicensing.smud.org/>) to facilitate information dissemination. This Web site contains all communications, correspondence, and consultation regarding the relicensing process. The information contained on the Web site now serves as the Record of Consultation for the ALP. The Web site made available an extensive amount of relicensing information, including meeting notices and summaries, correspondence, study plans, and technical reports.

During the four-year pre-filing process, use of the Web site steadily increased, presently averaging 22,000 visits per month.

The Record of Consultation, (also referred to as the “Public Review File” in the Communication and Process Protocols for the ALP), is attached to SMUD’s application for new license in electronic format. The Record of Consultation does not include the technical reports developed by SMUD because they are available as appendices to the PDEA.

4.3 Distribution and Amendment of Initial Information Package

In July 2001, SMUD distributed an Initial Information Package (IIP) for the existing UARP (SMUD 2001), which contains basic information on the UARP facilities and operations, as well as information on the environmental resources potentially affected by the UARP. During the initial phase of the UARP relicensing process, SMUD evaluated the potential for modifications to the UARP and identified the Iowa Hill Development as a potential addition, as documented in the July 2001 IIP for the UARP. Based primarily on a feasibility study completed in early 2003, SMUD decided to propose the Iowa Hill Development in its application for license and distributed an IIP for the Iowa Hill Development in May 2003 (SMUD 2003).

4.4 Formation of Plenary Group and Major Activities

On June 4, 2001, SMUD formed a collaborative group, known as the Plenary Group, for the UARP relicensing. The Plenary Group operated as a public forum open to any participant. The Plenary Group made decisions regarding the schedule and structure of the ALP, formulated issue questions and formed technical working groups, reviewed and approved study plans as well as resource measures generated by technical working groups. The Plenary Group’s major actions during the pre-filing phase of relicensing, all of which are available for review in the Record of Consultation, include:

1. Agreed on communication and process protocols to govern how the Plenary Group (and its designated subgroups) would make decisions, resolve disputes, share information, and generally interact. Parties that formally executed the Communications and Process Protocols include:
 - American River Recreation Association & Camp Lotus
 - American Whitewater
 - Apple Hill Growers Association
 - California Department of Fish and Game
 - California Outdoors
 - California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
 - California State Parks and Recreation
 - California State Water Resources Control Board
 - Camino Community Action Committee
 - Center for Sierra Nevada Conservation
 - City of Sacramento, Department of Utilities

- Ms. Sue Britting
 - Mr. Bill Demerritt
 - Mr. John Fonseca
 - Mr. Paul Helman
 - Mr. Dennis Rogers
 - Ms. Hilde Schweitzer
 - Mr. Chris Shackleton
 - Mr. Chris Shutes
 - El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
 - El Dorado County Citizens for Water
 - El Dorado County Water Agency
 - El Dorado County Water & Power Authority
 - El Dorado Irrigation District
 - Friends of El Dorado County
 - Friends of the River
 - Georgetown Divide Public Utility District
 - Georgetown Fire District
 - Iowa Hill Action Committee
 - Pacific Gas and Electric Company
 - Placer County Water Agency
 - Rainwater and Associates, LLC
 - Raft Photo
 - Republican Central Committee (of El Dorado County)
 - Sacramento Municipal Utility District
 - Taxpayers Association of El Dorado County
 - The Center for Sierra Nevada Conservation
 - Teichert and Son, Inc.
 - U.S.D.I. Bureau of Land Management
 - U.S.D.I. Fish and Wildlife Service
 - U.S.D.A. Forest Service
 - U.S.D.I. National Park Service
2. Developed issue questions to be addressed in the UARP relicensing. These questions included “Overlapping Issues” related to the joint operations of the UARP and PG&E’s Chili Bar Project, which is located downstream of the UARP on the SFAR. The Plenary Group organized the issue questions into broad resource categories. The issue questions eventually served as the foundation for the study plans developed within the relicensing process, including Overlapping Studies.
3. Formed six Technical Working Groups (TWGs): 1) Aquatics/Water Quality/Geomorphology/Hydrology; 2) Recreation/Aesthetics; 3) Terrestrial; 4) Land Use; 5) Cultural; and 6) Socioeconomics. The Plenary Group assigned each TWG the responsibility to review/amend the issue questions germane to its area of expertise and to

develop study plans to address the issue questions. After agreement by the participants in the TWG that they could “live with” a study plan, the plan was submitted to the Plenary Group for final approval. Additionally, a Water Balance Subcommittee was formed for interested participants to work together to develop a model to simulate the water use and operations of both the UARP and PG&E’s Chili Bar Project. To date, the TWGs have submitted over 70 study plans to the Plenary Group, all of which were approved.

4. Developed interests, goals, and desired conditions, and oversaw the TWGs’ review of the technical reports and determination of technical report adequacy.
5. Agreed on Settlement Negotiation Protocols to govern the process and decision-making for settlement negotiations regarding the PM&E measures.

4.5 NEPA Scoping

A principal goal of the ALP was to develop a single, efficient environmental review process that meets the requirements of separate state and federal statutory provisions. As part of the ALP for the UARP, SMUD conducted the NEPA review process in coordination with the CEQA process.

In accordance with the procedures established under NEPA, CEQA, and the ALP for the UARP, SMUD issued *Scoping Document 1 and Notice of Preparation for the Relicensing of the UARP* (SD1) on August 14, 2003. FERC noticed the availability of SD1 in the Federal Register on August 18, 2003. SD1 provides a brief overview of the relicensing process to date; explains the existing project facilities and operations; describes the proposed Iowa Hill Development; identifies major issues raised to date; and provides preliminary alternatives.

The purpose of the scoping process was to invite anyone to help SMUD and the collaborative team: 1) identify social and environmental issues associated with the proposed action; 2) identify reasonable alternatives; 3) determine the depth of analysis needed; and 4) identify how the project would or would not contribute to cumulative effects. In addition to issuing SD1, SMUD hosted three public meetings, two in Sacramento on September 9 and 10, 2003, and one in Placerville, CA on September 11, 2003. All three meetings were advertised in the Sacramento Bee and the Mountain Democrat newspapers two weeks in advance of the scoping meetings. A court reporter recorded each of the meetings. Comments on SD1 were accepted until October 13, 2003. Table 4.5-1 lists the entities that provided comments on SD1.

Table 4.5-1. Comments received on Scoping Document 1 and Notice of Preparation.	
Entity	Date of Communication
Oral Comments	
Tom Heflin, Camino Community Advisory Committee	September 11, 2003
Doug Leisz, El Dorado County Citizens for Water	September 11, 2003
Ray Larsen	September 11, 2003
Written Comments (letters)	
El Dorado County Citizens for Water	September 11, 2003
Camino Community Advisory Committee	September 11, 2003
State Water Resources Control Board	October 2, 2003
USDI National Park Service	October 9, 2003

Table 4.5-1. Comments received on Scoping Document 1 and Notice of Preparation.	
Entity	Date of Communication
California Department of Fish and Game	October 10, 2003
USDA Forest Service, Eldorado National Forest	October 10, 2003
Placer County Water Agency	October 10, 2003
El Dorado County Water Agency	October 10, 2003
Taxpayers Association of El Dorado County	October 10, 2003
USDI Bureau of Land Management	October 10, 2003
Pacific Gas and Electric Company	October 10, 2003
Friends of El Dorado County	October 13, 2003
American Whitewater	October 13, 2003
City of Sacramento	October 13, 2003
Written Comments (e-mail)	
Paul Raffaelli	September 10, 2003
Kelsey Schwind	October 6, 2003
Michael Picker	October 7, 2003
Chuck Seidler	October 9, 2003
Dan Crandall	October 9, 2003
Mike and Jude Lee	October 10, 2003
Phillip Samuels	October 10, 2003
Chris Shackleton	October 10, 2003
Justin States	October 13, 2003
Phillip Boudreau	October 14, 2003
Michael Snead	October 14, 2003

SMUD revised SD1 to reflect the written and oral comments and issued *Scoping Document 2 for the Relicensing of the UARP* (SD2) on May 24, 2004. The SD2 included a list of the entities that provided comments, and a summary table of issues raised and SMUD’s response. SD2 presented the issues unique to the UARP relicensing considered in this PDEA. As the lead agency under CEQA, SMUD will also use the public scoping and study results to prepare a draft and final environmental impact report in a manner consistent with CEQA.

4.6 Settlement Agreement Process

On May 10, 2004, the Plenary Group formed the Settlement Negotiations Group (SNG). The SNG is comprised of essentially the same participants as the Plenary Group; however, the SNG was created to protect the confidentiality of negotiating positions and settlement offers in order to seek agreement on protection, mitigation, and enhancement measures.

The purpose of the SNG is to resolve among the parties all issues regarding the protection, mitigation, and enhancement measures in support of FERC issuing a new license for the project and agencies issuing their license conditions.⁸ Two general types of measures discussed within the negotiations include: 1) those considered by FERC as proper for inclusion as new license conditions enforceable by FERC; and 2) those enforceable outside the license under contract law.

⁸ As noted in the ALP and SNG protocols, the SWRCB has participated in the process solely to provide guidance, given its unique role as the agency charged with 401 water quality certification under the Clean Water Act.

In the Settlement Negotiation Protocols, these two types of measures are referred to as Schedule A and Schedule B measures, respectively, and are collectively referred to as the Settlement Agreement.

The stated goals of the SNG are: 1) to reach a comprehensive written Settlement Agreement, including a preferred package of recommended protection, mitigation, and enhancement measures accepted by all parties (both Schedule A and Schedule B measures); and 2) to submit the measures included within the Settlement Agreement to FERC as part of the License Application that will serve as the basis for proposed terms and conditions of the new license for the UARP. The following parties executed the Settlement Negotiations Protocols:

- American River Recreation Association & Camp Lotus
- American Whitewater
- Apple Hill Growers Association
- California Department of Fish and Game
- California Outdoors
- California State Parks and Recreation
- California State Water Resources Control Board
- Camino Community Action Committee
- City of Sacramento, Department of Utilities
- Mr. John Fonseca
- Mr. Paul Helman
- Mr. Dennis Rogers
- Ms. Hilde Schweitzer
- Mr. Chris Shackleton
- Mr. Chris Shutes
- El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
- El Dorado County Citizens for Water
- El Dorado County Water Agency
- El Dorado County Water & Power Authority
- El Dorado Irrigation District
- Friends of El Dorado County
- Friends of the River
- Georgetown Divide Public Utility District
- Georgetown Fire District
- Iowa Hill Action Committee
- Pacific Gas and Electric Company
- Rainwater and Associates, LLC
- Sacramento Municipal Utility District
- Taxpayers Association of El Dorado County
- The Center for Sierra Nevada Conservation
- Teichert and Son, Inc.
- U.S.D.I. Bureau of Land Management

- U.S.D.I. Fish and Wildlife Service
- U.S.D.A. Forest Service
- U.S.D.I. National Park Service

4.7 Coordination with Chili Bar Project Relicensing

The Chili Bar Project, FERC-licensed hydroelectric Project No. 2155, is located directly downstream of the most downstream UARP facility – White Rock Powerhouse. The UARP and Chili Bar Project were licensed and built in tandem because the Chili Bar Reservoir serves as an afterbay to the White Rock Powerhouse. Both project licenses expire on July 31, 2007. SMUD and PG&E have filed their applications for new licenses for their respective projects. As described above, SMUD obtained FERC's authorization to use the ALP for the UARP relicensing. PG&E is separately seeking a new license for the Chili Bar Project by utilizing a modified Traditional Licensing Process (TLP) that makes extensive use of public collaboration (sometimes referred to as a hybrid relicensing process).

Since relicensing of the UARP and the Chili Bar Project have many common stakeholders, interests, and issues, SMUD and PG&E entered into two relicensing cooperation agreements: 1) the May 31, 2002 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU1); and 2) the February 13, 2004 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU2). These memoranda define the common relicensing issues between the Chili Bar Project and the UARP as “Overlapping Issues.” Overlapping issues are those issues related to: 1) quantity of flow into and out of Chili Bar Reservoir; 2) timing of flows into and out of Chili Bar Reservoir; and 3) operational coordination between White Rock Powerhouse and Chili Bar Powerhouse. This approach established a framework for SMUD and PG&E to address overlapping issues and combined operational effects of SMUD’s UARP and PG&E’s Chili Bar Project, particularly with respect to the dynamics of short-term storage in Chili Bar Reservoir and flows in the 19.1-mile section of the SFAR between Chili Bar Dam and Folsom Reservoir, part of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation’s (USBR) Central Valley Project.

Since mid-2001, PG&E has participated in the UARP ALP, including TWGs/Committees and the Plenary Group, to develop Overlapping Studies and the Water Balance Model. PG&E has also participated in the SNG meetings with respect to development of pertinent protection, mitigation and enhancement measures for Overlapping Issues.

4.8 Technical Reports

As mentioned above, over the course of the UARP Relicensing, SMUD worked with the Plenary Group to identify issues related to relicensing the project. For some of the issues, existing information was available to address the issue; others required SMUD to perform studies. For these, SMUD worked with the TWGs to develop detailed study plans, which were then forwarded to the Plenary Group for approval prior to conducting the studies.

Except for three wildlife studies discussed below, SMUD or SMUD and PG&E jointly performed all relicensing studies from 2001 through 2005. For each study, SMUD prepared a detailed technical report. In general, each technical report included a copy of the study plan approved by the Plenary Group, a description of the issue questions addressed by the study,

study objectives, methods, results and analysis, discussion, and conclusions. At the request of the Plenary Group, technical reports did not include a description of potential project effects or suggest resource management measures. As soon as the individual reports were available, SMUD provided the technical reports (in hardcopy and electronic format) to appropriate TWGs and posted the reports on the Relicensing Web site for review and use by all relicensing participants. SMUD revised and reissued many of the technical reports based on comments from resource agencies and TWGs, and if additional data were collected or analyses performed.

Table 4.8-1 lists the 73 technical reports issued by SMUD or SMUD and PG&E jointly for Overlapping Studies. Each technical report is attached to this PDEA on Compact Disc (CD), including the pertinent study plan.

The study plan methods approved by the Plenary Group for the Iowa Hill Development bald eagle, northern goshawk and California spotted owl studies require SMUD to perform two years of fieldwork in 2004 and 2005. For the northern goshawk and California spotted owl studies, SMUD completed the first year of fieldwork in summer 2004, prepared an interim report, and distributed the report to the Wildlife/Botanical TWG and other interested parties. These two interim reports are appended to this PDEA. For the Iowa Hill Development bald eagle study, however, an interim report was not prepared because the study was not initiated until late fall 2004 and insufficient data were available for analysis at the time this PDEA was issued. SMUD will complete fieldwork for each of these studies in summer 2005, and prepare and file with FERC final reports for each of these three Iowa Hill Development studies by September 15, 2005.

Table 4.8-1. List of Technical Reports prepared for the Upper American River Project Relicensing.								
Technical Report Title – Version / Date	Date Initial Version Issued to TWG	Date Approved by TWG	<i>Areas Addressed</i>				<i>CD/DVD</i>	Citation
			UARP	Chili Bar Reservoir	Reach Below Chili Bar	Iowa Hill		
WATER RESOURCES								
Aquatic Bioassessment – Version 2 / April 2005	March 2004	June 2004	X		X		Aquatics	DTA and Stillwater 2005b
Carbon Cycle Disruption White Paper – Version 0 / September 2004	September 2004	December 2004		X	X		Aquatics	DTA 2004f
Water Balance Model – Version 0 / June 2005	June 2005	N/A					Aquatics	SMUD 2005a
Chili Bar Reservoir Incremental Storage Modification – Version 1 / April 2005	November 2004	December 2004		X	X		Chili Bar	DTA 2005b
Hydrology – Version 3 / May 2005	April 2004	June 2004	X	X	X		Aquatics	DTA and Hannaford 2005a
Iowa Hill Water Temperature – Version 0 / February 2005	February 2005					X	Iowa Hill	DTA and EES 2005a
Shallow Water Entrainment – Version 0 / April 2005	April 2005		X				Aquatics	DTA and Stillwater 2005h
Water Quality – Version 3 / May 2005	January 2004		X	X	X		Aquatics	DTA 2005d
Water Temperature – Version 5 / May 2005	January 2004		X	X	X		Aquatics	DTA 2005e

Table 4.8-1. List of Technical Reports prepared for the Upper American River Project Relicensing.								
Technical Report Title – Version / Date	Date Initial Version Issued to TWG	Date Approved by TWG	Areas Addressed				CD/DVD	Citation
			UARP	Chili Bar Reservoir	Reach Below Chili Bar	Iowa Hill		
GEOLOGICAL RESOURCES								
Channel Morphology – Version 2 / April 2005	March 2004	June 2004	X	X	X		Aquatics	DTA and Stillwater
Chili Bar Reservoir Sediment Deposition – Version 2 / May 2005	November 2004	December 2004		X	X		Chili Bar	DTA and Stillwater 2005d
Iowa Hill Preliminary Supporting Design Report – Version 0 / February 2005	February 2005	N/A				X	Iowa Hill	MWH 2005a
Iowa Hill Pumped-storage Development Phase 2 Subsurface Exploration Geotechnical Investigation - Version 0 / August 2004	August 2004	N/A				X	Iowa Hill	MWH 2004c
Iowa Hill Turbidity Analysis – Version 0 / October 2004	October 2004					X	Iowa Hill	DTA and Stillwater 2004c
Project Sources of Sediment – Version 1 / April 2005	October 2004	December 2004	X	X	X		Aquatics	DTA 2005c
AQUATIC RESOURCES								
Amphibians and Aquatic Reptiles – Version 3 / April 2005	January 2004	June 2004	X	X	X		Aquatics	DTA and Stillwater 2005a
Amphibian Habitat Test Flow – Version 1 / August 2004	January 2004	June 2004	X				Aquatics	DTA and Stillwater 2004a
Deepwater Intake Entrainment – Version 1 / July 2004	January 2004	June 2004	X				Aquatics	DTA 2004g
Fish Passage Barriers –Version 1 / August 2004	February 2004	June 2004	X	X	X		Aquatics	DTA and Stillwater 2004b

Table 4.8-1. List of Technical Reports prepared for the Upper American River Project Relicensing.								
Technical Report Title – Version / Date	Date Initial Version Issued to TWG	Date Approved by TWG	Areas Addressed				CD/DVD	Citation
			UARP	Chili Bar Reservoir	Reach Below Chili Bar	Iowa Hill		
Flow and Fluctuation in the Reach Downstream of Chili Bar – Version 2 / May 2005	October 2004	December 2004			X		Chili Bar	DTA and Stillwater 2005e
Iowa Hill Fish Entrainment Potential – Version 0 / February 2005	February 2005					X	Iowa Hill	DTA and Stillwater 2005f
PHABSIM Volume 1 and 2 – Version 1 / August 2004	February 2004	June 2004	X				Aquatics	DTA and Stillwater 2004d
Reservoir Fisheries –Version 2 / April 2005	January 2004	June 2004	X	X			Aquatics	DTA and Stillwater 2004e
Reservoir Shoreline Habitat – Version 2 / April 2005	January 2004	June 2004	X	X			Aquatics	DTA and Stillwater 2005g
Stream Fisheries – Version 2 / January 2005	January 2004	June 2004	X		X		Aquatics	DTA and Stillwater 2005j
Stream Habitat Mapping - Version 3 / April 2005	January 2004	June 2004	X		X		Aquatics	DTA and Stillwater 2005i
RECREATION/AESTHETIC RESOURCES								
Camino Reach Whitewater Boating Flow Study –Version 0 / March 2005	March 2005		X				Recreation	DTA and LBG 2005a
Flatwater Boating Flow Study for Chili Bar Reservoir – Version 2 / April 2005	July 2004	October 2004		X			Chili Bar	DTA and LBG 2005b
Ice House Reach Whitewater Boating Flow Study – Version 0 / September 2004	September 2004		X				Recreation	DTA and LBG 2004a
Iowa Hill Visual Resources– Version 0 / January 2005	January 2005					X	Iowa Hill	DTA and Goodavish 2005b

Table 4.8-1. List of Technical Reports prepared for the Upper American River Project Relicensing.								
Technical Report Title – Version / Date	Date Initial Version Issued to TWG	Date Approved by TWG	Areas Addressed				CD/DVD	Citation
			UARP	Chili Bar Reservoir	Reach Below Chili Bar	Iowa Hill		
Recreation Carrying Capacity – Version 1 / April 2005	February 2004		X				Recreation	DTA and LBG 2005c
Recreation Demand – Version 1 / September 2004	February 2004	July 2004	X				Recreation	DTA and LBG 2004b
Recreation Needs Assessment – Version 0 / March 2005	March 2005		X				Recreation	DTA and LBG 2005d
Recreation Supply – Version 1 / September 2004	April 2004	July 2004	X				Recreation	DTA and LBG 2004c
Recreational Flow in the Reach Downstream of Chili Bar – Version 3 / April 2005	March 2004	July 2004			X		Chili Bar	DTA and LBG 2004d
Visitor Use and Impact –Version 2 / March 2005	March 2004	July 2004	X				Recreation	DTA and LBG 2005e
Visual Assessment of UARP Project Features – Version 2 / September 2004	March 2004	July 2004	X				Recreation	DTA and Goodavish 2004a
Visual Assessment of UARP Project Operations –Version 1 / September 2004	February 2004	July 2004	X				Recreation	DTA and Goodavish 2004b
Whitewater Boating Feasibility – Version 1 / September 2004	February 2004	July 2004	X				Recreation	DTA and LBG 2004e
Whitewater Boating Flow Study for Slab Creek Reach – Version 1 / October 2004	February 2004	July 2004	X				Recreation	DTA and LBG 2004f

Table 4.8-1. List of Technical Reports prepared for the Upper American River Project Relicensing.								
Technical Report Title – Version / Date	Date Initial Version Issued to TWG	Date Approved by TWG	Areas Addressed				CD/DVD	Citation
			UARP	Chili Bar Reservoir	Reach Below Chili Bar	Iowa Hill		
TERRESTRIAL RESOURCES								
Bald Eagle and Osprey –Version 1 / October 2004	March 2004	June 2004	X				Terrestrial	DTA 2004a
Bats – Version 1 / July 2004	February 2004	June 2004	X				Terrestrial	DTA 2004b
Bird/Powerline Associations – Version 1 / July 2004	February 2004	June 2004	X				Terrestrial	DTA 2004c
Black Bear – Version 1 / July 2004	February 2004	June 2004	X				Terrestrial	DTA 2004d
California Spotted Owl –Version 1 / July 2004	March 2004	June 2004	X				Terrestrial	DTA 2004e
Iowa Hill Development Bald Eagle – Version 0* / not yet issued	Planned for 3 rd Qtr. 2005					X	Iowa Hill	DTA 2005a
Iowa Hill Development Bats – Version 0 / September 2004	September 2004					X	Iowa Hill	DTA 2004h
Iowa Hill Development California Spotted Owl (Interim) – Version 0* / September 2004	September 2004					X	Iowa Hill	DTA 2004i
Iowa Hill Development Mule Deer – Version 1 / November 2004	November 2004					X	Iowa Hill	DTA 2004j
Iowa Hill Development Northern Goshawk (Interim) – Version 0* / September 2004	September 2004					X	Iowa Hill	DTA 2004k
Iowa Hill Development Noxious/Invasive Weeds – Version 1/ July 2004	July 2004					X	Iowa Hill	DTA 2004l

Table 4.8-1. List of Technical Reports prepared for the Upper American River Project Relicensing.								
Technical Report Title – Version / Date	Date Initial Version Issued to TWG	Date Approved by TWG	Areas Addressed				CD/DVD	Citation
			UARP	Chili Bar Reservoir	Reach Below Chili Bar	Iowa Hill		
Iowa Hill Development Special Status Plants – Version 1 / July 2004	July 2004					X	Iowa Hill	DTA 2004m
Iowa Hill Development Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle – Version 0 / September 2004	September 2004					X	Iowa Hill	DTA 2004n
Iowa Hill Development Vegetation Mapping and Wildlife Habitat Characterization – Version 1 / August 2004	August 2004					X	Iowa Hill	DTA 2004o
Iowa Hill Wetlands –Version 1 / October 2004	October 2004					X	Iowa Hill	DTA 2004p
Mesocarnivore – Version 1 / July 2004	May 2004	June 2004	X				Terrestrial	DTA 2004q
Mule Deer – Version 1 / July 2004	May 2004	June 2004	X				Terrestrial	DTA 2004r
Northern Goshawk – Version 1 / July 2004	May 2004	June 2004	X				Terrestrial	DTA 2004s
Riparian Vegetation and Wetlands – Version 2 / October 2004	February 2004	June 2004	X	X	X		Terrestrial	DTA 2004t
Special Status Plants and Invasive/Noxious Weeds –Version 1 / July 2004	February 2004	June 2004	X				Terrestrial	DTA 2004v
Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle – Version 1 / July 2004	February 2004	June 2004	X				Terrestrial	DTA 2004w
Vegetation Mapping –Version 1	February 2004	June 2004	X				Terrestrial	DTA 2004x
Waterfowl Nesting Habitat – Version 1 / July 2004	February 2004	June 2004	X				Terrestrial	DTA 2004y
Willow Flycatcher - Version 1 / July 2004	February 2004	June 2004	X				Terrestrial	DTA 2004z

Table 4.8-1. List of Technical Reports prepared for the Upper American River Project Relicensing.								
Technical Report Title – Version / Date	Date Initial Version Issued to TWG	Date Approved by TWG	Areas Addressed				CD/DVD	Citation
			UARP	Chili Bar Reservoir	Reach Below Chili Bar	Iowa Hill		
LAND USE AND MANAGEMENT RESOURCES								
Fire Risk and Protection –Version 1 / October 2004	March 2004	June 2004	X			X	Land Use Socioeconomics	DTA and CRS 2004a
Iowa Hill Pumped-storage Development Land Use –Version 0 / February 2005	February 2005					X	Iowa Hill	DTA and Goodavish 2005a
UARP Land Use– Version 0 / February 2005	February 2005		X				Land Use Socioeconomics	DTA and Goodavish 2005c
Cultural Resources								
UARP and Iowa Hill Archaeological Resources Inventory – Version 1 / October 2004	June 2003	October 2004	X			X	Confidential FERC only	DTA and EDAW 2004a
Ethnographic and Ethnohistoric – Version 1 / October 2004	September 2004	October 2004	X			X	Confidential FERC only	DTA and EDAW 2004b
SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES								
Auditory Assessment of Iowa Hill Construction and Operations – Version 0 / January 2005	January 2005					X	Land Use Socioeconomics	DTA and CH2M HILL 2005a
Iowa Hill Property Value Assessment – Version 0 / January 2005	January 2005					X	Iowa Hill	DTA and CH2M HILL 2005c
Socioeconomic Assessment of Iowa Hill Construction and Operations – Version 0 / January 2005	January 2005					X	Iowa Hill	DTA and CH2M HILL 2005d

Table 4.8-1. List of Technical Reports prepared for the Upper American River Project Relicensing.								
Technical Report Title – Version / Date	Date Initial Version Issued to TWG	Date Approved by TWG	<i>Areas Addressed</i>				<i>CD/DVD</i>	Citation
			UARP	Chili Bar Reservoir	Reach Below Chili Bar	Iowa Hill		
Socioeconomic Conditions in the Reach Downstream of Chili Bar – Version 1 / December 2004	May 2004				X		Chili Bar	DTA 2004u
Socioeconomic Impact –Version 1 / October 2004	February 2004		X					CH2M HILL 2004a

*This report to be revised and re-issued.

4.9 Plenary Group and SNG Status at Time of Filing Application

At the time of this writing, the SNG had not reached settlement or released an alternative for an analysis by SMUD in this PDEA. Pursuant to its protocols, the SNG is on hiatus to enable SMUD to complete its license application, with the intent to resume settlement negotiations in August 2005. The Plenary Group meets as needed to discuss and act on matters in public session. Table 4.9-1 below shows the number of meetings held by the Plenary Group, TWGs, SNG, and other committees since the inception of the ALP to consider important issues related to the relicensing of the UARP.

Table 4.9-1. Summary of Relicensing Meetings.						
Description	Number of Meetings					Total
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005¹	
Plenary Group	11	9	11	8		39
Technical Working Groups	15	42	70	65	1	193
Settlement Negotiation Group				15	18	33
Subcommittees and Internal Focus Group			21	21		42
Public Information	4	4	4	2	2	16
TOTALS	30	55	106	111	21	323

¹Meetings through June 2005