



Tom Taylor (SCE) informed the group that some Native Americans had expressed interest in receiving some guidance/guidelines for how the settlement negotiations will be conducted. Bill told the group that he would bring back some negotiation training options to present to the CRWG (see Action Item #1 below).

As part of an ongoing action item for the USFS to provide the CRWG with status updates on the evaluation of the “Mono Trail Corridor” relevant to the ALP, a representative of the USFS distributed a Mono Trail update to the group.

**Present Contents of Draft HPMP:** Tom Jackson (Pacific Legacy) then distributed the draft HPMP, with appendices, and explained the contents to the group (see Action Item #2 below).

A stakeholder told the group that he interpreted the HPMP to imply that the USFS will be evaluating a number of unevaluated trails and asked if the USFS was indeed committed to conducting these evaluations. A USFS representative responded that the only trail that the USFS has agreed to evaluate is the Mono Trail. Bill then told the group that the purpose of releasing the draft HPMP was to solicit comments from the group and its contents should not be interpreted as final or official positions or recommendations.

Bill asked Tom J. if there was any certain sequence or approach that he would like the group to follow for discussing and revising the draft HPMP. Tom J. answered that the group should focus on outstanding issues, such as the definition of the area of potential effects (APE), Chapters 5 and 6, and then Chapter 7. Tom J. added that the Cultural Resources Technical Report will soon be released and will contain technical information that people may find useful for interpreting and commenting on the draft HPMP (see Action Item #3 below).

Van Button (FERC) told the group that it will be important for CRWG members to solicit guidance from their organizations and Tribal Councils to make sure the group's representatives are adequately communicating their wishes. A stakeholder then asked if there has been any consensus reached by the tribes and if tribal consultation has been occurring. A Big Sandy Rancheria representative told the group that they do not consider discussions between SCE, or SCE consultants, and the tribes official consultation and have issued a letter stating this. Government to government consultation will only occur between the tribes and the FERC and that is the position of all the federally recognized tribes. So while there has been communication between the tribes and SCE representatives, this is not to be considered consultation. The group then had a brief discussion on whether FERC had designated SCE as the FERC representative for the relicensing process. It was further clarified that SCE is considered a non-federal designee, and FERC did write a formal letter designating SCE to represent FERC in consultation with SHPO, but FERC is still acting as the official consulting party.

**Ongoing Discussion - Effects and Mitigation, Impacts and Management for Draft HPMP:** The group then discussed what the management recommendations included in the Draft HPMP represented. Tom J. explained that the draft HPMP contents were by no

means inclusive, nor exclusive, but a draft based on previous CRWG discussions for people to respond to.

The group then briefly discussed how consensus would be reached among all Native Americans for deciding appropriate mitigation measures across the lands and resources in question. It was suggested that it might be useful for the Native American tribes to hold a private offline meeting without outside parties to discuss opinions and positions. A representative of Big Sandy offered to host the meeting (see Action Item #4 below).

The group then briefly discussed the comment process and Bill told the group that comments should be submitted to Kearns & West by February 25<sup>th</sup> to be included in comment tables for response and review (see Action Item #5 below).

**Discuss Management of Plant Species of Native American Concern:** The group then discussed plants of Native American concern. Polly told the group that she has spoken with Mark Newquist and Janelle about SCE maintenance practices of concern such as spraying and cutting. Some possible management options to discuss might be related to timing, locations, access and education. It was decided that due to the lack of time available to discuss plants in the larger CWRG meetings, it might be beneficial to form a smaller Plants Subgroup to look into these concerns in more detail (see Action Item #6 below).

The group was then told about a booklet on Native American Plants and Traditions that was created by Ron Goode (North Fork Mono Tribe) and Joanna Clines (USFS Sierra National Forest), which could serve as a good starting point for compiling a list of Native American plants of concern and what to do with them. SCE agreed to provide copies of the booklet to the Plant Subgroup members (see Action Item #7 below).

A stakeholder told the group about an abandoned asphalt covered road located near the Sam Daniels site and asked if there was anything that could be done to improve the area's appearance. Mark Newquist (SCE) agreed to look into possible options, such as covering with top-soil, to help fix the problem.

A USFS representative then told the group about an idea that has been discussed in a smaller group relating to making genetically native plant species' seeds more readily available for emergency revegetation, as well as other reseeding needs. She explained that because local native plant species survive better and have less impact to the environment than non-native species, the USFS has a requirement that local native plant species be used for plantings whenever possible. The CRWG could help identify useful native species and to complete a table of plants and their Native American uses. She also said that the USFS is working with the BLM to conduct a study to identify appropriate seed zones for re-vegetation and the USFS is also exploring possible partnerships through educational programs and use of the existing nursery to provide species for plantings that will be efficient and cost-effective in the long run.

**Review New Action Items, Schedule Next Meeting:** Bill reviewed the meeting's actions and set March 10th as the next CRWG meeting date.

*Action Items from the November Meeting*

**Action Item #1:** Kearns & West to propose options for tribal ALP/negotiation training.

**Action Item #2:** Ryan Bricker (Kearns & West) to coordinate with the USFS regarding updating the confidentiality list.

**Action Item #3:** The Cultural Resources Technical Report to be distributed in hard-copy format to the organizations listed on page 4 of the draft HPMP. Hard copies will also be provided for viewing at USFS and SCE locations.

**Action Item #4:** Big Sandy to initiate and host an offline tribal meeting to discuss tribal positions and opinions.

**Action Item #5:** CRWG participants to submit comments on the draft HPMP to Kearns & West by February 25<sup>th</sup>, with specific focus on Chapters 5-7.

**Action Item #6:** A Plant Subgroup to convene and discuss maintenance management options for plants of Native American concern. Ryan Bricker (Kearns & West) to assist in coordination and planning as necessary.

**Action Item #7:** Ron Goode to provide a copy of the booklet created by himself and Joanna Clines (USFS Sierra Nevada Forest) on Native American Plants and Traditions to SCE, who will make the necessary arrangements to provide copies to the Plant Subgroup member.