

Yale Hydroelectric Project
FERC Project No. 2071

APPLICATION FOR NEW LICENSE FOR
MAJOR PROJECT
Volume II

Exhibit E

PacifiCorp
Portland, Oregon
April 1999

CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1 ALTERNATIVE APPROACH TO RELICENSING NORTH FORK LEWIS RIVER PROJECTS.....	1-1
1.2 THE YALE APPLICATION AS PART OF THE ALTERNATIVE APPROACH FOR RELICENSING THE NORTH FORK LEWIS RIVER PROJECTS.....	1-3
1.3 YALE EXHIBIT E.....	1-3
1.3.1 Organization of the Exhibit E	1-4
2.0 GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE LOCALE.....	2-1
2.1 TOPOGRAPHY.....	2-1
2.2 GEOLOGY AND SOILS.....	2-1
2.2.1 Yale Lake Geology, and Lewis River from Swift Dam to Yale Lake.....	2-2
2.2.2 Transmission Line Geology	2-2
2.2.3 Soils.....	2-7
2.3 CLIMATE.....	2-7
2.4 VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE.....	2-8
2.5 LAND DEVELOPMENT AND POPULATION	2-8
3.0 WATER USE AND QUALITY	3-1
3.1 EXISTING RESOURCES	3-1
3.1.1 Existing and Proposed Uses of Project Waters	3-1
3.1.2 Existing Water Quality.....	3-1
3.1.3 Factors Affecting Water Quality	3-34
3.1.4 Existing Resource Management Plans	3-34
3.1.5 Existing Measures	3-35
3.2 PROPOSED ENHANCEMENT MEASURES	3-35
3.3 AGENCY AND TRIBAL CONSULTATION	3-36
3.3.1 Stage 1 and Stage 2 Consultation Prior to the Draft License Application.....	3-37
3.3.2 Stage 2 Consultation - Comments on the Draft License Application ...	3-38
3.4 CONTINUING IMPACTS	3-40
3.5 IMPLEMENTATION, COST, AND SCHEDULE	3-40
4.0 AQUATIC RESOURCES.....	4-1
4.1 EXISTING RESOURCES	4-1
4.1.1 Resident Fish Resources	4-2

CONTENTS (continued)

4.1.2	Anadromous Fish Resources	4-13
4.1.3	Threatened or Endangered Species	4-22
4.1.4	Aquatic Habitat	4-23
4.1.5	Benthic Macroinvertebrates	4-27
4.1.6	Factors Affecting Aquatic Resources	4-29
4.1.7	Existing Resource Management Plans	4-32
4.1.8	Existing Measures	4-34
4.2	PROPOSED ENHANCEMENT MEASURES	4-35
4.3	AGENCY AND TRIBAL CONSULTATION	4-35
4.3.1	Stage 1 and Stage 2 Consultation Prior to the Draft License Application	4-35
4.3.2	Stage 2 Consultation - Comments on the Draft License Application ...	4-37
4.4	CONTINUING IMPACTS	4-45
4.5	IMPLEMENTATION, SCHEDULE, AND COST	4-45
5.0	TERRESTRIAL RESOURCES	5-1
5.1	EXISTING RESOURCES	5-1
5.1.1	Botanical Resources	5-2
5.1.2	Wildlife Resources	5-30
5.1.3	Existing Resource Management Plans	5-69
5.1.4	Existing Measures	5-71
5.2	PROPOSED ENHANCEMENT MEASURES	5-72
5.2.1	Habitat Management Goals	5-75
5.2.2	Habitat Condition Assessment	5-76
5.2.3	Baseline Conditions Evaluation	5-76
5.2.4	Habitat Management Measures	5-76
5.2.5	Monitoring	5-77
5.3	ENHANCEMENT MEASURES NOT INCLUDED IN PACIFICORP'S PROPOSAL	5-78
5.4	AGENCY AND TRIBAL CONSULTATION	5-78
5.4.1	Stage 1 and Stage 2 Consultation Prior to the Draft License Application	5-78
5.4.2	Stage 2 Consultation - Comments on the Draft License Application ...	5-85
5.5	CONTINUING IMPACTS	5-89
5.6	IMPLEMENTATION, SCHEDULE, AND COST	5-90
6.0	CULTURAL RESOURCES	6-1
6.1	EXISTING RESOURCES	6-1
6.1.1	Prehistory and Archaeological Resources	6-1

CONTENTS (continued)

6.1.2	Traditional Cultural Properties and Ethnohistory	6-16
6.1.3	History and Historical Resources	6-19
6.1.4	Factors Affecting Cultural Resources	6-31
6.1.5	Existing Resource Management Plans	6-32
6.1.6	Existing Measures	6-32
6.2	PROPOSED ENHANCEMENT MEASURES	6-32
6.2.1	Issue: Protection of Known Cultural Deposits at NRHP-eligible Archaeological Sites	6-33
6.2.2	Issue: Curation of Artifacts Recovered During Site Evaluation Tests	6-33
6.2.3	Issue: Opportunities to Increase Knowledge of Lewis River Prehistory	6-33
6.2.4	Issue: Damage to NRHP-eligible Archaeological Sites by Illegal Looting and Vandalism	6-34
6.2.5	Issue: Damage to Unknown Buried NRHP-eligible Archaeological Deposits by Ground-disturbing Activities	6-34
6.3	ENHANCEMENT MEASURES NOT INCLUDED	6-34
6.4	AGENCY AND TRIBAL CONSULTATION	6-35
6.4.1	Consultation with Cowlitz Indian Tribe	6-35
6.4.2	Consultation with the Yakama Indian Nation (YIN)	6-39
6.5	CONTINUING IMPACTS	6-40
6.6	IMPLEMENTATION, SCHEDULE, AND COSTS	6-40
7.0	RECREATION RESOURCES	7-1
7.1	EXISTING RECREATION RESOURCES	7-1
7.1.1	Recreation Supply	7-2
7.1.2	Recreation Use and Demand	7-26
7.1.3	Recreation Capacity and Suitability	7-39
7.1.4	Recreation Needs	7-44
7.1.5	Agency Plans and Programs that Affect the Project	7-72
7.1.6	Existing Measures Implemented by PacifiCorp	7-80
7.2	PROPOSED ENHANCEMENT MEASURES	7-81
7.3	AGENCY AND TRIBAL CONSULTATION	7-83
7.3.1	Stage 1 and Stage 2 Consultation Prior to the Draft License Application	7-84
7.3.2	Stage 2 Consultation - Comments on the Draft License Application	7-87
7.4	CONTINUING IMPACTS	7-88
7.5	IMPLEMENTATION, SCHEDULE, AND COST	7-90

CONTENTS (continued)

8.0 LAND MANAGEMENT AND USE..... 8-1

8.1 EXISTING RESOURCES 8-1

8.1.1 Land Use and Management in the Project Vicinity..... 8-1

8.1.2 Existing Wetlands and Floodplains..... 8-16

8.1.3 Compliance with Established Land Use Plans, Policies, and Laws..... 8-18

8.1.4 Existing Measures 8-32

8.2 PROPOSED ENHANCEMENT MEASURES 8-33

8.3 AGENCY AND TRIBAL CONSULTATION 8-33

8.3.1 Stage 1 and Stage 2 Consultation Prior to the Draft License Application 8-33

8.3.2 Stage 2 Consultation - Comments on the Draft License Application 8-34

8.4 CONTINUING IMPACTS 8-34

8.5 IMPLEMENTATION, SCHEDULE, AND COSTS 8-34

9.0 AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES 9-1

9.1 EXISTING VISUAL RESOURCES..... 9-1

9.1.1 Visual Assessment of Project Facilities 9-1

9.1.2 Visual Assessment of Lake Level Fluctuations 9-6

9.1.3 Visual Resource Objectives, Policies, and Guidelines..... 9-12

9.1.4 Compliance With Visual Resource Objectives, Policies, and Guidelines 9-13

9.1.5 Existing Measures 9-13

9.2 PROPOSED ENHANCEMENT MEASURES 9-14

9.3 ENHANCEMENT MEASURES NOT INCLUDED IN PACIFICORP PROPOSAL..... 9-14

9.4 AGENCY AND TRIBAL CONSULTATION 9-14

9.5 CONTINUING IMPACTS 9-14

10.0 LITERATURE CITED..... 10-1

APPENDICES

- Appendix 1.3-1 Agency/Tribal Consultation
- Appendix 4.1-1 Lewis River Basin Anadromous Fish Barriers
- Appendix 5.1-1 Yale Vegetation and Wildlife Species Common and Scientific Names
- Appendix 7.5-1 Recreation Resource Measures

FIGURES

Figure 2.1-1. Project vicinity.....2-3
 Figure 2.1-2. Study area.2-5
 Figure 3.1-1. Water quality monitoring sites.....3-3
 Figure 3.1-2. Specific conductance at Speelyai Creek monitoring sites,
 November 1996 - February 1998.3-15
 Figure 3.1-3. Diel study site locations.....3-17
 Figure 3.1-4. Hourly monitoring of temperature at Yale powerhouse tailrace,
 and average hourly flow - August 15-22, 1997.3-19
 Figure 3.1-5. Yale Lake temperature profiles - April through December 1996 (top)
 and March 1997 through February 1998 (bottom).3-22
 Figure 3.1-6. Yale Lake pH profiles - April through December 1996 (top) and
 March through February 1998 (bottom).3-23
 Figure 3.1-7. Yale Lake dissolved oxygen profiles - April through December 1996
 (top) and March 1997 through February 1998 (bottom).3-24
 Figure 3.1-8. Secchi depth (meters) at upper and lower Yale Lake stations,
 April 1996 through February 1998.....3-26
 Figure 3.1-9. Yale Lake chlorophyll *a* data from March 1996 - February 1998 (top)
 and phytoplankton biovolume (bottom), March 1996 through August 1997.....3-28
 Figure 3.1-10. Density of *Daphnia* sp. at upper and lower Yale Lake sampling sites,
 April 1996 - February 1998.....3-29
 Figure 3.1-11. Discharge and temperature at Yale tailrace, August 7-13, 19983-32
 Figure 3.1-12. Discharge and temperature at sites downstream of Yale tailrace,
 August 7-13, 1998.....3-32
 Figure 4.1-1. Relationship between mean kokanee fork length (female) and spawning
 escapement in Cougar Creek.....4-7
 Figure 5.1-1. Vegetation cover types in the Yale Project study area.....5-5
 Figure 5.1-2. Yale Lake water level fluctuations during the fall, winter,
 and spring, 1992-1997.....5-23
 Figure 5.1-3. Area of drawdown zone exposed at different Yale Lake levels.5-24
 Figure 5.1-4. Beaver Bay wetland water level in relation to Yale Lake water level,
 April-July 1997.5-25
 Figure 5.1-5. IP wetland water level relative to Yale Lake water levels,
 April-May 1997.....5-27
 Figure 5.1-6. TES and priority species observations.....5-57
 Figure 5.2-1. Wildlife habitat management lands.5-73
 Figure 6.1-1. Cultural resource survey areas.....6-3
 Figure 7.1-1. Primary study area.7-3
 Figure 7.1-2. Recreation resources in the Lewis River basin.....7-5
 Figure 7.1-3. Yale Lake recreation sites and facilities.7-9
 Figure 7.1-4. Number of Yale Lake campsites occupied on days surveyed, 1996.....7-29
 Figure 7.1-5. Recreation suitability7-45

FIGURES (continued)

Figure 8.1-1. Land ownership. 8-3
Figure 8.1-2. Land management designations..... 8-5
Figure 8.1-3. Project area land uses. 8-7
Figure 9.1-1. Comparative photographs of high and low pool conditions from
Saddle Dam recreation area..... 9-7
Figure 9.1-2. Comparative photographs of high and low pool conditions from
Yale Park recreation area. 9-8
Figure 9.1-3. Comparative photographs of high and low pool conditions from
Cougar Park recreation area. 9-9
Figure 9.1-4. Comparative photographs of high and low pool conditions from
Highway 503. 9-10
Figure 9.1-5. Comparative photographs of high and low pool conditions from
Highway 503. 9-11

TABLES

Table 1.1-1. Hydroelectric projects on the North Fork Lewis River..... 1-2

Table 3.1-1. Water temperature monitoring sites..... 3-5

Table 3.1-2. Monthly median temperatures (°C) at North Fork Lewis River sites. 3-6

Table 3.1-3. Monthly median temperatures (°C) of North Fork Lewis River
tributaries..... 3-7

Table 3.1-4. Maximum 7-day average maximum temperatures (°C) recorded
in 1996 and 1997..... 3-8

Table 3.1-5. Results of quarterly analyses at Yale powerhouse tailrace (YALTR),
April 1996 through January 1998..... 3-12

Table 3.1-6. pH values less than 6.5 recorded during monthly water quality
monitoring 3-14

Table 3.1-7. Summary of diel study results, August 15-22, 1997..... 3-16

Table 3.1-8. Summary of WDOE surface water quality standards for Class A,
Class AA, and Lake Class water bodies..... 3-35

Table 4.1-1. Fish species known to inhabit the North Fork Lewis River upstream
of Merwin Dam. 4-3

Table 4.1-2. Summary of data collected from Cougar Creek kokanee surveys
from 1978 to present. 4-5

Table 4.1-3. Peak bull trout spawning survey counts in Cougar Creek,
1988 through 1997. 4-9

Table 4.1-4. The number of adult spring chinook, fall chinook, coho, and steelhead
collected at the Merwin Dam fish collection facility (1933-1953) 4-14

Table 4.1-5. Escapement estimates for adult spring chinook, fall chinook, and coho
salmon in the North Fork Lewis River (1980-1998)..... 4-17

Table 4.1-6. Angler catch of summer run and winter run steelhead in the mainstem
Lewis River and North Fork Lewis River (1979-80 through 1994-95) 4-20

Table 4.1-7. A summary of the major findings from the WDF document entitled
"Report on the 1956 survey of the North Fork Lewis River above Yale Dam" 4-21

Table 4.1-8. The historical spawning locations of fall chinook, coho, chum, and
steelhead in the Lewis River prior to the construction of Merwin Dam 4-22

Table 4.1-9. Pool:riffle:glide:cascade:side channel ratios based on surface areas
for the Swift bypass reach. 4-24

Table 4.1-10. Aquatic habitat characteristics in tributaries to Yale Lake and the
Swift No. 2 bypass reach during low flow conditions..... 4-26

Table 4.1-11. Cumulative scores for Yale macroinvertebrate sample sites. 4-29

Table 5.1-1. Cover type acres for the Yale Project study area. 5-3

Table 5.1-2. Tree layer attributes for forest cover types in the study area
for the Yale Project. 5-17

Table 5.1-3. Summary of data on snags, down woody material, and low
forb/grass layer for cover types in the study area for the Yale Project..... 5-18

Table 5.1-4. Shrub and tall forb layer attributes for cover types in the study area
for the Yale Project. 5-19

TABLES (continued)

Table 5.1-5. Summary of 1992-1997 Yale Lake drawdowns, October through May (243-244 days).	5-22
Table 5.1-6. Frequency of daily pool levels at Yale Lake during the October to May drawdown period, 1992-997.	5-23
Table 5.1-7. TES plant species potentially occurring in the vicinity of the Yale Project.	5-29
Table 5.1-8. Number of species observed in Yale Project study area cover types.	5-31
Table 5.1-9. Amphibian and reptile species habitat associations in the Yale Project study area.	5-32
Table 5.1-10. Amphibians and reptiles observed in wetlands and pond habitats in the Yale Hydroelectric Project study area.	5-34
Table 5.1-11. Amphibians and reptiles observed in instream, streamside/riparian, and lotic habitats in the Yale Project study area.	5-36
Table 5.1-12. Results of terrestrial amphibian and reptile surveys in the upland habitats in the Yale Hydroelectric Project study area.	5-39
Table 5.1-13. Confirmed and probable breeding bird species in the Yale study area.	5-40
Table 5.1-14. Species/habitat associations and breeding season relative abundance for birds in the Yale Project study area.	5-41
Table 5.1-15. Summary results of seasonal bird surveys, by habitat type, for the Yale Hydroelectric Project.	5-46
Table 5.1-16. Species/habitat associations for mammals in the Yale Project.	5-53
Table 5.1-17. TES wildlife species known or potentially occurring in the vicinity of the Yale Project.	5-54
Table 5.1-18. TES species observations by habitat.	5-55
Table 5.1-19. Summary of bald eagle observations during 1996-1997 winter helicopter surveys.	5-56
Table 5.1-20. Summary of osprey nesting activity in and near the study area for the Yale Hydroelectric Project.	5-69
Table 6.1-1. Summary of archaeological resources recorded in the Yale APE.	6-13
Table 6.1-2. Washington State earth-filled gravity-type hydroelectric dams built post WWII.	6-26
Table 6.1-3. Historic hydroelectric resources surveyed in the Yale Project study area.	6-27
Table 6.1-4. The significance and integrity of historic hydroelectric resources in the Yale Project study area.	6-31
Table 6.4-1. Record of cultural resources agency and tribal communications.	6-36
Table 7.1-1. Inventory of existing developed recreation facilities and dispersed sites and use areas at the Yale Hydroelectric Project.	7-15
Table 7.1-2. Condition of existing developed recreation facilities and dispersed sites and use areas at the Yale Hydroelectric Project.	7-17
Table 7.1-3. Occupancy rates at Yale Lake campgrounds during the last 4 years (1994 to 1997).	7-27

TABLES (continued)

Table 7.1-4. Average boat and bank anglers observed during holiday and non-holiday weekends at Yale Lake recreation sites, 1996-1997.	7-32
Table 7.1-5. Watercraft and angler use of Yale Lake during 1996 lake boater counts.	7-33
Table 7.1-6. Estimated current annual and seasonal recreation visitation at Yale Lake.	7-34
Table 7.1-7. Projected increase in recreation demand in PNRRC Region 2 by activity - by household trips.	7-36
Table 7.1-8. Projected increase in demand for recreation activities in the Yale Project study area to 2030.	7-38
Table 7.2-1. Proposed recreation resource measures for the Yale Hydroelectric Project.	7-82
Table 7.5-1. Implementation schedule and estimated cost of proposed recreation resource measures for the Yale Hydroelectric Project.	7-91
Table 8.1-1. Land ownership within the Yale study area.	8-9

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

4WD	4-wheel drive
ACS	Aquatic Conservation Strategy
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
ADAAG	Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines
APE	area of potential effect
APEA	Applicant Prepared Environmental Assessment
ATBCB	U.S. Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board
ATV	all-terrain vehicle
BBQ	barbecue
BIA	Bureau of Indian Affairs
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BOR	Bureau of Outdoor Recreation
BP	Before Present
BPA	Bonneville Power Administration
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
cfs	cubic feet per second
CO ₂	carbon dioxide
COUGM	Cougar Creek near mouth
CRGNSA	Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area
CRMP	Cultural Resources Management Plan
CWA	Clean Water Act
dbh	diameter at breast height
DNR	Washington State Department of Natural Resources
DO	dissolved oxygen
DPS	Distinct Population Segment
ECPA	Electric Consumers Protection Act
EFSEC	Energy Facilities Site Evaluation Council
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESU	Evolutionarily Significant Unit
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FPA	Federal Power Act
FPC	Federal Power Commission
FR	Federal Register
FSCD	First Stage Consultation Document
FTR	Final Technical Report
GIS	geographical information system
GMA	Growth Management Act
GPNF	Gifford Pinchot National Forest
HCP	Habitat Conservation Plan
HEP	Habitat Evaluation Procedure
HRA	Heritage Research Associates

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (continued)

HSI	Habitat Suitability Index
IAC	Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation
IFIM	Instream Flow Incremental Methodology
ILM	Integrated Landscape Management
IP	International Paper
ITR	Interim Technical Report
kcfs	thousand cubic feet per second
l	litre
LAC	Limits of Acceptable Change
LRMP	Land and Resource Management Plan
LWD	large woody debris
m	meter
MERTR	Merwin powerhouse tailrace
mg	milligram
Monument	Mount St. Helens National Volcanic Monument
MSHNVN	Mount St. Helens National Volcanic Monument
msl	mean sea level
MW	megawatt
MWHMA	Merwin Wildlife Habitat Management Area
MWHMP	Merwin Wildlife Habitat Management Program
N	nitrogen
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NID	National Inventory of Dams
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NO ₂	nitrogen dioxide
NPPC	Northwest Power Planning Council
NPS	National Park Service
NR	National Register
NRF	nesting, roosting, and foraging
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NTU	nephelometric turbidity unit
O&M	operations and maintenance
OAHP	Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
OLECM	Ole Creek near mouth
OP	ortho-phosphorus
ORV	Off-road vehicle
OSU	Oregon State University
PAOT	persons at one time
PCBs	polychlorinated biphenyls
PDEA	Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment
PHS	Priority Habitats and Species
PL	Public Law

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (continued)

PNRRC	Pacific Northwest Recreation Resource Commission
PP&L	Pacific Power and Light (i.e., PacifiCorp)
PUD	Public Utility District
PWC	personal watercraft
QA/QC	quality assurance/quality control
RCW	Revised Code of Washington
RM	River Mile
ROS	Recreation Opportunity Spectrum
ROW	right-of-way
rpm	revolutions per minute
RV	recreation vehicle
RVD	Recreation Visitor Day
SCORP	State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan
SEPA	State Environmental Policy Act
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SIoux	Siouxon Creek near mouth
SMMP	Shoreline Management Master Program
SMP	Shoreline Management Plan
SPLYL	Speelyai Creek at hatchery intake
SPLYU	Speelyai Creek upstream of diversion
SW2BL	Downstream end of Swift No. 2 bypass
SW2BU	Upstream end of Swift No. 2 bypass
SW2TR	Swift No. 2 powerhouse tailrace
SWRES	North Fork Lewis River inflow to Swift Reservoir
TCP	traditional cultural properties
TDG	total dissolved gas
TEC	threatened, endangered, or candidate
TES	threatened, endangered, or sensitive
TKN	total Kjeldahl nitrogen
TP	total phosphorus
TPN	total persulfate nitrogen
U.S.C.	United States Code
USDI	U.S. Department of the Interior
USFS	United States Forest Service
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
UTM	Universal Transverse Mercator
VRM	Visual Resource Management
WAC	Washington Administrative Code
WDF	Washington Department of Fisheries (now the WDFW)
WDFW	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
WDOE	Washington Department of Ecology
WMZ	Wetland Management Zone

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (continued)

WNHP	Washington Natural Heritage Program
WSA	Watershed Studies Approach
WSDOT	Washington State Department of Transportation
WSPRC	Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission
WWSP	Washington Wild Salmonid Policy
WY	water year
YALTR	Yale powerhouse tailrace
YIN	Yakama Indian Nation
YRESL	Yale Lake lower station
YRESU	Yale Lake upper station

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to requirements of 18 CFR (Sections 4.51 and 16.8), PacifiCorp has prepared this Exhibit E (Environmental Report) to address non-power resources associated with the Yale Hydroelectric Project (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission [FERC] Project No. 2071). This introduction presents the overall objectives of the relicensing process for the Yale Project.

PacifiCorp's primary objective in preparing the Yale License Application is to balance protection and enhancement of natural resources in the project-affected study area with hydropower generation. PacifiCorp believes that aquatic, terrestrial, recreation, and other natural resources are compatible with hydropower, and that these resources should be considered equally to the renewable water resource available in the North Fork Lewis River. To help achieve this balance, PacifiCorp established and is adhering to the following principles during the relicensing process:

- PacifiCorp strictly observed FERC regulations (18 CFR 16), which consider baseline conditions to be existing project conditions. These conditions were evaluated through numerous studies, from which mitigation and enhancement measures will be based.
- PacifiCorp investigated methods to further develop and maximize the efficient and economic use of available hydrologic resources for power generation purposes pursuant to FERC requirements.
- PacifiCorp evaluated the compatibility with existing and draft federal and state resource goals and plans.

Based on these principles, PacifiCorp has prepared this final License Application that provides a reasonable balance between power and nonpower values contained within the Yale Project study area. The Yale License Application is the initial component in the overall approach for relicensing all 4 hydroelectric projects on the North Fork Lewis River. This approach is discussed below.

1.1 ALTERNATIVE APPROACH TO RELICENSING NORTH FORK LEWIS RIVER PROJECTS

The Yale Project is 1 of 4 hydroelectric projects on the North Fork of the Lewis River. Three of the hydroelectric projects (Yale, Merwin, and Swift No. 1) are owned and operated by PacifiCorp. The fourth project, Swift No. 2, is owned by Public Utility District (PUD) No. 1 of Cowlitz County and is operated and maintained by PacifiCorp for the PUD.

During First Stage Consultation for the Yale Project relicensing, numerous agencies suggested that PacifiCorp combine all 3 of its projects into a single license and address their cumulative operational and environmental impacts. To accomplish this, PacifiCorp

and Cowlitz PUD (hereafter referred to as the Licensees) have proposed an alternative collaborative approach to relicensing all 4 projects. Use of this alternative approach was submitted to FERC and approved on April 2, 1999 (letter from J. Mark Robinson, Director of Licensing and Compliance, FERC to Dave Leonhardt, PacifiCorp). In approving this approach, FERC issued an order accelerating the expiration of the Merwin license to coincide with that of Swift No. 1 and Swift No. 2 (Order Accelerating License Expiration Date, issued April 1, 1999). The expiration date of each North Fork Lewis River project is listed in Table 1.1-1. Because the Yale Project license, which will expire in April 2001, cannot be extended without an Act of Congress, PacifiCorp requested that FERC defer processing the Yale License Application. This request was granted by FERC in its April 2, 1999 letter because a processing delay will allow concurrent environmental review of all 4 projects. FERC further explained that it would initially review the Yale License Application for adequacy and process it only as far as an acceptance notice. The analysis of the Yale Project presented herein ultimately will be incorporated into the Applicant-Prepared Environmental Assessment (APEA) that will address all 4 of the Lewis River projects. In addition, FERC's April 2, 1999 letter granted a waiver from Section 16.8(f)(7)(i) of its regulations requiring evidence that a Water Quality Certification had been requested from the Washington Department of Ecology (WDOE). This action will enable WDOE to provide comprehensive water quality terms and conditions for all 4 Lewis River projects through a single certification process.

Table 1.1-1. Hydroelectric projects on the North Fork Lewis River.

Project	Project Owner	FERC License No.	License Expiration	License Capacity
Yale	PacifiCorp	No. 2071	April 30, 2001	134 MW
Swift No. 1	PacifiCorp	No. 2111	April 30, 2006	240 MW
Swift No. 2	Cowlitz PUD	No. 2213	April 30, 2006	70 MW
Merwin	PacifiCorp	No. 935	April 30, 2006	136 MW

The Licensees' goal in using an alternative collaborative approach to relicense the North Fork Lewis River projects is to obtain new licenses that ensure each project operates profitably and addresses environmental effects associated with their operation.

The Licensees are proposing to prepare a preliminary draft environmental assessment (PDEA) for the projects as part of the collaborative process to:

- Consolidate and streamline the licensing proceedings;
- Comprehensively assess environmental effects; and
- Promote early, comprehensive settlement discussions.

The Licensees, in cooperation with participating agencies, have agreed to use a watershed studies approach (WSA) to evaluate potential cumulative effects of the 4 projects on natural, recreational, and cultural resources. The WSA will serve as the scientific basis for the APEA, and will encompass the pre-filing consultation and scoping of environmental issues under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). It will also

be used to support the Licensees' applications for new licenses and to facilitate comprehensive settlement negotiations.

Through the watershed studies, cumulative project effects will be assessed and a comprehensive, single settlement agreement will be negotiated that includes enhancement measures for all 4 projects. The proposed approach is consistent with the FERC's new rule (18 CFR, Section 4.34[i]), establishing an alternative administrative process during which pre-filing consultation and environmental review procedures may be combined in a single collaborative relicensing process. The Licensees have obtained the support of key agencies and interests for the collaborative approach.

1.2 THE YALE APPLICATION AS PART OF THE ALTERNATIVE APPROACH FOR RELICENSING THE NORTH FORK LEWIS RIVER PROJECTS

The Yale License Application assesses both existing conditions and the effects that would be induced by continued operation of the Yale Project. It precedes the formal adoption by FERC of the APEA for all of the Lewis River projects. Because the basin-wide APEA process will be ongoing for the next several years, upon receipt of the Yale final License Application, FERC has agreed to defer processing to coincide with receipt of the APEA for Merwin, Swift No. 1, and Swift No. 2. Accordingly, this License Application identifies only those enhancement measures proposed for implementation during the current license period, and those which do not "pre-judge" results of watershed studies, or future settlement negotiations for addressing impacts related to all 4 projects. Different enhancement measures may be proposed for Yale based on the results of the watershed studies.

To facilitate this consolidated evaluation process, FERC has approved PacifiCorp's request to accelerate relicensing of the Merwin Project to coincide with Swift Nos. 1 and 2. Such a schedule would allow the Licensees and stakeholders to assess the cumulative effects of all 4 North Fork Lewis River projects and to prepare a comprehensive basin settlement agreement.

The settlement agreement will contain measures related to the continuing impacts of all 4 hydroelectric projects. These will be defined and examined as part of the ongoing basin watershed studies. The measures contained within this Exhibit E reflect only Yale Project-specific enhancements. PacifiCorp will implement these measures prior to issuance of a new license in accordance with schedules indicated for each resource. The measures contained herein are not intended to prejudge the outcome of the basin watershed studies nor any agreement that may derive from settlement negotiations.

1.3 YALE EXHIBIT E

Much of the information contained in the Exhibit E is the result of over 2 years of studies conducted during the second stage of consultation. PacifiCorp initiated relicensing studies in spring of 1996 with the issuance of the First Stage Consultation Document (FSCD) (PacifiCorp 1996). The FSCD provided the following:

- Described existing environment and significant resources in the project vicinity, based on information derived from resources agency reports, literature, and personal communications;
- Described the project components and the current project operation; and
- Described various studies that PacifiCorp proposed to conduct during relicensing of the Yale Project.

Results of 1996 studies were presented in the Interim Technical Report (ITR) distributed for agency and tribal review and comment in early 1997 (PacifiCorp 1997). Some studies continued and several new studies were initiated in 1997, in response to comments on the ITR. Results of both 1996 and 1997 studies were presented in 4 Final Technical Reports (FTR), one each for Aquatic, Terrestrial, Cultural, and Recreation Resources, distributed in early 1998 (PacifiCorp 1998a-d). Studies for some resource areas (e.g., water quality) continued into early 1998. Study results have been updated in the FTRs and are also included in this final Exhibit E.

Cultural resources consultation is ongoing; PacifiCorp will prepare a separate Cultural Resource Management Plan (CRMP) that will be submitted to appropriate agencies for review when complete, and subsequently filed with the FERC.

Due to the sensitive nature of cultural resources, information regarding the specific locations of archaeological sites and finds is not available for general distribution. This information is contained in the Final Technical Report (PacifiCorp 1998c) and has been made available to appropriate agencies and tribes only.

Information presented in the Exhibit E is derived chiefly from data presented in the FTRs. Supplemental material used to prepare the Exhibit E is included in several appendices. All letters and memoranda related to agency consultation are included in Appendix 1.3-1. The introduction to this appendix contains a log of all written comments received to date.

1.3.1 Organization of Exhibit E

Exhibit E is organized into 2 volumes. The first Exhibit E volume (Volume 2 of the License Application) contains the following sections: Introduction (this section); General Description of the Locale (Section 2.0); and individual resource reports found in Sections 3 through 9. These reports cover the following topics:

- Water Use and Quality (Section 3.0)
- Aquatic Resources (Section 4.0)
- Terrestrial Resources (Section 5.0)
- Cultural Resources (Section 6.0)
- Recreation Resources (Section 7.0)
- Land Use and Management (Section 8.0)
- Aesthetics/Visual Resources (Section 9.0)

Literature cited is presented in Section 10.0.

The resource reports focus on the existing environment and potential impacts to resources within the Yale project vicinity, as defined in the General Description of the Locale in Section 2.0.

Each report contains the following information:

- Description of existing resources;
- Factors (either project-related or environmental) affecting resource conditions;
- Description of the Licensees' existing and proposed measures for resource enhancement and mitigation;
- Summary of the agency consultation process;
- Description of any continuing effects; and
- Discussion of costs and schedule associated with implementing proposed project-specific enhancements.

Included as Volume 3 of this License Application are the appendices to Exhibit E.

2.0 GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE LOCALE

The Yale Hydroelectric Project is located in the North Fork Lewis River basin on the western flanks of the Cascade Mountains in southwest Washington State, approximately 45 miles northeast of the City of Portland, Oregon, and 20 miles south of Mount St. Helens (Figure 2.1-1). The project is upstream of Lake Merwin on the North Fork of the Lewis River, approximately 35 miles from its confluence with the Columbia River. Figure 2.1.2 shows the location of the project features, the primary of which are Yale Dam and the adjacent Saddle Dam. These 2 structures create Yale Lake, a 3,800-acre reservoir.

The Yale Project study area focuses intensively on an area extending approximately 0.5 mile beyond the FERC project boundary in the reservoir vicinity, and 0.125 mile on either side of the Yale-Merwin transmission line. This boundary also extends eastward to encompass the North Fork Lewis River channel downstream of Swift Dam and PacifiCorp ownership in that vicinity. In response to agency comments received on the FSCD and the draft License Application, a much broader area will be examined to assess the cumulative effects of the Yale Project in relation to the other hydroelectric projects in the basin. This watershed boundary, depicted on Figure 2.1-1, extends from Mount Adams at the eastern-most point, to the confluence of the North Fork Lewis River with Cedar Creek as the western-most point. The northern and southern boundaries are defined by the crests of the drainage basin. Within this broader study area lie 4 hydroelectric facilities, Yale, Merwin, Swift No. 1, and Swift No. 2.

2.1 TOPOGRAPHY

The topography around Yale Lake ranges from approximately 3,000 feet mean sea level (msl) on the surrounding hills to approximately 500 feet msl at the valley floor. Slopes in the area are generally steep, resulting from the incision of numerous streams and rivers into the geologically young landscape. A few miles to the west (downstream) of the project, the Lewis River enters a terrain of rolling hills, downstream of which it transitions to the essentially flat "Woodland Bottoms."

2.2 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The region surrounding the project has a complex geologic history, having undergone Tertiary volcanism, several glaciations, and interglacial erosion and deposition. Bedrock surrounding Yale Lake and along the route of the transmission line from Yale Dam to the Merwin switchyard is predominantly comprised of younger Eocene to older Oligocene volcanic lava flows, Oligocene volcanoclastic rocks, and Quaternary volcanoclastic deposits. Alpine glacial deposits overlay older bedrock but underlay the younger Quaternary volcanoclastic deposits.

The volcanic rocks have undergone regional compressional deformation; rock strata are folded by a major southeast plunging anticline and a southeast plunging syncline. The syncline crosses the area of the transmission line about 8 miles west of Yale Dam. While

no faults are mapped in the project vicinity, an east-northeast trending fault zone is mapped about 2 miles south of Yale Dam.

Soils in the project vicinity are formed from volcanic materials. Their erosion hazard is dependent on slope and vegetation cover.

2.2.1 Yale Lake Geology, and Lewis River from Swift Dam to Yale Lake


Rocks exposed around Yale Lake are predominantly volcanic in origin and vary in age from about 38 million years to 1,900 years (Phillips 1987a, 1987b; Walsh et al. 1987). The oldest rocks are Eocene-Oligocene basaltic-andesite lava flows (about 38 to 35 million years old) that occur on the western shore of Yale Lake between Cougar and Speelyai Canal. These lava flows include flow breccia with thin interbeds of siltstone, sandstone, conglomerate, and tuff. Volcaniclastic sedimentary and volcanic rocks of about the same age (37 to 34 million years) define much of the eastern shore north of Siouxon Creek. These rocks are typically thick bedded and poorly exposed. At Yale Dam the rock is overlain by andesite and basaltic-andesite lava flows of about 33 million years ago. These overlying rocks typically form massive, blocky- to platy-jointed flows, and extend from the dam north to Siouxon Creek.

Other deposits around the Yale Lake area are much younger. Quaternary pyroclastic flows and lahar material of Mount St. Helens were deposited between about 40,000 and 2,500 years ago. These rocks consist of valley-filling deposits up to 65 meters thick, and are associated with terrace-like structures. They occur along the eastern shore for a short distance north of Siouxon Creek, in the vicinity of Yale Dam, along the western lake shore at the Speelyai Canal area and Cougar area, and along the northern side of Lewis River between Swift Dam and Yale Lake. A small area on the north side of the Lewis River near the inlet to Yale Lake has deposits of basalt lava flows that were erupted from the southwest base of Mount St. Helens about 1,900 years ago. This deposit, known as Cave Basalt, is generally hummocky or flat over broad areas and contains vertical and horizontal tree molds and some lava tubes (including Ape Cave).

2.2.2 Transmission Line Geology


The transmission line extends east from Yale Dam 10.5 miles to the Merwin switchyard near Merwin Dam. Bedrock exposed along the transmission line includes the same deposits of Eocene-Oligocene basaltic-andesite lava flows and volcaniclastic sedimentary and volcanic rocks that occur around Yale Lake. These are located on the upland areas. Along the lowland areas from Yale Dam across Lewis River are the same pyroclastic flows and lahar deposits of Mount St. Helens as described around Yale Lake.

Alpine glacial deposits of till and outwash sand and gravel are mapped along the south side of Lewis River, adjacent to the Quaternary pyroclastic flows. These were deposited between 40,000 and 140,000 years ago and currently form dissected terraced deposits.




Legend

- Study Area
- Lewis River Watershed
- Assessment Unit
- Public Land Survey
- ADMINISTRATIVE BOUNDARIES**
- County Line
- - - State Line
- HYDROGRAPHY**
- Water
- Stream
- TRANSPORTATION**
- == Primary Road
- Secondary Road
- Light Duty Road



**Yale
Hydroelectric Project
Figure 2.1-1
Project Vicinity**



- Legend**
- Study Area
 - FERC Project Boundary
 - Transmission Line
 - Public Land Survey
 - County Line
 - Topography
 - Recreation
 - Residential
 - HYDROGRAPHY**
 - Water
 - Stream
 - TRANSPORTATION**
 - Primary Road
 - Secondary Road



**Yale
Hydroelectric Project**
Figure 2.1-2
Study Area

2.2.3 Soils

Soils in the project area are predominantly well drained and medium-textured, and were derived from volcanic ash or were formed in sediments derived from mixed volcanic rocks and ash. Slopes, which are variable from gentle to steep, range from flat to more than 70 percent. Soil erosion hazard is dependent on slope and vegetation cover; the erosion hazard increases with increasing slope and extent of bare soil.

Soils along the transmission line from Yale Dam to the Merwin switchyard and along the eastern shoreline of Yale Lake are predominantly well drained silt loam or stony silt loam (USDA 1972). Slopes are variable from 3 to 70 percent along the transmission line, and moderately steep (30 percent) to steep (greater than 70 percent) along the slopes of the eastern side of Yale Lake.

Soils along the western and northern shore of Yale Lake from Yale Dam to Cougar are well drained silt loam and gravelly silt loam that formed in wind-laid silts and volcanic ash (USDA 1974). Most slopes are variable from about 8 to 50 percent. Terraces that are generally flat have silt loam soils that are sometimes gravelly. These terraces occur near Yale Dam, in the vicinity of Speelyai Canal, and at Cougar.

A terrace that is bisected by Panamaker Creek uplake of Cougar has a soil cover of excessively drained gravelly loam formed in sediments derived from mixed volcanic rock and ash. Most of the rest of the shoreline along the northern shore of Yale Lake to the Lewis River inlet are excessively drained soils formed in pumice and andesite mud flow material, except for the occurrence of some rock outcrop near the inlet.

Soils along the north shore of the Swift No. 2 canal are mostly very deep, somewhat excessively drained soils on terrace escarpments (USDA 1989). The escarpments vary in slope from about 65 to 120 percent. This soil has formed in pyroclastic flow and lahar material with a thin mantle of volcanic ash and pumice. The hazard of water erosion is severe. On the south shore of the channel are deep, somewhat excessively drained soils formed in alluvium derived from construction activities on the terrace. Alluvial soils are formed on either side of the Lewis River between Swift Dam and Yale Lake.

2.3 CLIMATE

The climate in the project vicinity is influenced by the Pacific Ocean to the west and the Cascade Range to the east. The Pacific Ocean provides a moderating influence on temperatures in the basin. Storms from the Pacific encounter the Cascade Range, forcing the air masses to rise, cool, and drop large volumes of precipitation. Levels of precipitation increase with elevation in this area. Average annual precipitation varies from 45 inches near Woodland, to over 140 inches on nearby Mount Adams. The majority of the precipitation occurs during the rainy fall and winter months, with snow falling at higher elevations of the basin. Summers (July through mid-October) are generally drier.

2.4 VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE

The majority of the Lewis River basin near the Yale Project is forested, typical of the Southern Washington Cascades Province. Most of this province is within the western hemlock vegetation zone (Franklin and Dyrness 1988). Although the Lewis River drainage has been affected by timber harvest, it is estimated that 70 percent of the study area is forested, of which coniferous stands cover 34 percent.

Study area lands provide winter range for deer and elk; mink and beaver are common in study area wetlands. Large numbers of amphibians were observed primarily in wetland and riparian/riverine habitats. Over 100 species of birds were observed, including waterfowl, raptors, and numerous species of passerines. More detailed information regarding terrestrial resources is presented in Section 5.0.

2.5 LAND DEVELOPMENT AND POPULATION

The majority of the North Fork Lewis River basin is managed as commercial forest, and as such is undeveloped except for logging roads. In recent years, these lands have experienced increased recreation use. Other land uses include farming in the lower elevation areas, residential, hydropower, parks, and the Mount St. Helens National Volcanic Monument (MSHNVN, or the Monument). These are described in Section 8.0.

Population densities in the Yale project vicinity are low. The small communities of Cougar, Chelatchie, and Amboy are near the project, along with scattered private homes and recreational properties. The largest town near the project is Woodland, located 23 miles to the west, with a population of 3,600.