

**7-16-08 Conference Call Summary – *Approved 8-20-08***  
**RESOURCE COORDINATION COMMITTEE (RCC)**  
**NORTH UMPQUA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT- FERC #1927-008**

RCC Members or Alternates Present

Craig Kohanek (OWRD)  
Ed Meyer (NMFS)  
Chris Stine (ODEQ)  
Pam Sighting (USDA-FS)  
Monte Garrett (PacifiCorp Energy)  
Ariel Hiller (BLM)  
Ken Homolka (ODFW)

Also Present

Mary Grainey (OWRD)  
Rich Grost (PacifiCorp Energy)  
Beth Bendickson (PacifiCorp Energy)  
Lois Schwennesen (Schwennesen & Assoc.)

Absent

Dave Harris (ODFW) – proxy given to Ken Homolka  
Craig Tuss (USFWS) – proxy give to Pam Sighting

---

**INTRODUCTIONS, AGENDA, OLD BUSINESS**

Member Updates – Gina Freel will be the RCC Alternate for the USDA-FS.

Public Information Opportunities - Monte will show the video to the Rotary Club on August 21 and is looking for one more RCC member to attend with him.

Public Meeting Debrief

Lois Schwennesen gave the following brief overview of the public meeting:

There seemed to be two distinctive groups at the July 14, 2008 public meeting of the RCC in Roseburg; one group expressing “concern, but will listen; need more information” and the other expressing: “we don’t care what you say, we don’t trust you, we don’t want a Settlement Agreement amendment, this is a delay tactic.”

Monte Garrett agreed with the group designations and acknowledged that the latter group represented the majority. There seemed to be re-emerging anger over past experiences and memories from the old relicensing issues and the Settlement Agreement process.

Lois felt it was a good use of time; that things needed to be aired. For those not living in Roseburg, it was important to hear the types of concerns aired by the NGOs. It was a critical and important step.

Chris Stine agreed that it was a very engaged and knowledgeable group. “There seemed to be a level of frustration.” The public seemed to not clearly understand the proposed process or think that any

process is justified, given their satisfaction with the current settlement agreement requirement. There was a strong desire to know more about the information to be presented at the workshop.

Generally, many of those that attended the meeting and spoke wanted to know more about how much money is involved. Monte stated that since we are uncertain as to enhancement actions that would potentially be included in a funding package, we can't convey costs yet. Aside from the enquiries at the public meeting, Pam Sichting asked "is PacifiCorp hesitant to put a dollar amount on it because it may come back to haunt us?" Monte said "PacifiCorp wasn't ready, nor prepared to talk about dollars yet. We have not yet determined if a compelling case exists for an alternative to fish passage, and the parties are not currently conducting negotiations. Therefore, discussion of how much money is inappropriate."

At the public meeting, both the RCC and the meeting attendees were concerned about when the information package would be available and how much time there will be to review it.

Pam expressed that the information package should be as complete as possible. Lois mentioned there seems to be some fuzziness about what will be included in the package. The RCC indicated the importance of what the modeling says about predation, what are the drivers in the models, and what benefits/costs may result to non-fisheries issues and resources.

Lois asked the RCC what exactly is the "nugget" the RCC wants to see in the package. Pam wants to know what exactly is being proposed so they have something they can compare to what's required under the existing FERC license. "Presumably the information was initially presented to PacifiCorp by Stillwater. The hard findings from Stillwater's modeling need to be the core of what's presented to the RCC."

Monte will talk to Frank Ligon at Stillwater regarding the contents of the information package to be delivered to the RCC by August 5. Stillwater's charge is to provide a condensed package of quantitative benefits derived from their modeling. Pam said it's not all about the fish. Mary Grainey said, on the chance that Frank Ligon doesn't have all the information could he give where he will go to get additional information? Monte said he's not going to get additional information; existing information is being used for modeling in order to quantify potential alternative benefits. The science panel and technical working group may have questions that will go beyond the information that exists. "Because we are near the 90% design of the fish passage facilities" Monte said, "a decision regarding any alternative to fish passage needs to be made soon (shortly after the workshop)." There won't be time to gather additional information while at the same time staying on a facility-construction schedule. Hopefully enough questions will be answered at the workshop for the decision-making process to be completed.

The science panel will prepare the workshop report to be reviewed by the RCC and the TWG. Ken Homolka asked if this is something that Frank Ligon will spearhead. He wanted to know if the report was going to be made public or just available for the TWG and the RCC. Monte said it will be available to the public, and will be a detailed summary of the science panel's conclusions and opinions. Stillwater will be working with the science panel, and may write the report, but that the panel will be the author of the report. The RCC can specify Stillwater's level of involvement. Once the TWG/RCC reviews the report, they can develop recommendations for the policy group. Ken also asked if it would

be a journal quality publication. Monte said the process of preparing a publication for a scientific journal is a lengthy one and not the intent, although the report may ultimately get there. Lois asked of Ken why he was asking about the publication. Ken said he was just wondering if it was Stillwater's or PacifiCorp's intent, down the road, to have it out in a journal. Primarily, Ken just wanted clarification.

Monte will talk to Frank Ligon about needing the complete information package for review, as indicated at the public meeting, by August 5. He'll ask for quantification of benefits for both fish and non-fish resources.

Ed Meyer wanted to know if the information will be broken down into off-site and on-site mitigation. Monte indicated that, yes, it was originally defined to us that way.

NEXT STEPS: Lois will send out a short meeting summary and asked everyone if they wanted the public testimony to be included. The RCC agreed the public statements should be included in the draft summary and made available to the public. Lois will focus more on the issues talked about, rather than "he said/she said." Diana Wales said she had her testimony typed up and that we could include it.

Lois said Diana Wales and Stan Vejtasa were grateful that the RCC listened to them with respect. They felt the respect was genuine. Lois will send a draft of the first part of the summary to the RCC (without the public testimony). Once she gets the public feedback, she'll send it to the RCC.

Rich Grost mentioned that at the Partnership for Umpqua's Rivers meeting, held the next day, that Stan recapped the meeting passionately. Stan told the group that PacifiCorp's proposal was a tactic to avoid or delay the fish passage project. Rich spoke up, telling the group that PacifiCorp thinks it's prudent to look at this alternative; furthermore, he said we're still going forward with the passage design. They gave Rich an opportunity to comment on Stan's concerns. They didn't want further follow-up.

Lois said the message needs to be that nothing will be done without further RCC/TWG review - - that PacifiCorp does not intend to pursue an alternative without full RCC/TWG review/approval.

Monte recommended having a meeting with policy representatives, RCC, PacifiCorp, and Frank Ligon to make sure we're all on the same page - - a common understanding of what we're trying to do. As soon as the information package comes out on August 5, this meeting could be set up. At this same meeting, PacifiCorp could provide more of what may be included in a proposed license modification.

Both Ed and Pam expressed concerns about the PacifiCorp RCC representative having communicated first with the policy group first, rather than the RCC; which is the protocol established in the Resource Coordination Plan.

Lois added her sense of this is that perhaps it's Monte's way to help give RCC members what they're asking for; that is, coordinated communication with the policy group and the RCC at the same time. Monte said that it is PacifiCorp's desire to cut to the chase and bring its and the agency decision-makers together for a question/answer time. He offered that this would give the RCC and policy representatives time to be able to speak to the PacifiCorp policy people - - allow the decision-makers opportunity to talk to each other to better understand each others' interests.

Ed, Pam, and Mary Grainey think a meeting like this is premature. They may need time to review the information package and put together their own set of questions.

Lois had a qualifying question. She heard the following two questions going on.

1. What's the science?
2. What is PacifiCorp putting on the table (not technical)?

Monte clarified that PacifiCorp is only putting forth a process for evaluation of a potential alternative. Ed said once they evaluate the substance of the information provided, then that's when he suggests bringing the policy group together. Otherwise, he feels this is twisting his arm.

Monte said the motive in proposing the meeting is for a clear understanding. He heard Monday night that RCC members may have a different process in mind than what PacifiCorp thought it understood from the policy group.

Both Ed and Pam suggest having another meeting with the RCC first. Ed said that the whole process has been "piece-mealed" with conversations, e-mails, etc. He would like to have a face-to-face RCC meeting to talk about the process before the policy representatives are invited. Ken Homolka agreed. It was suggested to have Frank Ligon at that meeting. The September 8 meeting scheduled at the public meeting may be an appropriate time for this discussion.

PacifiCorp's main need is to have the Stillwater information evaluated by scientists that are completely independent from the settlement agreement and license implementation, to provide their opinions that can be included in the report. Monte is hearing that the RCC doesn't even want a science panel. Ed asked why the panel was needed when those present on the RCC were the ones who largely evaluated the original technical information in the Settlement Agreement. He wants the RCC to look at the information package first.

Monte asked if the RCC will make the decision after the September 8 RCC/TWG meeting as to whether or not a workshop will be held. The RCC indicated that is the preferred route for this process.

There may be an interim meeting before September 8.

**RCC Action: The June 18 meeting summary was approved and finalized.**

## **CURRENT PROJECT UPDATES**

Fish Creek (Screens and Canal Shutoff & Drainage) – Hydraulic measurements were made and R2 is working up the information. R2 is also addressing comments to the earlier version of strategy on the O&M plan. A repeat test will happen in the fall when flows are back up. The diversion will be shut down as flows are at or near minimum flow, possibly as early as next week. The Fish Creek penstock is being used as a domestic water supply for Toketee due to public advisory of Lemolo Reservoir on July 10. Programming will continue.

CW2 CSD – construction is scheduled for mid to late August. We're still awaiting the notice-to-proceed from USDA-FS.

LM2 CSD – It's not a good time of year to do the canal shutdown test, so it is postponed until fall for more favorable conditions. R2 did a smaller test to learn as much as they could with full flow conditions and without any special ramping of river reaches. The kick-off meeting is scheduled for July 17.

Macro-invert Ladder – Work is in progress.

Soda Springs Tailrace Barrier – The hydraulic evaluation took place on July 3. Rich Grost has supplied preliminary information to Suzanne Pollon & Ed Meyer for review. Overall, the average velocity was within the one-foot per second criteria. The local hydraulics within each bay is a bit squirrely. Ed visited the site yesterday and will inquire with other experienced engineers to see if more work is warranted.

Erosion Site Remediation – will start next week. We're still awaiting the notice-to-proceed from USDA-FS. The 401 review is scheduled for August 19.

## **TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG) PROJECT UPDATES**

FHS (Fish Habitat Studies) – Long term monitoring continuing on. ODFW is unable to waive the indirect costs for personnel as described at last RCC meeting, thus TWG requests that RCC approve spending the additional money to ODFW (about \$26k for 2007 and \$35k for 2008). This puts total 2007 program costs \$14k over the RCC-approved spending limit for that year. TWG can remain within RCC-approved spending limit for 2008, but fund will be depleted.

**RCC Action: Approve additional \$14K (ODFW indirect costs) spent on 19.2 budget in 2007.**  
RCC approved the additional expenditures.

**RCC Action: Understand that the additional ODFW indirect costs for 2007 and 2008 result in the SA 19.2 fund being depleted by the end of 2008.** RCC understands this to be the case.

### FPD (Fish Passage Design)

**Soda Springs Fish Passage Design:** The 60% design level is complete with the 90% design in progress. ENSR is working on the hydraulic model. Meeting scheduled for August 13 viewing. PacifiCorp, NMFS, and ODFW will attend. The final design scheduled for September 30 will now be complete by end of year. FERC will need to be notified about this extension. Construction is still on track to start in 2009. The permitting process is moving forward.

**RCC Action: Monte will e-mail RCC for their approval of FERC extension.**

F&R (Flows & Ramping) - *nothing new to report at this time.*

CSD (Canal Shut off & Drainage)

**14.2 Clearwater 2:** Construction is scheduled to start date late August.

**14.2 Lemolo 2:** Kick off meeting will happen on July 17.

**Lemolo Reservoir:** At the last meeting, the blue green algae remained below advisory levels. It was suggested at the last TWG meeting that Rich Grost do his best to speed up the reduction of water in the reservoir. The USDA-FS monitoring on July 7 indicated that the clarity was improving. Mid-lake cell counts were 1,000 per ml. However, the swimming area was well over 1 million cells per ml. With the warm weather, an algae bloom exploded between July 7 and 10. On July 9, a report of stranded boats was issued and upon checking it out, visible scums were observed by USFS around the lake. On July 10, a water contact advisory was issued. PacifiCorp accelerated the drawdown, reached the target level of 4143 ft MSL on July 13, and is operating as proposed (avg: 4143 ft). On Sunday, July 13, Joe Eilers did water quality monitoring and said that the algae bloom seemed to be waning. He hopes that we can tease out which of the efforts are affecting the bloom: lowering of the reservoir or brown trout enhancement (about 50,000 tui chub removed so far). Scott Lamb built a boat with a pump and manifold to try to break up the algae with jets of water. The effort may be more effective than using a Solar Bee. The bottom line with current conditions is that PacifiCorp plans to follow the RCC-approved experimental water level management during the summer. The next TWG meeting is scheduled for August 12 at Lemolo Resort. With the multitudes of tui chub, the TWG showed a renewed interest for a deeper winter drawdown.

**RCC Action: Approve retroactive drawdown of more than 0.5 ft/day as requested by the TWG (July 10, 11 exceeded that rate).** RCC approved that drawdown rate for those days.

The next RCC Conference Call is scheduled for August 20, 10:00 AM

Adjourn