

**Final Notes**  
**Bear River License Implementation**  
**Environmental Coordination Committee Meeting**  
**February 16, 2005**  
**Pocatello, Idaho**

<b>Commitments Made at the February 2005 ECC Meeting</b>	
Monte Garrett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribute historic photos of the Grace/Cove area to ECC members.</li> <li>• Follow up on PacifiCorp contact with local commissioners prior to upcoming public meetings.</li> <li>• Check on next procedural step following PacifiCorp's recent meeting with Twin Lake proponents.</li> <li>• Participate in attorneys' conference call regarding the Settlement Agreement for Cove.</li> <li>• Check on availability of funds and bearing interest language in Settlement Agreement for Cove.</li> <li>• Distribute final draft of the Black Canyon Monitoring Plan to ECC members during last week of February.</li> <li>• Update web site to reflect project process (ranking criteria).</li> <li>• Process bills for public meeting expenses.</li> <li>• Check on interest index (funding discussion)</li> </ul>
All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review Removal Plan to be distributed during the week of February 21.</li> <li>• Review final draft of Black Canyon (final 30-day review begins with distribution at the end of February).</li> <li>• Review Settlement Agreement distributed during the week of February 21 for discussion at next meeting.</li> <li>• Forward names of individuals/groups to add to RFP list for Black Canyon monitoring to Monte Garrett.</li> <li>• Forward comments on thermal imaging to Dave Teuscher by February 26.</li> <li>• Forward comments on the draft 2004 Annual Report to Monte Garrett/Miriam Hugentobler by February 28.</li> </ul>
Marv Hoyt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add information to the short form for ranking criteria.</li> <li>• Put together ranking criteria to hand out with project applications.</li> </ul>
Deb Mignogno	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add ECC's mission and vision to the project ranking criteria form.</li> </ul>
Eve Davies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Send Grace address to Jim Capurso.</li> </ul>
Jim Capurso	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Set up additional meetings with local Chambers of Commerce, landowners as part of the public meeting process. Contact local media.</li> </ul>

**Decisions Made at the February 2005 ECC Meeting**

- Delay signing of Settlement Agreement for Cove until after completion of Environmental Report (see Figure 1, Attachments for timeline).
- Analyze full range of alternatives as described in the Cove Feasibility Study in the Environmental Report for Cove.

- Agree that reduction in flows from 80 to 63 cfs would not result in significant impacts to aquatic resources for the purpose of analysis in the ER.
- Flows for the No Action Alternative analyzed in the ER will be 10-35 cfs.
- Cirrus will be present for discussion at the next ECC meeting.
- A review draft of the Environmental Report will be available by the end of March.
- In the Black Canyon Monitoring Plan, significant decline (0.10 alpha level) in any parameter would trigger discussion of weight of evidence. If weight of evidence (full ECC discussion) shows that negative impacts to the system (by consensus as defined in the SA) are happening, then adaptive flow management will be discussed.
- Develop a pamphlet to describe the funding application process.

#### **ECC Members Present**

Pat Koelsch, Bureau of Land Management  
 Deb Mignogno, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
 Warren Colyer, Trout Unlimited  
 Kevin Lewis, Idaho Rivers United  
 Marv Hoyt, Greater Yellowstone Coalition  
 Jim Mende, Idaho Department of Fish and Game  
 Jim Capurso, U.S. Forest Service  
 Lynn Van Every, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality  
 Monte Garrett, PacifiCorp, Environmental Coordinator  
 Scott Pratt, PacifiCorp, Facilitator

#### **Others Present**

Greg Mladenka, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality  
 Scott Christianson, Greater Yellowstone Coalition  
 Jeff Seamons, citizen  
 Dave Teuscher, Idaho Department of Fish and Game  
 Claudia Conder, PacifiCorp  
 Eve Davies, PacifiCorp  
 Claire Bosen, citizen (p.m. only)  
 Neal Artz, Cirrus Environmental Solutions

#### **Participating by Telephone**

Mary Lucachick, Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation  
 Connely Baldwin, PacifiCorp

#### **ECC Members Not Present**

Hunter Osborne, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes  
 Susan Rosebrough, National Park Service  
 Charlie Vincent, American Whitewater

## **Welcome and Review of Agenda**

The ECC meeting began at 9 a.m. Notes from January's ECC meeting were approved with changes from Dave Tuescher (IDFG), Jim Capurso (USFS), and Jim Mende (IDFG).

## **Updates and Review of Commitments from the January ECC Meeting**

Monte Garrett (PacifiCorp) said he spoke with engineers about water in Cove during the decommissioning process and will summarize results later in the meeting. He noted that the financial ledger will be included in the annual report and will be reviewed later in the meeting. Garrett also noted that the latest version of the Settlement Agreement for Cove was distributed to ECC members on January 31. In regard to historic photos of the Grace/Cove area, some photos have been located, are being scanned, and will be distributed for review to ECC members. Garrett said that a press release for Cove decommissioning is in progress.

Deb Mignogno (USFWS) asked when sediment testing at Cove will be done and indicated that USFWS and perhaps others may not be able to sign the Settlement Agreement for Cove until the Environmental Report is complete. Marv Hoyt (GYC) pointed out there would be little effect on the timing of signing; Garrett agreed as there are provisions in the Agreement to handle that. Garrett also noted that Hoyt will be handling Scott Yates' (TU) former position, representing the ECC's non-governmental agencies at the attorneys' meetings. Garrett said the Agreement is nearly complete, with another attorney conference call scheduled for February 17.

Scott Pratt (PacifiCorp) said he attended Preston Soil Conservation District board meeting—there were individuals on the board who spoke for themselves rather than the board, but they were very clear about having no interest in Bonneville cutthroat trout.

Teuscher (IDFG) reported progress working with PacifiCorp on new funding allocation/budgets for temperature tags in telemetry study. He said PacifiCorp is purchasing the tags directly to avoid overhead (20% surcharge). Teuscher said the temperature components add \$45 to each of 200 tags. IDFG has sent PacifiCorp their contract revision to meet PacifiCorp contract requirements. Jim Capurso and Deb Mignogno asked how IDFG will handle the overhead and additional costs that were not budgeted when their geneticist put together the bid. Teuscher said IDFG is handling some costs internally and some indirect costs are being greatly reduced by purchasing directly through PacifiCorp.

Teuscher said the thermal imaging sub-group met, including Warren Colyer (TU), and noted that telemetry methodology is still being refined.

Lynn Van Every (IDEQ) reported that a Black Canyon Monitoring Plan subcommittee meeting had been held. He said the group got good input from John Gangemi (AW) and the subgroup agreed on a conservative 10 percent alpha level for determining significance

of effects. He noted that there was good input and agreement on how to revise draft BCMP. Van Every said he and Greg Mladenka (IDEQ) subsequently met with the SWCA consultant to make revisions to the plan.

Mignogno said her commitments were complete, and results will be discussed later in the meeting.

Capurso said he has developed a draft PowerPoint presentation for upcoming public meetings, and the presentation is currently out for review to public meeting subcommittee members.

Garrett said that he was unsure if Glen Pond (PacifiCorp) is scheduled to meet with local commissioners, etc to garner additional support for public meetings. Garrett said he will follow up on this.

Mary Lucachick (IDPR) said she is working with Michael Jurnee (public affairs, Idaho Governor's Office) to coordinate the upcoming Cove press release.

Miriam Hugentobler drafted and distributed the 2004 Annual Report for review by ECC

Pratt announced that he would be pursuing his PhD program at Utah State University and will no longer be working full-time for PacifiCorp starting in April. This means that PacifiCorp would not be providing ECC meeting facilitation after the March meeting. The discussion regarding need for facilitation was tabled until the March meeting.

### **Cove Settlement Agreement – Monte Garrett**

Garrett said he had spoken with Stan Christensen, a farmer from Grace area who may be interested in the operation of Cove. Garrett said he had responded to Christensen with financial analysis, etc; and that ECC stakeholders want to move forward with decommissioning. Garrett said he told Christensen of ECC meetings, but did not invite him to today's discussion of Cove Settlement Agreement. Mende said he also spoke with Christensen and suggested he speak with Dan Tomich and the Idaho Water Resource Board to get independent information.

Garrett asked Connely Baldwin (PacifiCorp) to summarize the discussion PacifiCorp recently conducted with Clair Bosen (Twin Lake proponent). Twin Lakes was required (by FERC) to meet with PacifiCorp within 30 days to attempt to resolve differences. Baldwin said he told Bosen that PacifiCorp's license is intimately tied to the Settlement Agreement with the ECC, and that PacifiCorp will not be happy if the other stakeholders are not happy. They also discussed the issue of operational impacts. Mende asked whether FERC action is mostly perfunctory—as opposed to momentum building. There was general agreement among the ECC that this is what FERC always does (grant preliminary permits). Capurso reminded Garrett and Pratt that they said they would put together a presentation to respond to Twin Lakes issues during the upcoming public meetings. Garrett clarified that, after thought, he decided to keep the discussion informal,

but would be prepared with talking points. A discussion of how project is viewed in local community followed. Mladenka asked what the process is from here, after we met our consultation requirement. Garrett said he would check with PacifiCorp.

**Discussion of Cove Agreement – ECC Comments on January 31 version**

- Paragraph 3 regarding support of stakeholders before the PUC will be modified
- Definition of decommissioning costs will be modified to delete Environmental Coordinator time and PacifiCorp legal expenses
- Section 6.2.3.2 will be modified to indicate that PacifiCorp will only seek relief due to unexpected costs not covered by a cost-share by seeking changes to the Removal Plan
- The Agreement is now being presented as a separate agreement; not as an amendment to the original relicensing settlement agreement; attorneys now will make this a stand-alone agreement and therefore additional boilerplate language has been added to the text. Final meeting (conference call) will be this Thursday for attorneys to finalize the Agreement.

Mignogno asked about paragraph 25: the availability of funds and about bearing interest. Garrett said he will seek clarification. Also questioned whether NMFS needs to be included in paragraph 31.

Mende asked why a different dispute resolution process from original SA is necessary. Garrett explained that the time necessary for acceptance of the new License Order requires an accelerated dispute process should the need arise. Yates drafted this new language based on need for different timelines. Mende also noted change of unanimity requires entire group, not core agency group. Garrett indicated that the attorneys felt that all parties have equal interest, as opposed to certain parties have more voice than others in some specific areas, as was the case in the relicensing agreement. Mende said he wants to make sure that this change is noted in the record. Hoyt added that, in the original relicensing agreement, unanimity was in response to specific legal responsibilities of different agencies, and this is not the case for this Agreement.

Garrett added that the Explanatory Statement drafting will soon begin. The group also need to decide exactly when, where, and by whom would the Agreement be signed. Mignogno brought up the discussion of when to sign agreement in regards to sediment analysis—and how that could compromise some stakeholders in making their decision, once the agreement is public. Garrett responded that the water amendment to 63 cfs will not happen in time, but that process is not necessarily tied to signing this Agreement. Capurso noted he supports Mignogno's conclusion that these projects take on a life of their own and build momentum. Colyer indicated a desire to sign sooner rather than later, but thinks if the press release is made at the same time, that could be a problem. Garrett indicated that PacifiCorp wants to get this done as soon as possible, given process and legal costs.

Garrett asked if everyone felt that signing should only occur after the sediment analysis is complete, and the Agreement include the finished Environmental Report. Although there

were diverse opinions, the majority seemed to feel that the Agreement should include all its parts prior to signing.

PacifiCorp plans to mobilize for sediment analysis by early March, but weather could delay the process resulting in the Offer of Settlement to FERC filing as late as June. However, Garrett said he does not see a tie between temporary amendment to reduce flows and the signing of the Agreement; as soon as the temporary amendment to Article 408 is received, PacifiCorp will be able to reduce flows in order to begin the BCMP study. Garrett also noted the proposed Grace outage in April for 10 days (15-26 April). Garrett proposed a timeline (Figure 1); unanimous support for timeline as proposed.

Mladenka asked about PacifiCorp's message to the public; Garrett suggested that we say that all stakeholders have agreed to propose to FERC that we amend the license for decommissioning, not that decommissioning will occur; as only FERC can make that decision.

### **Environmental Report for Cove Decommissioning – Neal Artz, Cirrus**

Artz (Cirrus Environmental Solutions) was introduced to the ECC as the consultant preparing the ER for Cove. Garrett said the ER will become the draft Environmental Assessment for FERC's environmental analysis process. Garrett said he sent the original ER outline draft to ECC members for their review on February 7. The outline describes proposed contents for the Draft ER. A discussion of ER contents with the ECC by Artz followed. Artz suggested accomplishing three things at this meeting: 1) check in on format; 2) discuss/address inaccuracies or data holes/blanks to be filled; 3) most important for them-discussion of content from ECC.

Mignogno questioned need for scoping. Garrett said PacifiCorp will present one position, but FERC may not agree and will likely conduct their own scoping process.

A discussion of whether Cove should be put on the agenda for the public meetings followed. The ECC determined that this should not be specifically on the agenda, but public discussion of Cove will be expected at the public meetings and this will be presented as scoping for the Cove. FERC may require other scoping specifically for Cove. Agenda for public meetings will be discussed later.

Koelsch (BLM) questioned section 3.1.1.6. Garrett clarified that additional engineering input will be added later.

### **Cirrus Summary of Issues for the Environmental Report**

Cirrus will need to take comments on the initial write-up. Mignogno questioned whether PacifiCorp will have a hydrogeomorphologist look at this. Garrett said yes, both Black and Veatch and an internal PacifiCorp engineer, Will Shallenburger. Another issue mentioned was velocity changes in Black Canyon due to changes in minimum flow. Most think that is unlikely due to the slight change in flow regime and existing bedrock control against headward-cutting.

Mende wanted to know if the ER was an appropriate venue to discuss positive impacts (benefits) from Cove decommissioning, not just negative impacts. Artz said this has to be objective, not 'selling' project, but the ER will cover positive impacts as well. Koelsch asked whether direct and indirect impacts would be analyzed in order to cover NEPA; Artz said yes.

Capurso said he doesn't think alternatives should be analyzed, but Garrett explained that it is necessary to meet FERC needs and NEPA requirements. Garrett said he would like to include dam removal analysis in the range of alternatives. Koelsch said the analysis could be tightened up to limit alternatives. Garrett suggested analyzing action alternatives as 'dropped from further consideration' and make the range of alternatives be the dam removal analysis by Black and Veatch. Hoyt noted that a full range of alternatives should be analyzed, as that is the public process. Mende said the focus should not be narrowed to the point that FERC would feel compelled to open up the range of alternatives. Garrett went back to what Feasibility Study was about—a full range of alternatives. Mignogno said she believed the ECC went through the correct process by evaluating all the options to see what met our needs. ECC members seemed to coalesce around need to analyze a full range of alternatives as originally presented in the Cove Feasibility Study.

<Lunch Break>

Colyer said the Environmental Report should cover all native aquatic species, not just Bonneville cutthroat trout.

Teuscher said that under the warmwater fishery issue, walleye could expand up to Grace Dam. Also smallmouth bass may expand and impact rainbow trout. He agreed that possible long-term impacts should be extended to all fish species; not just Bonneville cutthroat trout.

Artz asked about the availability of data. Teuscher said creel surveys and stocking information are available from IDFG and suggested annual reports and the draft Bonneville cutthroat trout plan for identification and data for fish trends.

Artz said the Environmental Report needs to cover a wide variety of aquatic native and non-native species and asked about the need to cover impacts due to flow reduction from 80 to 63 cfs. Teuscher said the ECC has already looked at that and there seem to be only slight changes in effects. No empirical data is available about this. Hoyt noted that NEPA only requires looking at the best information available, and with no data, using best professional judgment. ECC consensus was that with the information we currently have, seems there is no impact down to 63 cfs.

Mladenka said the ER should indicate that the Grace to Cove reach will receive run of river flows if Cove dam is removed, versus 10-35 cfs if it is not. Run of river flows will certainly provide more aquatic habitat in this reach than 10-35 cfs.

Artz asked whether there was concern with loss of warmwater species currently in the Cove forebay (perch, suckers, carp). Mladenka suggested handling the issue by noting a trade in lentic (lake/still water) for lotic (stream) habitat. He also noted a potential increase in fishing and boating in the Cove Bypass reach with this proposal. Garrett said he thinks the same species in forebay will be in river, so there would be no overall loss.

Artz asked about water quality issues. Short-term impacts are listed— are there any other or longer term impacts? Is Cove a good sediment trap? Not likely due to reservoirs upstream and substrate in Black Canyon. Does Kackley Springs cool the forebay? Van Every said a negligible amount because of so much water going through pipe, which overwhelms other river flow.

Potential wetland and riparian concerns were raised. What impact would occur during construction? A discussion followed on whether riparian impacts have already occurred due to no operation of Cove for the last three years. Eve Davies (PacifiCorp) mentioned a cattail area adjacent to the forebay. Mladenka indicated that wetland or riparian impacts due to change from 80 to 63 cfs may actually not be measurable. Koelsch asked how No Action compares since 10 or 35 cfs has never existed. The ECC agreed that No Action is 10 or 35 cfs, even though flow at that level never occurred.

Further discussion involved issues regarding aesthetics and land ownership boundaries. Socioeconomic analysis will address jobs and tax base, as well as energy use. Vegetation will include reclamation and noxious weed issues. Artz said he assumed the discussion of cultural issues in the ER will be straightforward due to the consultation already conducted as part of the HPMP.

Cirrus will be present for discussion at the next ECC meeting; it was proposed that a review draft of the Environmental Report will be available by the end of March.

### **Removal Plan – Monte Garrett**

Figure 2 (Attachments) summarizes a discussion of how using notch in dam with small berm was the approach recommended by PacifiCorp's contractor, Black and Veatch, who is preparing the Removal Plan. No coffer dam will be necessary and the forebay will slowly drain to decant the sediment in the forebay and result in less downstream sediment transport than originally anticipated. The plan is to follow the 5505-foot contour level, achieved by draining the forebay with the tainter gate. This will also result in less expense because no coffer dam is needed and there is no need to shut off minimum flows in Black Canyon. Discussion followed regarding the accuracy of this approach, but the ECC agreed to follow the lead of the engineers.

Garrett emphasized that the Removal Plan will be the direction of the Cove Settlement Agreement on the ground; he asked ECC members to review the Removal Plan draft that is expected to be available next week; the next agenda will include a big block of time for discussion.



## **Black Canyon Monitoring Plan**

Results of the BCMP subcommittee meeting were discussed. A major change resulting from the subcommittee meeting included sampling only twice each year (March and October), which will save funding. Statistical significance level for biologically meaningful effect was set at 0.10 (alpha level (this will help prevent committing type II errors). A change of 10 percent or more in any parameter will be considered biologically-significant. Group believes 10 percent may not be detectable; however, there was broad consensus for this criteria in the subcommittee. John Gangemi (AW) was involved in the subcommittee's discussion and reminded the group that AWs mission statement is river ecology/integrity first. Gangemi seconded 10 percent criteria (group started at 20 percent). These two criteria ( $\alpha = 0.10$  and 10% biological significance level) will determine when adaptive management will be explored—further studies/monitoring may be necessary. Teuscher asked about which metric this criterion applies to, as we will have many—if one bug number falls short by 10 percent or if rainbow trout decline 10 percent, or if only one metric out of all declines by 10 percent, where does adaptive management fit in? Mladenka said a weight of evidence approach would then be used to determine whether the overall effect was negative, positive, or neutral. Colyer and several others indicated that any 10 percent change in any parameter opens discussion regarding adaptive management of whitewater flow. Mladenka said he and Susan Kammerdeiner (SWCA) will clarify that point in the monitoring plan. Mignogno wanted to know if adaptive flow management will happen right away. Answer was no, because the Settlement Agreement (3.1.6.3) allows for adaptive flow management only in and after year 7. Money for adaptive management will have to come from other mitigation funding, as monitoring budgets are only for the first 7 years. Mladenka said he thinks if there is a clear, negative biological effect due to whitewater boating flows the ECC will likely vote for a major change in flow management, versus minor adjustments of whitewater flows (for example, consolidation of high flows over a continuous period, with much slower ramping rates).

It was decided that a significant decline (10% at  $\alpha = 0.10$ ) in any parameter would trigger evaluation of all parameters measured using a weight of evidence approach, to determine whether the overall effect of whitewater boating flows was positive, negative, or neutral. If weight of evidence (full ECC discussion) shows that negative impacts to the system (by consensus (or vote?) as defined in the SA) are happening, then adaptive flow management will be discussed.

The BCMP subcommittee is still discussing the need and availability of a reference reach and whether monitoring could be contracted out to a university or other interested contractors. With the change in sampling frequency, there is less money required for macroinvertebrate identification; therefore, the ECC could also put out an RFP-- get a third party, outside look; would have less time of committee involved; could fund parts of several students and could save money every step by using students.

There will be one more review of plan before it is finalized in the next 3-4 weeks. A final draft will be distributed to the ECC by the end of February by Garrett for a 30-day

review. ECC will discuss sending out RFP at the next meeting. If anyone wants to add individuals or vendors to the RFP list, forward them to Garrett.

### **Final Ranking Criteria and Project Proposal Application – Deb Mignogno**

1- Explanation of Process, 2-Basic Application, 3-Lengthy Application, 4-Final Ranking Criteria (subcommittee meets 2x/year May/October to use project ranking criteria), 5- Subcommittee meets and gives recommends for funding to ECC, 6-Easement/land acquisitions –a special topic of its own?

Teuscher suggested that the ECC should not have a wide-open schedule for receiving proposals, and suggested adding structure as to when the ECC ranks proposals and makes decisions. Mignogno clarified that was her view—certain evaluation time periods.

Hoyt shared concern over a wide-open process, and wants to make sure people submitting applications are aware of the mission/goals of the ECC. Also, how do we enforce longer time frames and monitoring of easements over these longer time frames? Hoyt said he thinks the short form is too short—thinks more information should accompany the application to meet ECC needs. The long form is too long, but short form is not enough.

Discussion followed of what the right vehicle is for this-- a pamphlet? Garrett said he wants a more targeted project process than what we are seeing. Hoyt also discussed what happens when land changes hands, and if there are not deed restrictions, the next owners could change everything the ECC money paid for. Mende asked if the ECC has to require mitigation in perpetuity.

Capurso discussed the fundamental vision of trust (two-way) with private landowners. Capurso proposed that Hoyt take Mignogno's short form and add necessary pieces to that, based on the long form and any other holes he sees. Then we will have a first iteration for the public meetings in March. Mignogno suggested adding text to the form about the ECC's mission and vision. She will put something together for that. Hoyt suggested handing out the ranking criteria at the same time: Capurso concurred. Hoyt said he will put some text together for that. Garrett will update web site to reflect project process; group agrees that a pamphlet will be put together in the future to describe this project process.

### **Thermal Imagery – Dave Teuscher**

Teuscher handed out the draft RFP. He said he needs to finalize deliverables to fit in with PacifiCorp's RFP format and asked for input on deliverables from the ECC. Colyer suggested tying to GIS-geo-reference the data, using the same Idaho metadata to tie to. Final points from telemetry subcommittee – it was decided to look at a 1,000-foot footprint. The subcommittee also discovered that thermal imaging is more expensive (\$275-325/river mile with video footage) than color infrared photos (not same as previously thought—about \$150/river mile). Teuscher asked for comments from the ECC

by February 26. Capurso said he wanted to emphasize that the ECC is making a choice to not use FSA flights, as we have too many other components/too specialized to make this work. Instead, we are using the PacifiCorp RFP process.

### **Public Meetings –Jim Capurso**

Capurso asked the ECC for comments on the public meeting presentation. He also asked for clarification on who from PacifiCorp will be named to receive funding proposal applications. Davies will provide Capurso with Grace address; with application going to Garrett/Davies at this point. Capurso turned in a \$35 bill for the meeting room in Preston. The Soil Conservation District boards are hosting the meetings in Montpelier and Soda Springs, but not the Preston meeting. Cost of \$37/district for mailing—ECC says yes; PacifiCorp needs invoice and Claudia can pay with company check. Capurso said he would like to set up daytime meetings also with local chambers, etc. (local radio stations and newspapers). Capurso will also set up a meeting with Wendell Smith, long-time local landowner, to discuss issues. Refreshments at the public meetings will be provided by PacifiCorp. Capurso also discussed another land trust (IDFP&L) that would like to come to the next meeting.

### **Annual Report and Funding – Monte Garrett**

Garrett requested comments for the March 1 submittal of Annual Report to FERC and clarified that means it needs to go to the printer soon. Garrett asked for final comments on the annual report by Monday, February 28. Garrett then presented a funding account balance ledger/sheet. He pointed out that facilitation services in 2004 cost \$22,000, which was deducted from the genetics study fund, as decided by the ECC; the balance needed for the genetics study will come out of the aerial photography fund. Extra amount on thermal tags will also come out of this fund. Garrett pointed out that PacifiCorp accountants are determining what the interest index will be, and he used 2 percent as a placeholder. He said he will get back to the ECC on this; the interest rate is calculated on an annual basis. Garrett illustrated the escalation value of inflation – approximately 3 percent annually for the different funds. Garrett also showed a ledger of environmental coordinator and project coordinator hours (the one FTE obligation of the Settlement Agreement); this year it came out at 1577 hours. Next month we will discuss specifics of what environmental coordinator tasks are.

### **March Agenda**

EC/Facilitation needs—1 hr.  
Environmental Report—1 hr.  
Removal Plan—1 hr.  
Cove Settlement Agreement—30 min.  
Twin Lakes Proposal—1 hr.  
Public Mtgs Summary—15 min.  
IDFP&L Trust Presentation—30 min.  
Project Proposal Form/Pamphlet/Website Design—1 hr.  
Grace/Cove Site Plan Update—30 min.

Black Canyon RFP discussion—30 min.

16 March 8 a.m. start for the next ECC meeting

## **Attachments**

Figure 1 – Timeline for Cove Settlement Agreement  
Figure 2 – Removal Plan