

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

Commitments Made at the March 2005 ECC Meeting	
All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review memo to FERC regarding the proposed Twin Lakes dam prepared by Marv Hoyt and distributed to ECC members by email 3/25/05. Be prepared to discuss comments or concerns at the April meeting. • Review and provide comments on the Dam Removal Plan to Monte Garrett. • Review and provide comments on the Grace-Cove Site Plan to Eve Davies.
Monte Garrett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribute a preliminary draft of the Environmental Report for Cove Settlement Agreement to ECC members. • Prepare draft RFP for Black Canyon monitoring work. • Prepare RFP for thermal imaging work. • Receive/prepare proposals for funding in preparation for the subcommittee meeting.
Marv Hoyt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft a memo to FERC regarding the ECC's position on the proposed Twin Lakes dam and forward to ECC members for review and comment.
Greg Mladenka	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Black Canyon Monitoring Plan. Revised based on comments from Charlie Vincent and American Whitewater. Send revisions to Monte Garrett and Susan Kammerdiener (SWCA).
Claudia Conder	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to research possible land purchase.
Deb Mignogno	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrange for land trust group to attend the April ECC meeting.

Decisions Made at the March 2005 ECC Meeting

- Draft a memo to FERC stating the ECC's position on Twin Lakes Canal Company's proposed Bear River Narrows Reservoir project.
- Form a subcommittee to review and rank funding proposals from outside groups.
- Revise the Black Canyon Monitoring Plan based on comments from American Whitewater.
- Rotate meeting facilitation responsibility among ECC members.
- Continue meeting with land trust organizations.
- Develop a brochure or pamphlet describing the ECC's work.

ECC Members Present

Monte Garrett, PacifiCorp
Charlie Vincent, American Whitewater
Jim Capurso, U.S. Forest Service
Deb Mignogno, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Marv Hoyt, Greater Yellowstone Coalition
Warren Colyer, Trout Unlimited
Pat Koelsch, Bureau of Land Management
Greg Mladenka, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality
Jim Mende, Idaho Department of Fish and Game

Others Present

Blaine Newman, Bureau of Land Management
Becky Lazduaskas, Bureau of Land Management
Eve Davies, PacifiCorp
Dick Scully, Idaho Department of Fish and Game
Jeff Seamons, Citizen of Preston
Kelly Holt, PacifiCorp
Glen Pond, PacifiCorp
David Eskelsen, PacifiCorp
Claudia Conder, PacifiCorp
Dave Teuscher, Idaho Department of Fish and Game
Earl Ward, Twin Lakes Canal Company
Nick Josten, GeoSense
Clair Bosen, Twin Lakes Canal Company
Steven Smith, Idaho Soil Conservation Service
Connely Baldwin, PacifiCorp
David Schiess, Twin Lakes Canal Company
Richard Westerberg, Citizen
Neal Artz, Cirrus Environmental Solutions
Kelli Taylor, Cirrus Environmental Solutions
Will Shallenberger, PacifiCorp

ECC Members Not Present

Susan Rosebrough, National Park Service
Lynn Van Every, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (Greg Mladenka sitting in)
Kevin Lewis, Idaho Rivers United
Scott Pratt, PacifiCorp
Hunter Osborne, Shoshone Bannock Tribes

Participating by Telephone

Mary Lucachick, Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation

Welcome and Review of Agenda and Commitments - Monte Garrett

Garrett informed the ECC that PacifiCorp facilitator Scott Pratt would not be able to attend and Garrett would conduct the meeting in Pratt's absence. It was also noted that this was to have been Pratt's final meeting, as he is leaving PacifiCorp to continue his education.

Review of Draft Meeting Notes – Monte Garrett

Notes from the February ECC meeting were approved with changes from Greg Mladenka (Idaho Department of Environmental Quality) and Deb Mignogno (US Fish and Wildlife Service).

Project Updates – Monte Garrett

Garrett told the ECC that a FERC order had been issued approving the Temporary Amendment of Article 408, and that PacifiCorp can adjust flows when the license amendment application is filed so that monitoring work can proceed in Black Canyon. However, methodology for conducting monitoring in Black Canyon has not been finalized and a contractor has not yet been selected to do the work. Dick Scully (Idaho Department of Fish and Game) asked why flows, which have been approximately 100 cfs, are so high. Garrett said it has been difficult setting the flow gate on Grace dam to provide a consistent outflow. Kelly Holt (PacifiCorp) noted that flow measurement is not exact, especially in shallow streams. He said the gate opening has not changed, yet flow measurements have varied. Holt also noted that flows have not gone below the required minimum, and that PacifiCorp is erring on the high side. Scully asked whether flow measurements will be refined or improved. Garrett said they should, especially when the new spillgate is installed in upcoming years, and he will keep the ECC informed. Patrick Koelsch (Bureau of Land Management) said he would be more concerned if PacifiCorp were erring on the low side.

Garrett also noted that approval has been received from FERC on the Fish Salvage Plan, the 2004 Annual Report has been filed with FERC, and the Historic Resources Management Plan (last of the major plans required by FERC) will be filed at the end of March.

Recap of Public Meetings – Jim Capurso

Capurso (U.S. Forest Service) reviewed the outcome of the public meetings on the ECC's role and activities that were held in February. Capurso said meetings were also held with county commissioners, Rotary Club, other public groups, PacifiCorp linemen. Glen Pond (PacifiCorp) and Capurso said they thought the meetings went well. Capurso added that it was good to get ahead of any possible public misinformation regarding the ECC. Marv Hoyt (Greater Yellowstone Coalition) said he heard a comment that there was too much emphasis on money at the public meetings (i.e., that people may have felt like we were saying that the only way we are going to get conservation is to buy it).

Project Funding Proposals

Deb Mignogno (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) told ECC members that the proposal subcommittee decided on a May 10, 2005 date for the first review of applications for funding, and asked for ECC input on whether October 10 would be an appropriate date for the next round of proposal review. Eve Davies suggested a midwinter date to avoid farmers' busy times. Mignogno suggested getting the subcommittee to work out the details. Garrett asked whether any proposals had been received. Warren Colyer said a proposal had been received from Martin Mast, who owns a wetlands complex that he would like to manage for wildlife. Mignogno said she had attended a meeting of the Sagebrush Steppe Land Trust and that group will have proposals for the ECC soon. Colyer suggested de-emphasizing deadlines for proposals and instead accept applications year-round, but evaluate them twice a year. Discussion was tabled until later in the day.

Introduce David Eskelsen – PacifiCorp External Communications

Garrett introduced David Eskelsen to the ECC. Eskelsen prepared PacifiCorp's recent press release regarding Cove and attended the public meetings in February. Eskelsen said he felt the public meetings were successful and Garrett agreed, adding that the message got through that there is funding available that will benefit resources in the basin, as well as the local communities.

Environmental Coordinator Time Budget – Monte Garrett

Garrett presented a time budget for PacifiCorp's environmental coordinator (EC) position (Attachment A-1) during 2004 and asked the ECC for their comments and concerns. Mignogno said as time goes on, the ECC will be meeting less, and time will be shifted to work on the ground, grant writing, etc. She said she hopes this will happen within the coming year, stating that she would like to see less time in meetings and more time on project work. She said the EC will be central point of contact for incoming information, proposals, etc.

Capurso said that 50 percent time seemed to be too much for planning and conducting meetings. Garrett clarified that the time included all the FERC plans that were prepared. Capurso suggested that planning and conducting meetings be reduced to 25 percent and more hours be shifted to other areas, like identifying willing landowners. Garrett clarified that this was last year's time commitment, and he fully expects that past time allocations for the EC will change.

Koelsch said he believed that the environmental coordinator would be the primary point of contact for the public, and would be the person who went out to meet people and see their land, etc. Garrett said he anticipates that when proposals come in, the environmental coordinator will identify an appropriate person on the ECC to go out and meet with the

person. Koelsch said he still feels the environmental coordinator should be the person who initially goes out. Garrett said initial contact would be by phone, and he doesn't see going out for every meeting as the best use of the EC's time. Garrett said he would rather send best qualified person, but added that the ECC can discuss this later, during proposal portion of the agenda. Garrett also noted that in the coming months he will be phased out of the EC position and replaced, perhaps by someone local.

Colyer asked how long monthly ECC meetings would continue. Garrett said perhaps for another year, until the Settlement Agreement for Cove and telemetry studies are complete. Garrett said he expects to stay with the group for perhaps another 6 months.

Mignogno suggested that the ECC plan to conduct annual public meetings to keep a public profile. Davies suggested that we show photos, etc. to help build interest. Scully added that it would be good to have brochures to hand out in routine dealings with the landowners and also suggested soliciting newspaper articles. It was noted that a DVD of the public meetings is available from the Soda Springs television station (Chat TV).

Facilitation Needs

With Scott Pratt's departure, the need for facilitation at future meetings was discussed. Mignogno suggested that ECC members take turns running the meetings. Charlie Vincent (American Whitewater) said he thought a paid facilitator would be worth it if it saves ECC members' time. There was general agreement among ECC members to try rotating responsibility for running the meetings among themselves for a period of time and see if it works. Garrett suggested that the ECC decide who will run the next meeting at the end of each ECC meeting during this trial period.

Twin Lakes Canal Company – Clair Bosen

Bosen was introduced to ECC members to present an update on Twin Lake Canal Company's (TLCC) proposal for a dam on the Bear River. Bosen said he feels there is quite a lot of common ground between TLCC and the ECC. He said as stockholder and director of TLCC, he has the job of getting permitting done for the proposed Oneida Narrows dam. He said he was at today's ECC meeting mainly to inform the ECC of what TLCC wants to do and the reasons behind it.

Bosen introduced Nick Josten of GeoSense as the person who will prepare the license application. Josten said he has been communicating with FERC and other agencies, identifying issues and dealing with them. He said he also anticipates dealing with many of the ECC members in coming years. Josten said that during the FERC process, there will be opportunities for public input. He said any information filed with FERC is public information, and is available from FERC on the internet. Josten presented a map of the TLCC's project (Attachment A-2).

Mignogno asked for more history on the project. Bosen addressed water rights. He said TLCC has senior rights in Mink Creek, which runs into the Bear River. A goal is to provide additional water storage, especially during winter. Water storage would back

water up in the Bear River between Mink Creek and Oneida dam and would convert the river to a reservoir, which would be the main impact of this project. It would also inundate roads and recreation facilities.

Hoyt asked about the storage capacity of the proposed reservoir. Bosen said it would be 15 to 16 thousand acre-feet. Facilities would include a 104-foot dam, powerhouse, and facilities to make water delivery more efficient. Money for power generation would be used to pay for improvements to make water delivery more efficient.

Bosen said he thinks that as part of the project, Mink Creek could be made a better Bonneville cutthroat trout fishery.

Colyer asked whether the reservoir would really increase efficiency if water loss from reservoir due to evaporation were taken into account (versus using the siphon). Bosen said TLCC currently loses 32 percent of the water that goes into the canal, and that as part of the project the canal will be converted to a pipeline.

Bosen cited two main reasons for the project:

- 1) Loss of water to Utah
- 2) The need for hydroelectric generation to fund improvements such as canal lining or piping.

Bosen noted that TLCC would not be using the water in the winter, but storing for later use in summer.

Garrett asked for evaporation loss. David Schiess (TLCC) estimated the loss at 3-4 feet, but noted that he did not have exact figures with him. Bosen added that the proponents have searched for other suitable locations for a reservoir, but there are none.

Hoyt asked about potential problems with groundwater recharge if canals are lined or piped. Bosen said wells aren't used extensively in the project area, and that other canal-lining efforts actually prevented problems with flooded basements, etc. Bosen clarified that 3 1/2 miles of the Bear River would be used for storage under their proposal.

Vincent asked what kind of mitigation there would be for recreation use (whitewater boating, etc) if the Twin Lakes project goes forward. Bosen said plans include building a campground and boat launch below the dam, with additional access on the company's stockholders' land. Vincent said this would satisfy recreation users such as fishermen, but not whitewater boaters. Bosen noted that flows would be more constant with the dam in place, and that achieving more constant flows would also help with fencing, which is currently damaged by icing in winter. This would help keep cattle off the river banks, he said.

Schiess said the hydro facility would be a small power producer, there would be no peaking, etc. and it would generate evenly. There would be no large swings in water levels, rather a constant small release. Bosen added that it would be a 10 megawatt plant.

Mladenka asked whether TLCC had looked at other alternatives, like putting heat tape on the siphon, to save money. Bosen said yes, but the problem is that there are many--not just one--siphons that have the same problem with freezing up in winter. Bosen said they have even looked at burying pipe.

Capurso asked whether TLCC had looked into grants for water conservation. Bosen said TLCC has not really looked into that.

Vincent said that while it seems that project feasibility is good, environmentally TLCC is up against a huge wall. He asked whether the TLCC has an alternate plan.

Bosen said he agrees that it looks like the dam can go in and he feels there are things TLCC can provide to offset potential impacts. He said the company hopes to work on that in the coming year.

Hoyt asked what the problem has been with previous proposals for a dam in this area. Bosen said previous proposals included too large of a project. Schiess said the inundation zone for the project has been staked and GPSed.

Claudia Conder (PacifiCorp) asked if the project included a proposal to bring an access road in a different location. Bosen said yes and described two possible locations for new roads that tie in with existing roads. Hoyt asked about the number of miles of new road proposed. Bosen said he is not sure yet. Hoyt noted that road building would be expensive, and perhaps that hasn't been looked at thoroughly enough. Bosen said he feels TLCC can do it. Garrett asked whether the counties have agreed to take on maintenance of the roads once they are built. Bosen said no.

Mignogno asked whether TLCC had included fish passage in their project design. Bosen said no, but design isn't done yet, only a feasibility study.

Capurso gave some of the history of the Settlement Agreement, including fish passage, which the ECC would like to address in the next 30-year period. Capurso said the TLCC proposal could jeopardize the Settlement Agreement. Schiess said TLCC would not do that and could add fish passage. Capurso questioned whether mitigation in Mink Creek would mitigate loss on the Bear River.

Mladenka asked whether Mink Creek is all on private land and whether recreation opportunities be the same on Mink Creek. Bosen said yes, that TLCC could make more space available through their stockholders, who own the land on Mink Creek.

Bosen said he has fished the Bear River for years and has never caught a Bonneville cutthroat trout in the river, only in Mink Creek.

Hoyt asked about water rights, and whether the priority date changes with point of diversion.

Mignogno asked whether TLCC has consulted with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes. Bosen said no.

Capurso asked about the economic impact of the proposal, such as opportunities forgone by going forward with project as the Bear River has other resource values. He said he believed this should be included in TLCC's study. Bosen said concerns such as this would be addressed if ECC members would put them on paper.

Mignogno pointed out that the FERC process is different, as FERC's traditional methods require certain specific studies, etc.

Davies asked about the project's timeline. Bosen said TLCC doesn't have one yet. Josten said that TLCC will follow the traditional FERC process, and will be contacting agencies officially. He said he expects the process will take up to 2 years. Bosen said he would send Garrett a list of contact information for the TLCC to distribute to the ECC. Garrett asked how TLCC sees things going forward with FERC. Bosen asked that everyone in the room to write up concerns so they may be addressed. Bosen said he expects public meetings on the proposal to take place in May or June.

In closing, Bosen said TLCC would be willing to come back for another meeting with the ECC if needed.

<break>

Colyer asked ECC members whether they felt the ECC should move from expressing reservations about the TLCC's proposal to opposition (i.e., their project would result in a violation of the Settlement Agreement).

It was noted that TLCC may believe it is possible to address all the ECC's concerns based on the ECC's previous letter to FERC regarding the Twin Lakes project. Colyer said he felt the ECC should not lead TLCC on about the possibility of gaining ECC support for their proposal. Garrett asked for a volunteer to develop a letter. Capurso said he felt that may be premature, and suggested waiting for the scoping period.

Blaine Newman (Bureau of Land Management) said he thought TLCC would like to state that they have spoken with the ECC and are addressing our concerns. Garrett said that the ECC could restate that the ECC does not support the Twin Lakes proposal. Hoyt offered to review the ECC's letter to FERC regarding the Twin Lakes proposal drafted by Scott Yates and draft a new one. Hoyt will then distribute the letter to the ECC for review. Mignogno also suggested drafting a letter to the editor regarding the Twin Lakes proposal.

Dave Tuescher (Idaho Department of Fish and Game) countered some of the points made by TLCC during their presentation and noted that he and Dick Scully (Idaho Department

of Fish and Game) did not correct apparent misinformation point by point during their presentation because this was not the appropriate forum.

Environmental Report for Cove – Neal Artz, Cirrus Environmental

Artz and Kelli Taylor (also of Cirrus) presented an update on progress on the Cove Environment Report since the last review (see Attachment A-3 - Issues and concerns to be addressed in the Environmental Report).

Artz said there is still a question on whether the State lands owns the Bear River bed. At this point it appears this is not the case, and permitting from State Lands may not be required.

Artz said the wolf and the bald eagle were identified as wildlife species of concern for the project; however, the impacts to these species due to decommissioning were not likely.

Water quantity and quality were identified as a key issue. Hoyt asked whether water rights would be addressed in the ER. Taylor said the issue was addressed in the EIS. Garrett said the ER should address the fact that downstream water rights would not be affected by the project. Artz suggested addressing water rights under issues considered but not analyzed in detail.

Artz and Taylor asked for clarification on an ECC comment during previous review regarding travertine bedrock. The ECC agreed that this is not an issue, and it will not be considered further.

There was a discussion of the Gentile Valley diversion being a continuing barrier to fish passage even if Cove is taken out. Garrett noted that the Gentile Valley diversion is not a large impediment and added that the ECC anticipates dealing with fish passage for the Gentile Valley facility in the future. Connely Baldwin (PacifiCorp) said that if water is in short supply, the stream could be dry below the diversion point if Gentile Valley takes their flow. He added that this has already happened during the recent drought. Jim Mende (Idaho Department of Fish and Game) said he was not aware that there could be dryout during drought years. Garrett said yes, this was presented on hydrographs during the Settlement Agreement. Baldwin clarified that that is most likely to occur during "shoulder season," and that augmentation from storage water begins soon after. Koelsch said this was still a concern, as it only takes one day to kill the fish. Colyer said maybe not, that fish could move out of the area, and added that he believed occasional dry spells are still better than having a dam.

Mignogno asked that a section on Threatened and Endangered Species be added to the wildlife section of the Environmental Report. It was also noted that the number of employees should be revised in the socioeconomic section. It was estimated that one or two jobs could potentially be lost due to Cove decommissioning. Holt and Garrett will discuss and get a number to Artz.

<Lunch Break>

Union-Pacific Railroad Property – Claudia Conder, PacifiCorp

Conder distributed a memo regarding Union-Pacific Railroad's interest in selling its property in the project area (Attachment A-4). Conder also discussed a possible land purchase in the project area. The ECC requested that Conder contact the landowner about this possibility and report back at the next meeting.

Sediment and Survey Update - Will Shallenberger – PacifiCorp

Shallenberger updated the ECC on plans for Cove decommissioning and sediment sampling.

Sediment Sampling

Shallenberger said sediment sampling efforts had been delayed until ice cleared off the forebay. The forebay is now clear, and he hopes that sampling will take place on Monday (3/21/05). He said the barge that will be used to conduct sampling is already on site and is ready to go.

Dam Removal Plan (50 percent plan)

Shallenberger gave ECC members a Powerpoint presentation on dam removal plans. He noted that sheet 120 of the plans shows the proposed sequence of events for dam removal.

Shallenberger said crews will notch the dam and grade during stage 2 of dewatering. Capurso asked whether notching could be done in the area where the newly restored stream channel would be. Shallenberger said that is a possibility.

Capurso asked if there will be recontouring of the streambank once the dam is removed. Shallenberger said yes, but we won't know how extensive recontouring will be until the amount of sediment present is revealed. He added that there will be both recontouring and hydroseeding of the banks.

Colyer asked whether the channel will be constructed or if a new streambed will just happen. Shallenberger said PacifiCorp will excavate the initial portion (immediately upstream) of the new channel by digging underwater before dam removal is complete.

Colyer asked about building a longer coffer dam to dewater and whether that would help limit sediment. Hoyt asked how much sediment IDEQ would allow. Shallenberger noted that the sediment is not likely fine-grained, and that not all will be released when the dam comes out – some will be released during a high-flow conditions.

Colyer asked if the river was left to build its own channel, how long would that process take. Shallenberger said much is not yet known about the nature and amount of sediments present on site, so that would be difficult to answer.

Mladenka noted that IDEQ has standards for turbidity, including for one-time releases. But the lack of information on sediments present behind the dam has precluded analysis of potential impacts.

Garrett asked ECC members for comments on the Dam Removal Plan, and noted that much of the Environmental Report will be based on information presented in the Removal Plan.

Colyer asked whether others (e.g., Jack Schmidt, Utah State University) would be consulted regarding channel reconstruction. Shallenberger agreed it would make a good research project because this really has not been studied but that may be out of scope for the project. Garrett said experts may be included in the next level of review for the Removal Plan.

Shallenberger also showed historic photos of the project area, which showed that the river consisted of a relatively straight stream channel before Cove was in place.

Garrett asked that ECC members forward any comments on the Removal Plan to him, and he will pass them along to Shallenberger. He noted that the Dam Removal Plan and the Environmental Report will be included as appendices to the Settlement Agreement for Cove and that comments will be needed soon so that the Settlement Agreement for Cove can move forward.

Grace-Cove Site Plan – Eve Davies, PacifiCorp

A draft of the Grace-Cove Site Plan was distributed to ECC members for review and comment. Garrett noted that he will also circulate electronic copies. It was noted that the site plan is not yet complete, and comments would be appreciated, especially on the structure (outline) of plan and whether the content meets everyone's needs. The Grace-Cove Site Plan will serve as a template for other Site Plans in the future. It was also noted that a series of maps incorporating layers from the Land Management Plan will soon be added.

Idaho Foundation for Parks and Lands – Tony Varilone

Tony Varilone, a representative of IFPL, was introduced to ECC members. Varilone said he became interested in the ECC when he heard the ECC had funding for land and water acquisition for conservation purposes. He said perhaps the ECC and IFPL could work jointly on these types of projects, with IFPL taking responsibility for planning, etc. and serving as the land management agency in perpetuity. Varilone said the IFPL would do planning in conjunction with the ECC on such projects.

Hoyt noted that the IFPL's board doesn't appear to have depth in conservation, and since the ECC has the task of doing a lot of restoration/conservation work, he wonders whether this is a good fit.

Garrett asked Varilone for clarification, for instance, is IFPL proposing that if the ECC identified and bought a parcel of land, would the process be that the ECC then transferred ownership of the land to IFPL in fee and title, and IFPL would then manage it? Varilone said yes. He also said that if the ECC would like to speak with other IFPL board members, please let him know.

Hoyt said he thought the ECC should talk with other land trusts before making a decision. Mignogno asked whether IFPL has a certain area of expertise. Varilone said no, the foundation has a huge variety of projects and approaches. Mende asked for clarification about the connection between IFPL and Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation. Varilone said IFPL donated the land for Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation's new building in exchange for office space. Mende asked whether the two groups maintain a relationship. Varilone said yes.

Cove Settlement Agreement – Monte Garrett

Garrett updated ECC members on the Settlement Agreement for Cove. He said over the next couple months, the explanatory statement will be drafted in preparation for completing the license amendment application package for filing with the FERC. Garrett is planning for the explanatory statement to be prepared in concert with the ECC.

Black Canyon Monitoring Plan

Vincent discussed comments on recent revisions to Black Canyon Monitoring Plan that define a 10 percent change (+/-) in monitoring parameters as biologically significant. Vincent said he thinks the way the BCMP is currently structured, there are too many variables between sampling events to isolate whitewater flows as the cause. Mladenka agreed that there would be other factors to investigate as the potential source of changes in monitored parameters, and a "weight of evidence" approach would be used.

Vincent said he would still like to have that section of the BCMP reworked (i.e., p. 9 Data Analysis, Impact Analysis). Garrett said time is a factor in finalizing the BCMP. He said the BCMP must be completed before the monitoring task can go out for bid. Mladenka said he would review, make changes, and get the BCMP to Garrett within a week. Assuming that schedule, Garrett will distribute draft Request for Proposals for the monitoring work in Black Canyon prior to the April meeting.

Proposal Funding/Website Design and Pamphlet

ECC members discussed the need for a brochure or pamphlet, and decided to include this on the April ECC meeting agenda. Mignogno asked whether the funding proposal form was available on the ECC's website. Garrett said he would add the long form to the website. ECC members decided on May 10 and November 30 as evaluation dates for funding proposals.

ECC members established a funding proposal review subcommittee made up of the following members:

Eve Davies
Monte Garrett
Deb Mignogno
Warren Colyer
Marv Hoyt
Jim Capurso
Lynn Van Every

Next Agenda - April 20, 2005

ECC members agreed to hold the April 2005 meeting at Grace. The proposal funding subcommittee will meet at 9 a.m., with the regular ECC meeting beginning at 11 a.m. A land trust will be invited for discussion after the regular meeting (Mignogno will arrange for them to attend).

Mignogno agreed to facilitate the April meeting.

Proposed Agenda Items

- Decide whether to continue meeting monthly.
- Pamphlet (30 min)
- Twin Lakes position paper (15 min)
- Kackley Springs land sale (15 min)
- Sediment sampling/grading plan survey results (1 hour)
- Environmental Report Review (30 min).
- Grace Site Plan (15 min)
- Review draft Black Canyon RFP (30 min)
- Thermal imaging RFP (15 min)
- Follow with a land trust group, arranged by Mignogno.

Attachments: Handouts

- A-1 Environmental Coordinator Time Budget (2004)
- A-2 Map of Twin Lakes Canal Company's proposed reservoir and dam
- A-3 Issues and Concerns to be addressed in the Environmental Report
- A-4 Memo to ECC members from Claudia Conder, PacifiCorp, regarding Union Pacific Railroad Property for sale.