

**Final Notes**  
**Bear River Environmental Coordination Committee Meeting**  
**Funding Proposal Subcommittee Meeting**  
**April 4, 2006**  
**Grace, Idaho**

---

<b>Commitments Made at the April 5, 2006 Bear River ECC Meeting</b>	
All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Send any examples of data sharing protocols to Mark Stenberg</li> </ul>
Mark Stenberg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue working to refine thermal imaging task.</li> <li>• Notify land trusts regarding decision made to offer the MOA for land trust services to Sagebrush-Steppe Land Trust with MOA as is, barring legal problems with the MOA, or the MOA will be offered to another land trust. SSLT must decide by April 20.</li> <li>• Draft language regarding use of land &amp; water acquisition funds for diversion inventory.</li> </ul>
Lynn Van Every	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contact Idaho State University professor about upcoming studies above and below Cove regarding dam removal.</li> </ul>
Eve Davies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue discussions regarding Cove fencing (with Buffi Morris and Claudia Conder)</li> </ul>
Funding Proposal subcommittee members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Call projects proponents to inform them of the status of their funding proposals.</li> </ul>

**Decisions Made at This Meeting:**

- When decisions are made during ECC meetings, stop and check for consensus.
- Move forward with thermal imaging work as bid.
- Agree to work with one land trust.
- Offer the land trust services MOA to one land trust. Offer the MOA as written barring specific legal problems that would prevent acceptance of the MOA.
- Offer the MOA to Sagebrush-Steppe Land Trust.
- If Sagebrush-Steppe does not accept the MOA as written, barring legal problems, it will be offered to the Idaho Foundation for Parks and Lands.
- Allocate land and water acquisition funds as recommended by the subcommittee.
- Fund habitat enhancement proposals as recommended by the subcommittee.
- Monitor use of land and water acquisition funds for irrigation diversion data gathering project for 10 years, and reimburse the funds if use does not meet the intended purpose.
- Use \$13,000 irrigation diversion mapping funds for thermal imaging project to cover shortage needed for rubber sheeting the images.

**ECC Members Present**

Mark Stenberg, PacifiCorp  
Deb Mignogno, US Fish and Wildlife Service  
Jim Capurso, US Forest Service  
Pat Koelsch, Bureau of Land Management  
Warren Colyer, Trout Unlimited  
Marv Hoyt, Greater Yellowstone Coalition  
Lynn Van Every, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality  
Jim Mende, Idaho Department of Fish and Game

**Others Present**

Eve Davies, PacifiCorp  
Claudia Conder, PacifiCorp  
Glen Pond, PacifiCorp (Rocky Mountain Power)  
Scott Pratt, Option Management  
Kelly Holt, PacifiCorp  
Clair Bosen, Twin Lakes Canal Company  
Steve Anderson, Idaho Department of Fish and Game  
Dave Eskelsen, PacifiCorp  
Dave Teuscher, Idaho Department of Fish and Game  
Buffi Morris, PacifiCorp

**Participating By Telephone (some of the time)**

Mary Lucachick, Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation

**Review of Notes and Agenda**

An update on the Implementation 2005 Annual Report was added to the agenda.

Notes from the previous ECC meeting were accepted with changes from Mignogno on the Funding Proposal subcommittee notes (p. 3, 6).

**Review of Commitments**

The following February 2006 commitments were carried forward:

- All - Forward outstanding invoices for habitat enhancement funds to Stenberg.
- All - Consider adopting a protocol for sharing of data gathered during ECC-sponsored studies. Stenberg will work on a preliminary model. Will discuss at a future meeting.
- Davies - Continue to meet with landowners regarding Cove fencing.
- Stenberg - Report back to ECC regarding SHPO MOA.
- Teuscher - Continue to coordinate available temperature data for Black Canyon among ECC member agencies and organizations.
- Van Every - Continue discussion with Gangemi regarding use of artificial vs. natural substrates for Black Canyon monitoring. Report back when there is a recommendation.

## **Updates**

### **Habitat Enhancement Funds**

Stenberg noted that some project sponsors still have outstanding invoices for 2005 habitat enhancement projects. He asked the ECC if there should be a set time frame for disbursing funds. Van Every and Colyer said there may be problems with delays in working with private landowners. Stenberg said he wants to zero out funding balances at some time and doesn't think the ECC should hold funds indefinitely for projects. Capurso suggested checking in on ongoing projects once a year. Colyer suggested checking in every two months, by reviewing what was still out at the beginning of each regular ECC meeting. Van Every suggested a larger review of ongoing projects every year. Mignogno suggested adding this to the monitoring report.

### **2005 Annual Report**

Stenberg said the 30-day review of the annual report was complete and comments were received from Teuscher and Mignogno. In regard to Mignogno's comments on the Grace/Cove Site Plan, Davies suggested adding the implementation schedule from the Grace/Cove Site Plan as an appendix to the annual report. Davies noted that two implementation tasks were not yet completed, Kackley Spring and lease revisions. She also noted an error in the site plan that involved weed spraying. An errata sheet will be sent out to correct this and other clarifications to the plan. Davies said that yearly monitoring will be summarized in the annual report, and a more lengthy monitoring report will be available on the Bear River ECC's web site.

### **Cove Decommissioning**

Stenberg said he will go through comments and updates to the Cove Removal Plan with ECC members during lunch.

Hoyt told ECC members he had been contacted by Idaho Rivers United about holding a celebration of Cove Decommissioning. Stenberg said he spoke with Kevin Lewis of IRU about working with the ECC on this because of sensitivity of issues surrounding Cove.

### **Thermal Imaging**

Stenberg said that PacifiCorp would be awarding the bid for thermal imaging work to Watershed Sciences of Corvallis Ore. (for \$84,000). Rubbersheeting was not awarded, he said. Teuscher said he would like to have photos corrected to work with existing GIS coverage and suggested not shooting the upper watershed, i.e., the Cub River and Thomas Fork, in order to pay for this. Teuscher said if he had to choose one of the two, he would eliminate the Cub River first. Stenberg said that flights will take place during the third to fourth week in July. Colyer asked for a firm date, and said that perhaps alternative sources of funding could be used. Van Every said IDEQ could possibly contribute in order to get the entire watershed done. (Following discussion determined that using the \$13k for irrigation diversion mapping funds with the existing thermal imaging funds will cover the cost of all the flights and the rubber sheeting of the images.)

## **ECC Roles and Responsibilities – Scott Pratt**

ECC members took part in a facilitated discussion of ECC roles and responsibilities. Mende asked whether PacifiCorp was covering Pratt's fees. Stenberg said yes.

Pratt said he had spoken individually with ECC members prior to the meeting, and some expressed concern about decisions and communications (i.e., stress) regarding telemetry/temperature work, land trust selection, and aerial photography. Stenberg asked that the focus of the discussion be on issues that led to problems. Pratt suggested going around room, giving each ECC member 5 minutes to comment.

Teuscher said he felt that IRZ should have been included in the thermal imaging bid process. He said that the ECC had agreed to include them, then at the next ECC meeting were told that IRZ was not invited to bid, which PacifiCorp had decided with no further discussion with the ECC. Teuscher said he does not believe that PacifiCorp should have veto power over ECC decisions.

Hoyt said he had felt comfortable letting the subcommittee make the decision on thermal imaging. He said he was not concerned specifically that IRZ didn't get to bid, but he does not want to set a pattern that PacifiCorp makes decisions for the ECC out of expediency.

Mende said it seems that ECC decisions are subject to review and approval by PacifiCorp.

Van Every said it seemed that on a couple of issues, the environmental coordinator has taken decisions made by the ECC and run them through PacifiCorp's fiscal people or upper management, where he gets a different viewpoint than what the ECC had agreed to. He said the environmental coordinator needs to be careful to keep the ECC informed, whether expediency is needed or not.

Hoyt said the ECC should then have another opportunity to review and discuss before a decision is made, or there will be an appearance that PacifiCorp is making decisions unilaterally.

Stenberg said that in regard to IRZ, he had already spoken with Davies and (former EC) Monte Garrett and had a position on the firm in mind. He said he was surprised when Teuscher suggested that IRZ should get the RFP. He said the ECC did not formally reach consensus about sending IRZ the bid, and said he was wondering why the ECC thought it was their role to tell PacifiCorp who to do business with. Stenberg said he did not come to consensus as PacifiCorp's ECC representative. Stenberg said he discussed the ECC desire to solicit a proposal from IRZ with PacifiCorp's procurement officer and was again advised against it. Stenberg said he thought it was disingenuous to send IRZ the RFP if they weren't going to be selected based on last year's non-performance.

Stenberg said the concern is not just with PacifiCorp, but with any contractor selected by (for example) Trout Unlimited. Colyer noted that Trout Unlimited was readministering ECC funds and therefore the situation was not analogous.

Hoyt said that in past (i.e., when Garrett was serving as environmental coordinator), bids were reviewed and approved by the ECC. Van Every cited Black Canyon Monitoring. He said the subcommittee had worked on scope and met and had a strong hand (direct involvement) in selecting a contractor.

Mende said that according to the Settlement Agreement, consensus is unanimity, so he guesses the ECC did not have consensus on the IRZ decision after all.

Koelsch said that the meetings are not as formal now as they were at first. He suggested that when decisions are made, the facilitator stop and check for consensus. Mignogno suggested that all share that responsibility, including Hugentobler (check while recording). ECC members unanimously agreed to implement this.

### **Contractor Selection**

Pratt said that historically contractor selection has been a very hands-on process with the ECC. He noted that a decision had been made by the ECC to put all future work out for bid after a misunderstanding with IDFG regarding the telemetry work. In that case, IDFG had understood they would be awarded the telemetry work, but the ECC did not agree. The ECC decided to give to the work to IDFG, but put all work out for bid in the future. Pratt said that this is how it was historically done, and asked whether this differed from how Stenberg sees it.

Stenberg said no. He brought up land trust selection, and the decision to issue an RFP for land trusts. He said he had circulated the RFP to ECC members, and received no comments. He circulated the list of land trusts to receive the solicitation, as well. He said he received proposals and circulated them to the subcommittee with an evaluation matrix. Very few comments were received. He said that he discussed land trust selection at length with the ECC on several occasions, and doesn't see this as little or minimal selection process. Stenberg said it was not made clear to him from the beginning that there was tacit understanding about the future involvement with Sagebrush Steppe Land Trust (SSLT) prior to issuance of RFP. He said it is clear to him now that the ECC and PacifiCorp had in the previous year made actions that sent a clear message about future intent, and that he had subsequently found out that most ECC members considered the RFP just a paper process to satisfy PacifiCorp procurement rules. He said he also offered to circulate the RFP for aerial photography, and heard from two members. He said he believes that he's been very inclusive and these steps seem the same or more intensive than those previously employed for contractor selection.

Davies said that perhaps she and Garrett had not communicated some ECC history to Stenberg during transition.

In regard to land trust history, Mignogno said that excitement had built to involve SSLT on a planned property purchase in the Grace area. She said that development of a memorandum of agreement (MOA) with a land trust was suggested, SSLT reviewed it and paid a lawyer to review it as well. The project is now stalled, she said. She said that now another project was received from SSLT and she was told the MOA was not needed because the land trust submitted the project rather than the ECC, so she is very confused about the process.

Stenberg said one problem was that PacifiCorp's legal department worked on the MOA without involving the procurement department, a company problem. He said he could have proceeded differently but was not made aware of concerns by the ECC until late in the process. He said Mende later told him that helping to develop the local land trust was one of the ECC's goals. Stenberg said he believes this is now being addressed by asking for further information from land trusts.

Hoyt said he was still unclear on PacifiCorp's involvement in selecting a land trust.

Stenberg said it is because PacifiCorp is the entity entering into the MOA. He said that if the ECC was a legal entity, PacifiCorp could just give the ECC the annual funding for them to administer.

Hoyt said perhaps the ECC should incorporate into a nonprofit.

Hoyt said that didn't happen with the planned purchase of property near Grace because PacifiCorp brought that project to the table, and that's what prompted the MOA.

Mende said he should have spoken up earlier but he thought the RFP was a paper process and SSLT would have a chance. He said he believed the ECC has been inconsistent in RFP decision making.

Colyer said he didn't realize that the ultimate decision on a land trust would be based on checkmarks in a box on an evaluation matrix. He said he thought there would be discussion, especially of intangibles. He said he also thought work would go to SSLT but that the ECC would be open to working with others.

Pratt asked whether there were any problems with the RFP process. He said it seems that the problem is with prior commitments, not the RFP process. He asked whether there were questions about future land acquisitions.

Mignogno said ECC members need to speak out during these processes and be sure things are made clear. She said PacifiCorp needs to listen to the ECC.

Colyer said that PacifiCorp has veto power over bids because of the procurement process. He said the ECC could incorporate, but would then have to do all the work PacifiCorp is currently providing.

Stenberg summarized the procurement process:

He said when work is coming up, the ECC will scope it as a group or a subgroup then come back to the ECC and check for consensus on scope. If an RFP is required, the ECC will be asked for names to include on the bid list, then PacifiCorp will package the RFP for bid and circulate to the ECC for comment before it is sent out to bidders. An evaluation matrix will also be circulated to the ECC (this must happen before the bids come in). When proposals come in, Stenberg will check in with the ECC or subgroup and the ECC will help select the winning bid. He said at this point, there may still be some problems with the bid from PacifiCorp's perspective, though he expects this will be rare.

Pratt asked if that happens, will it come back to the ECC for discussion. Stenberg said yes.

Davies asked about allowing outside information in evaluating proposals.

Van Every asked whether a certain dollar amount triggered the matrix evaluation process. Davies said she believed that the process was not needed for amounts under \$20,000 but for amounts over \$100,000, it was a solid need.

Pratt asked whether the ECC would like to review the chart outlining PacifiCorp's procurement process (presented at one of the first ECC meetings), adding opportunity for ECC involvement. Hoyt said he believed that process was more important in the beginning and that the phase of work requiring RFPs is almost over. Stenberg said he will see that there is more dialog if PacifiCorp vetos an ECC recommendation. Colyer said that if PacifiCorp does veto an ECC decision, it should have good reason. Stenberg said he doesn't think it will be a long-term problem.

Mignogno mentioned the evaluation matrix for land trusts. She said that she had asked Stenberg to route it to others, leaving her off the distribution list as she is a member of the SSLT's board, but Stenberg did not. Stenberg said no one asked for it.

Pratt asked about PacifiCorp's veto vs obligation and asks how much discretion PacifiCorp has in the process, and also whether the ECC would like to amend its ground rules to address PacifiCorp's veto power.

Colyer asked whether PacifiCorp has just one seat at the table, but additional power inside the company.

Mende said he would like to discuss this issue further, including the Settlement Agreement language on absence of consensus.

**<Lunch Break>**

## **ECC Roles and Responsibilities, continued**

Glen Pond discussed governance and pointed out that this was not just within the company, that PacifiCorp must report to six utility commissions. He said that all contracting is reviewed by these commissions, the books are open.

Pratt said he spoke with several ECC members during lunch and then summarized the issues raised. He said that funding mechanisms or any other decision making process is defined in the ECC's ground rules. He said the opportunity is there that if either party backs away from a decision, then there is a need to reopen the issue. In applying the ground rules, decisions can be elevated, if necessary. Ultimately, veto doesn't have much bearing, he said. Decision making comes back to the group.

Teuscher asked where decisions are elevated to. Pratt cited section 4.2 of the ECC's ground rules, i.e., when consensus is not reached, then majority voting is the next step. He noted that all ECC representatives have equal representation.

Pratt asked what ECC members could do personally to address concerns raised at this meeting.

- Mende said ECC members should assume nothing and should make sure they know what they vote on and agree to.
- Stenberg said the ECC should be sure to confirm consensus. He said when there is a contractor selection process, he will sit down with the ECC and discuss it before proceeding, and when there is a problem (like bidder selection) he won't just email, but will convene a conference call or meeting.
- Van Every said he will manage his personal workload more efficiently and be sure to review ECC meeting notes.
- Colyer said he will check his email more closely and respond in timely manner.
- Capurso said he will work on communication and work harder at listening to people's concerns.
- Hoyt said he will pay more attention to emails and review the Settlement Agreement from time to time.
- Koelsch said he will speak up if problems arise rather than waiting until the regular ECC meeting, and others should as well.
- Mignogno said she will check for consensus when decisions are made and will pay close attention.
- Hugentobler said she will keep a list of decisions for every meeting.



Mignogno asked that PacifiCorp formally notice the ECC when PacifiCorp decisions go contrary to ECC decisions.

The ECC agreed to put the IRZ issue to rest and move forward (consensus).

### **Land Trust Selection**

Mignogno excused herself from this portion of the ECC meeting as she is a member of Sagebrush-Steppe Land Trust's (SSLT) board.

Stenberg said he had spoken again with representatives of Idaho Foundation for Parks and Lands (IFPL) and SSLT. He told the ECC that IFPL said they would be willing to partner with SSLT for a period of time. He said he spoke with PacifiCorp procurement, and they said it would be OK to ask both trusts to submit any additional information they would like the ECC to have prior to making a decision. Additional information was received on March 29 and was circulated to ECC members by email. Stenberg asked for a round table on how ECC members feel about the submissions. He said he would also like to discuss the redlined MOA and who will pay for legal time required to fix it (estimated \$10,000-\$15,000 by John Sample, Stenberg thinks it may be less). Stenberg asked that the ECC consider using land and water acquisition funds for this task. Stenberg said he will not use the evaluation matrix to evaluate the proposals, as the Settlement Agreement says PacifiCorp will administer work on acquisitions at the direction of the ECC.

Stenberg said it appears from the submissions received from the land trusts that either could do the job well, while one has a cost of entry (MOA redlines), the other doesn't. He said IFPL isn't worried about MOA and SSLT and it may be because proportionately ECC projects would be a much larger percentage of SSLT's work.

Hoyt said he wanted to be sure that personnel issues with IFPL were addressed before committing to work with them. Stenberg told Hoyt that IFPL had said they would do whatever it took to work with the ECC.

Hoyt wanted to know how much it would cost to redo the MOA. Without knowing that, he said, he would have trouble deciding whether to proceed.

Koelsch said he did not support paying for revision of the MOA. He said the ECC had reviewed it and was happy with it. He said he believed that SSLT should accept or reject it as is.

Concern was raised that the land trust selection seemed to be a sole-source arrangement. Stenberg said the message he got at the February ECC meeting was that IFPL was not acceptable, and that SSLT was the only acceptable organization.

Capurso said that SSLT still has the possibility of partnering with another group if they don't accept the MOA, regardless of what the ECC decides today.

Mende said the ECC should determine how much, if any, weight to put towards previous overtures to SSLT.

Stenberg asked for a proposal on how to proceed.

Mende asked whether the ECC should first decide on whether to enter into an MOA with one group or with multiple groups. Van Every said the MOA does not preclude the ECC from working with other land trusts. Stenberg said he sees entering into multiple MOAs as rife with potential conflict. Capurso said competition is always good and that competition could help get the ECC a better deal. He also pointed out that some groups may be better suited to certain projects. Colyer said he had concerns about revisiting the decision over which group to go with again and again.

Colyer asked how the ECC would go forward if it chose to pursue MOAs with both land trusts. Capurso said he assumed that both groups would be looking for opportunities and would bring them to the ECC. Colyer said the ECC can afford to sit back and wait for that, but asked about the projects the ECC already has and needs to work with a land trust on.

Conder said she was surprised to hear talk of the ECC offering seed money for the land trusts to shop for opportunities. She said she had assumed they would be doing the shopping on their own. Stenberg and Davies said the process could work either way.

Stenberg asked again for a proposal to proceed on land trust selection. It was proposed that ECC members first decide whether to select one or multiple land trusts and a vote was called on the issue.

Hoyt - one

Koelsch – one, but don't preclude more in future.

Capurso – multiple

Colyer – one but preserve the option of using another if they bring a project to the ECC.

Van Every - one

Stenberg – one

Mende - one

Lucachick - one

Capurso said he can live with one, so consensus was reached and the ECC will work with one land trust.

The ECC then voted on whether to offer the selected land trust the MOA as it stands. If they don't accept, the MOA would be offered to the other land trust.

Van Every suggested a review of the issues outlined in MOA revisions first. Hoyt disagreed, and suggested keeping the process simple by assuming that if the MOA was that bad, the land trust will turn it down.

Capurso said that since the proposals had already been evaluated, the ECC must justify its decision if the vote goes against the previous evaluation. Stenberg said that statistically, with the supplemental information submitted, the ECC has two solid proposals at this point.

Colyer asked whether the ECC would have an out if things do not work out with the land trust selected. Stenberg said yes.

A proposal was made to select one land trust based on acceptance of the MOA, with the exception of difficulties that would make the land trust unable to lawfully perform.

A vote was taken. All ECC members present agreed. Consensus was reached.

A proposal was made to poll ECC members on their choice of a land trust to work with the ECC.

Capurso - abstaining  
Mende - SSLT  
Koelsch - SSLT  
Hoyt - SSLT  
Colyer - SSLT  
Van Every - SSLT  
Stenberg - IFPL  
Lucachick - SSLT

Check for consensus – Stenberg said he can live with decision. Consensus was reached to offer the MOA to SSLT.

## **2006 Funding Proposals**

Stenberg presented an updated habitat enhancement funding spreadsheet (Attached). He told ECC members that available funding would cover ranked proposals down to Mickelson, for a total of \$179,575 and leaving an approximately \$2,000 balance in habitat enhancement funds.

The funding proposal subcommittee's 2006 rankings were presented to the ECC. Sponsors briefly explained each recommended proposal. The subcommittee recommended that money for funding the diversion inventory proposal come from land and water acquisition funds. Davies noted that the inventory is in lieu of visiting each diversion on the ground.

Hoyt noted that previously, the ECC had discussed setting land and water acquisition funds aside for multiple years for future land purchases. He said that if the ECC proposes using these funds to conduct the diversion inventory, the ECC should have everybody

who signed the Settlement Agreement agree, because it is in direct violation of Settlement Agreement.

Colyer said he understands Hoyt's concern, but the diversion inventory would benefit land and water acquisition efforts. He said the ECC should evaluate the proposal on its own merits, rather than being rule bound.

Hoyt said he still feels like it's a stretch.

Mignogno said she is strong on the Settlement Agreement language too, but feels the diversion inventory would benefit land and water acquisition.

Davies suggested spelling out why this exception was made. Hoyt suggested monitoring whether this use of land and water acquisition funds was the right decision.

Colyer proposed using \$13,000 through thermal imaging so that coverage can be obtained of the full watershed. Then, he also proposed taking the full \$45,530 out of land and water acquisition funding to be used for irrigation diversion mapping and draft an agreement that this use of funding will be monitored for 10 years and if it doesn't meet the purpose of the land and water acquisition funds, the money will be reimbursed at the \$45,530 amount. Stenberg said this agreement will be detailed in the ECC's 2006 Annual Report.

Van Every said that the Natural Resource Conservation Service or State Ag would be good organizations to conduct the diversion inventory work.

Stenberg continued with review of the funding proposal subcommittee's rankings and briefed ECC members on an internal PacifiCorp discussion regarding use of the funding for projects outside the action area. He presented the following framework criteria as guidance for considering proposals outside the action area.

- Project must contribute to restoration objectives within the project area
  - Benefit BCT populations within the project area
  - Improve water quality within the project area
  - Other?
- Be in a time period when a substantial amount of restoration work is complete within the project area? 15-20 years?
- Have a high benefit to cost
- Other competing criteria
  - partnership opportunities
  - actions that improve status in a significant portion of range

Stenberg proposed checking for consensus on the funding package as shown, contingent on PacifiCorp management accepting the "out" projects (See Ranking Table, attached). He also proposed adding if agreement is signed with land trust and reporting on the use of

the land and water acquisition funds for diversion mapping, as well as use of \$13,000 irrigation diversion mapping funds on thermal imaging.

The ECC unanimously agreed to:

- Allocate land and water acquisition funding as recommended by the subcommittee.
- Fund habitat enhancement projects as recommended by subcommittee, subject to review of out of project area projects by PacifiCorp management.
- Monitor the use of land and water acquisition funding for irrigation mapping for 10 years, and reimburse the fund if the use of funding for this purpose does not ultimately meet the purpose of the funding.
- Use \$13,000 from Irrigation Diversion Mapping funds for aerial photography.

Project sponsors will call to inform proponents of the status of their 2006 applications.

### **Future Meetings**

#### **Meeting Schedule**

ECC members agreed to hold its next ECC meeting on June 21, 2006 at the Grace Training Facility, then resume its regular third Wednesday, every other month meeting schedule.

#### **Items for June Agenda**

- Cove decommissioning
- Sam Smith Easement
- Land Trust MOA
- Idaho State University studies of Cove decommissioning
- Funding of projects vs. plans.
- Consider setting tighter project criteria for funding proposals (e.g., whether to fund weed control projects)
- Monitoring

#### **Items for Future Discussion:**

- Status review for funded projects.
- Data sharing for consultants, etc.
- Invite ISU professor conducting studies of Cove decommissioning to ECC meeting.

2006 Funding Proposals - Project Rankings				
Kackley Springs Restoration Feasibility Evaluation and Site Plan	\$10,000	\$14,185	137	In
Ovid Irrigation Diversion	\$11,000	\$45,000	135	In
Alleman Lower Diversions Screening and Bypass	\$30,000	\$45,000	131	In
Cub River Phase II – Screening	\$47,000	\$154,000	130	In
Nounan Road Crossing of Skinner Creek	\$25,000	\$55,000	129	In
Davis Canyon Fence/Cattleguard	\$2,000	\$13,000	123	Out
Mast/Bear River Streambank Restoration	\$15,000	\$78,000	121	Out
Bob McGregor Fencing	\$5,000	\$9,000	111	In
Liberty Creek Diversions Screen and Weir	\$16,000	\$20,000	110	In
Sam Smith Cottonwood/Shingle Creek Diversions (included in Irrigation Diversion Inventory)	---	\$7,500	95	In
Roger Mickelson EQIP	\$18,575	\$41,993.50	86	In
Cub River Biological Control	\$2,500	\$5,000	84	In
Midland Trail Renovation	\$7,723	\$10,000	84	In
Highland CWMA Aquatic Invasive Species	\$25,000	\$50,000	76	Out
Nieber Spring/Mill Creek Riparian Exclosure	\$10,000	\$30,000	68	In
Alternative Livestock Watering Development	\$5,500	\$8,500	65	In
Cub River Maple Burn	\$20,000	\$50,000	45	In
Railroad Springs Ranch	\$40,000	n/a	Not Ranked	

Shaded rows indicate plans