

**Bear River Environmental Coordination Committee  
Final Meeting Notes  
January 21, 2009  
Pocatello, Idaho**

<b>Commitments Made at the January 21, 2009 Meeting</b>	
All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider volunteering time and/or equipment to install and monitor level loggers during upcoming ramp rate studies. Contact Stenberg to coordinate.</li> <li>• Review Grace and Last Chance Site Plan. Provide comments to Davies by Feb. 14.</li> <li>• Review Bear River Hydroelectric Project 2008 Annual Report. Provide comments to Hugentobler by Feb. 20.</li> <li>• Be advised that new proposal and application forms for 2009 projects are available at: <a href="http://www.pacificorp.com/Article/Article49033.html">http://www.pacificorp.com/Article/Article49033.html</a></li> <li>• Be advised of <b>2009 project review schedule</b>: Proposals (short forms) due Feb. 9; discuss via conference call Feb. 18; applications (long forms) due Mar. 9; subcommittee meets to rank Mar. 18; ECC reviews subcommittee recommendations and reaches consensus/votes to approve at April 15 ECC meeting.</li> </ul>
Teuscher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forward irrigation diversion inventory to Stenberg &amp; Hugentobler for distribution to ECC, late January.</li> </ul>
Stenberg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedule a field visit to the Gentile diversion with Teuscher, Brimmer, Colyer, and the landowner to consider a 2009 habitat enhancement project.</li> <li>• Send multi-year Soda inflow data to American Whitewater</li> <li>• Set up a conference call with Black Canyon monitoring subcommittee to discuss flows below Grace</li> <li>• Rename Upper Cub River Irrigation Diversion Project, Middle Cub. (2008 project)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Circulate Land Trust MOA to ECC members when edits are complete, likely January or February.</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Circulate draft declaration of trust between Sagebrush Steppe Land Trust and PacifiCorp to ECC members for review and consensus.</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Schedule Jeff Horsburgh, USU Water Lab, to attend an ECC meeting early in 2009.</a></li> </ul>
Hugentobler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Check website regarding short form due date</li> <li>• Distribute Conservation Action Plan info to ECC/Add DeGeorgio to April ECC agenda.</li> <li>• Rename Upper Cub River Irrigation Diversion Project, Middle Cub. (2008 project)</li> </ul>
Davies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordinate with DeGeorgio regarding next ECC meeting.</li> </ul>
Action items in <a href="#">blue</a> have been carried over from previous ECC meetings.	

## **Decisions Made**

- Approve the 2009 Boater Flow Schedule developed by PacifiCorp and American Whitewater.

## **ECC Members Present**

Mark Stenberg, PacifiCorp

Lynn Van Every, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality

Marv Hoyt, Greater Yellowstone Coalition

Dave Teuscher, Idaho Department of Fish and Game

Warren Colyer, Trout Unlimited

Charlie Vincent, American Whitewater

Mary Lucachick, Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation (participating by phone)

## **Others Present**

Eve Davies, PacifiCorp

Greg Mladenka, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality

Dave Steindorf, American Whitewater

Kevin Colburn, American Whitewater

Arnie Brimmer, Idaho Department of Fish and Game

Kelly Holt, PacifiCorp

Glen Pond, PacifiCorp

Katie Strong, Greater Yellowstone Coalition

Claudia Conder, PacifiCorp

Joselin Matkins, Sagebrush Steppe Land Trust

Joan DeGeorgio (participating by phone for the Conservation Action Plan discussion)

## **Review of Agenda**

The following items were added to the day's agenda:

- Proposed dam on the Bear River Narrows
- The ECC's decisionmaking flowchart
- Gentile diversion
- Conservation Action Plan process – Joan DeGeorgio, The Nature Conservancy

## **Updates**

### **Telemetry Study – Teuscher**

Teuscher updated ECC members on IDFG's Bonneville cutthroat trout (BCT) telemetry study. He said Hillyard (Idaho State University graduate student who conducted the project) has completed a draft of his thesis. He is hoping to have a draft report for the ECC by end of January and is planning to defend his thesis in March. Teuscher clarified that the thesis and report are separate publications. He will forward the ECC's report to Stenberg and Hugentobler for distribution when it is complete.

### **Irrigation Diversion Inventory – Teuscher**

Teuscher updated ECC members on IDFG's irrigation diversion inventory. He said he is hoping to have the inventory complete by the start of field season. Teuscher introduced Arnie Brimmer, fishery biologist

for IDFG, who will be taking over the irrigation diversion inventory report and will also be involved in the Black Canyon monitoring work.

#### **Bonneville Cutthroat Trout Restoration Plan – Stenberg**

Stenberg updated ECC members on the BCT Restoration Plan. He said the plan has been finalized and distributed to the ECC. He noted that the plan will be updated on a regular schedule so that it remains fresh and usable.

#### **Annual Report – Hugentobler**

Hugentobler said a draft of the 2008 Annual Report has been distributed to the ECC and is now in the 30-day review period. Comments from ECC members are due to Hugentobler by Feb. 20, with a final report due to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission by March 1.

#### **Grace and Last Chance Site Plan – Davies**

Davies reviewed the Grace and Last Chance Site Plan with ECC members. The site plan has been distributed to the ECC and is now in the 30-day review period. Comments on the site plan are due to Davies by Feb. 14. Davies said that areas will be surveyed and posted this coming year. An implementation schedule is included in the plan.

#### **Bear River Narrows – Stenberg**

Stenberg told ECC members that the proponent for the proposed Bear River Narrows dam has announced a study plan meeting, scheduled to take place next week. He said PacifiCorp and IDFG plan to attend.

#### **Gentile Valley Diversion – Stenberg**

Stenberg told the ECC that he would like to consider a habitat enhancement project at this diversion for 2009. He said he would like to schedule a site visit to brainstorm and asked for ECC volunteers to take part. Teuscher said he expects the project would consist of a large fish screen, and would likely be costly.

#### **2008 Grant Project Updates**

**Bailey Creek** – Funds have been disbursed so materials can be purchased.

**Turner Bridge** - Seventeen dump truck loads of trash have been removed.

**Cub River** – Plan to engineer this spring, survey during summer and build in fall after irrigation season.

**Panther Ames/Harris Ditch** – On the same schedule as Cub.

**Screen Tender** – Teuscher said he is not going to bill for 2008 and will ask for funding in 2009 instead. He said he will reintroduce the proposal at the next meeting.

**Bushman Farms** – Culverts and crossings have been completed. Materials have been purchased. Another year will probably be needed to finish.

**Henderson Easement** – Sagebrush Steppe Land Trust closed on this easement and the project was completed on schedule and on budget.

**Laurie Harris** – Alternative water source piping is now being finished. Fencers are coming in to do last the half-mile of wire fence next week. Some maintenance will be done in the area as well. Materials have been purchased for the jack fence. The project is in its final stages. Davies asked that fisheries biologists visit and evaluate the spring for spawning potential when they are out for the Gentile Valley field visit.

**Georgetown Summit WMA/Thomson Addition**– Landowner decided not to go through with the project. IDFG’s land department will contact again to see if landowner will reconsider.

**Ovid** – Fish screen at Ovid is currently not working. Colyer said he expects to approach the subcommittee for maintenance funds to get the structure functional again.

## **2009 Grant Projects**

**Kackley Springs** – Stenberg said he plans to sponsor a 2009 grant project based on Theis’ work at Kackley Springs. He said he is currently preparing permit applications, which agency people can expect to see soon.

## **CAP Process – Davies with Joan DeGeorgio, The Nature Conservancy**

Davies said she and Colyer attended a meeting titled, “Going Big on the Bear,” in Brigham City during January. State, federal, non-governmental organizations, industry, and private landowners took part in the meeting. The purpose was to prepare a Conservation Action Plan (CAP) (See attached materials) for the entire Bear River. Joan DeGeorgio of The Nature Conservancy (TNC) called in to discuss the CAP with ECC members.

DeGeorgio said the CAP process is intended to identify important places to work, (i.e., are we doing the right things in the right places?) She said TNC is interested in working with the ECC. She explained that CAP is a planning tool of TNC and showed 10 steps of CAP as an overhead.

DeGeorgio said a planning meeting for the Upper Bear and Lower Bear will take place during February. She said it would be ideal if the ECC would consider the process and participate for the middle section. Davies suggested designating a portion of the regular ECC meetings to the CAP process. The Natural Resources Conservation Service and others could also be invited to participate with that portion of the meeting, she said. Davies asked if the ECC is interested/sees the utility in this proposal. Colyer added that the Bear River middle section corresponds exactly to the ECC’s action area. Davies said there may be match potential with projects up and down stream. Hoyt said he could see the benefit of information sharing, etc., but expressed concern that it would not fit within the constraints of the Settlement Agreement. DeGeorgio noted that the CAP process would help identify priorities in areas of mutual interest. She said TNC does not have a funding source now, but affiliation with the ECC may help attract funding. Conder mentioned the WIS project, which was designed to do the same sort of thing. Davies mentioned the Bear River task force, and suggested that they be included in the process as well.

Davies asked ECC members for their thoughts on participating in the CAP process. Stenberg said he thought it would be OK. Colburn said the ECC should at least be feeding information to TNC. DeGeorgio offered to attend an ECC meeting to discuss the proposal further. Davies will coordinate this for the April ECC meeting.

## **2008 Fund Accounting – Stenberg**

Stenberg reviewed the annual fund accounting with the ECC. A complete accounting will also be included in the 2008 Annual Report. Stenberg presented spreadsheets for each of the accounts as an overhead. Stenberg discussed the transfer of funds from one account to another during 2008, as approved by the ECC and permitted through the Settlement Agreement. Specific instances were discussed. Stenberg noted that aerial photography funds were not completely spent, so he transferred those funds to the broodstock program, as other allowable accounts have been closed out. Colyer asked whether the money could still be spent on telemetry, etc., if for example there were issues with the telemetry report. Stenberg said yes. Teuscher noted that any unused broodstock funds may be used for the habitat enhancement fund. Stenberg confirmed. Teuscher recommended moving the remaining broodstock funds to the habitat enhancement fund. ECC members agreed.

Stenberg noted that approximately \$192,000 is available in habitat enhancement funds for the upcoming project funding cycle.

## **ECC Decisionmaking Flowchart**

ECC members reviewed the flowchart developed last year by Stenberg and based on the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

## **Henderson Conservation Easement – Matkins, Sagebrush Steppe Land Trust**

Matkins said SSLT closed on the Henderson conservation easement around Thanksgiving. She said the property looks very good, and SSLT will be monitoring in the coming year. She said SSLT is currently looking at the Harris easement and would like to hear from ECC members if they know of any potential projects.

## **Boater Flow Schedule – Stenberg**

Stenberg reviewed the 2009 boater flow schedule, developed in conjunction with American Whitewater. The schedule was sent to ECC members via email for review prior to the meeting. Stenberg asked if there were any issues with the schedule. No issues were noted. Stenberg asked for consensus on the 2009 boater flow schedule. Consensus was reached. Stenberg will file the approved schedule with FERC.

Teuscher said he had no comments on the schedule but would like to discuss impacts downstream of the Boater Program Ramp Rate Study area during 2008 test flows. Stenberg discussed level loggers. He said they had failed for the most part during 2008. He said plans are to deploy loggers again during the coming year. Stenberg also said the test flows leave a “hole.” Davies said Baldwin (PacifiCorp) had noted a “wave” was also created, and it ultimately overtakes the hole. Stenberg said they will gather more information on this phenomenon in the coming year. Stenberg said there had also been citizen reports of flooding on the islands and low-lying areas during nesting season during flushing flows. Teuscher said he thought this had not been considered fully in advance, and birds had not been considered at all. Stenberg noted that the nests might have been lost anyway by natural high water. Davies said that birds such as geese typically re-nest if their nests are lost.

Teuscher said IDFG would like to know more about the level of impact in regard to this reported issue before the study reaches the decision-making stage. Stenberg said the problem was not the ramp rate, it was the change in flow. Davies said she was concerned about public perception. Van Every noted that this flow was also accompanied by a dramatic downturn in water quality, which may not be a problem in

coming years. ECC members discussed whether to gather additional data. Stenberg noted that everyone had been focused on fish stranding and he doesn't believe that's the problem. There was further discussion on the hole and pillow phenomenon.

Stenberg reiterated that while a ramp rate of 0.25 ft. per hr. is being studied, this ramp rate does not work for PacifiCorp with the current regime.

Colyer said he would like to be sure that level loggers are deployed and capture data during 2009 test flows. Stenberg said there is not much funding for this study, and he is looking for partners, people, and equipment. He asked that ECC members contact him if they can assist with this effort. Stenberg said PacifiCorp has agreed to monitor water quality during test flows during first five events.

Meeting adjourned, a Black Canyon Monitoring Subcommittee meeting followed the regular ECC meeting.

## **Black Canyon Monitoring Subcommittee Meeting**

### **Guest speaker Dave Steindorf, American Whitewater**

Colburn introduced American Whitewater representative Dave Steindorf, who has been extensively involved in a similar study on the North Feather River in California. Steindorf said the North Feather study has been ongoing for eight years and has cost \$10 million. He added that most people involved would agree that the studies weren't set up properly.

Steindorf gave a Powerpoint presentation entitled, "Methods to Develop and Test Hypotheses on Effects Associated with Pulse Flows in California." A group discussion followed. The question of what should be measured during studies in the Black Canyon was posed.

Colburn said he believed the subcommittee should decide on which way things might change (increase, decrease) and whether that change would be good or bad. He also proposed having the consultant who analyzed data for the North Feather (Resch and Hauer) review the Black Canyon monitoring study plan (approx. 3 hrs) and advise by phone. American Whitewater will contact.

Stenberg asked for volunteers/equipment to install level loggers during the 2009 test flows. He said he would leave the question of what to do about geese up to the ECC.

The question was asked, do we specifically want to look at fish stranding during one of the events that creates a "hole?" Colburn inquired about what it would take to eliminate the pillow and hole. Mladenka said he liked that idea, why study the effect if we can just correct for it? Stenberg said he believed it would not be possible to correct for the effect.

**Attachment – Conservation Action Planning, The Nature Conservancy**

# Conservation Action Planning (CAP)

The Nature Conservancy achieves conservation results by designing and implementing conservation projects at multiple scales. Over the past 15 years, TNC has developed an integrated process for planning, implementing, and measuring conservation success for its conservation projects. This process is called the “Conservation Action Planning (CAP)” process. The CAP process has been tested with a wide range of projects from different parts of the world and is supported by a network of trained CAP professionals that make up the Efrogmson Coaches Network for Conservation Action Planning.

The CAP process guides project teams to identify effective conservation strategies. It provides an objective, consistent and transparent accounting of conservation actions and the intended and actual outcomes of conservation projects. It enables project staff to responsively adapt their actions to improve strategy effectiveness and achieve greater conservation impact. A brief summary of the CAP Process is provided below. For a full set of CAP and Efrogmson Coaches Network news, tools, training opportunities, examples, and guidance documents, visit [www.conserveonline.org/workspaces/cap/](http://www.conserveonline.org/workspaces/cap/).

## THE 10 STEPS OF THE CAP PROCESS

### 1. Identify People Involved In Your Project

This step asks you to identify your most valuable resource – the people who will be involved in designing and implementing your project. Addresses questions like: ♦ “Who will design our project?”, ♦ “Who will be responsible for ensuring the plan goes forward?”, ♦ “Who can give us advice?”, ♦ “Who will help us through this process?”

### 2. Define Project Scope & Focal Conservation Targets

With this step you define the extent of your project and select the specific species and natural systems that your project will focus on as being representative of the overall biodiversity of the project area. This step helps your project team come to consensus on the overall goal and scale of the project and your ultimate measures of success. Addresses questions like: ♦ “Where is our project?”, ♦ “What are we trying to conserve or restore?”

### 3. Assess Viability of Focal Conservation Targets

This step asks you to look at each of your focal targets carefully to determine how to measure its “health” over time. And then to identify how the target is doing today and what a “healthy state” might look like. This step is the key to knowing which of your targets are most in need of immediate attention, and for measuring success over time. Addresses questions like: ♦ “How do we define ‘health’ (viability) for each of our targets?”, ♦ “What is the current status of each of our targets?”, ♦ “What is our desired status for each of our targets?”



#### **4. Identify Critical Threats**

This step helps you to identify the various factors that immediately affect your project's focal targets and then rank them so that you can concentrate your conservation actions where they are most needed. Addresses questions like: ♦ *“What threats are affecting our targets?”*, ♦ *“Which threats are more of a problem?”*

#### **5. Conduct Situation Analysis**

This step asks you to describe your current understanding of your project situation – both the biological issues and the human context in which your project occurs. This step is not meant to be an unbounded analysis, but instead probes more deeply into the conditions surrounding your critical threats and degraded targets to bring explicit attention/consideration to causal factors, key actors, and opportunities for successful action. Addresses questions like: ♦ *“What factors positively & negatively affect our targets?”*, ♦ *“Who are the key stakeholders linked to each of these factors?”*

#### **6. Develop Strategies: Objectives and Actions**

This step asks you to specifically and measurably describe what success looks like and to develop practical and *strategic* actions you and your partners will undertake to achieve it. In particular, you want to try to find the actions that will enable you to get the most impact for the resources you have. Addresses questions like: ♦ *“What do we need to accomplish?”*, ♦ *“What is the most effective way to achieve these results?”*

#### **7. Establish Measures**

This step involves deciding how your project team will measure your results. This step is needed to help your team see whether its strategies are working as planned and thus whether adjustments will be needed. It is also needed to keep an eye on those targets and threats that you are not acting on at the moment, but may need to consider in the future. Addresses questions like: ♦ *“What do we need to measure to see if we are making progress towards our objectives and whether our actions are making a difference?”*, ♦ *“Are there other targets or threats that we need to pay attention to?”*

#### **8. Develop Work Plans**

This step asks you to take your strategic actions and measures and develop specific plans for doing this work as your project goes forward. Addresses questions like: ♦ *“What do we specifically need to do?”*, ♦ *“Who will be responsible for each task?”*, ♦ *“What resources do we need?”*

#### **9. Implement**

Action and monitoring plans won't do any good sitting on the shelf – your challenge here is to trust the hard work you have done and implement your plans to the best of your ability. Implementation is the most important step in this entire process; however, given the diversity of project needs and situations, the only requirement is: ♦ *Put your plans into action*

#### **10. Analyze, Learn, Adapt, & Share**

This step first asks you to systematically take the time to evaluate the actions you have implemented, to update and refine your knowledge of your targets, and to review the results available from your monitoring data. This reflection provides insight on how your actions are working, what may need to change, and what to emphasize next. This step then asks you to document what you have learned and to share it with other people so they can benefit from your successes and failures. Addresses questions like: ♦ *“What are our monitoring data telling us about our project?”*, ♦ *“What should we be doing differently?”*, ♦ *“How will we capture what we have learned?”*, ♦ *“How can we make sure other people benefit from what we have learned?”*