

**Bear River ECC
Final Meeting Notes
December 10, 2014
Pocatello, ID**

ECC Members Present

Mark Stenberg, PacifiCorp
 Cary Myler, US Fish and Wildlife Service
 Corey Lyman, US Forest Service
 David Teuscher, Idaho Department of Fish and Game
 Arn Berglund, Bureau of Land Management
 Kathy Rinaldi, Greater Yellowstone Coalition
 Jim DeRito, Trout Unlimited
 Lynn Van Every, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality

Others Present

Jerry DeBacker, Sagebrush Steppe Land Trust
 Kevin Colburn, American Whitewater, by phone
 Eve Davies, PacifiCorp, by phone
 Blaine Newman, Bureau of Land Management
 Danny Miller, Bureau of Land Management
 Tom Lucia, Interested Citizen
 Mark Davidson, Trout Unlimited
 Sarah Lien, Trout Unlimited, by phone

Commitments Made at the December 10, 2014 Meeting	
All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be advised that the 2-day boater flow meetings have been rescheduled to take place Wednesday and Thursday, February 18 and 19 at IDEQ offices in Pocatello. Extended monitoring data will be distributed to ECC members during the first week of February. • Consider revision or amendment of the Comprehensive BCT Recovery Plan to include new information from Mabey. Schedule meeting time as needed. • Consider developing a demonstration installation of streambank stabilization solutions other than rock.
Grant Fund subcommittee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be advised that the 2015 project ranking meeting will take place Wednesday, March 18. Short forms (proposals) for projects will be due Friday, February 6. Long forms (applications) will be due Friday, February 27. • Communicate to project proponents the ECC's priority for habitat enhancement projects on the tributaries rather than the mainstem Bear River in this year's grant fund announcement.
Stenberg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request points of discussion regarding a proposed land and water acquisition project and build agenda for next meeting. • Check status of Tingey project. • Request hydrograph for Black Canyon for duration of dataset from Baldwin. Provide to Teuscher, Mladenka. • Speak with PacifiCorp Operations about the implications of three-day whitewater boating flows. • Check in with project sponsors prior to ECC meetings.

Commitments Made at the December 10, 2014 Meeting	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bring photos of Grace-Cove to next ECC meeting. • Provide Teuscher with a brief written description of the planned drawdown at Soda. Also consider placing informational signs at boat ramps.
Van Every & Mladenka	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribute data from extended monitoring in the Black Canyon to ECC members by the first week of February 2015. Share/compare with IDFG in the interim.
Teuscher & Hillyard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribute data from extended monitoring in the Black Canyon to ECC members by the first week of February 2015. Share/compare with IDEQ in the interim.
Hugentobler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post 2015 whitewater boater flow schedule to web site. • Post IDEQ & IDFG's extended monitoring data to the ECC's website when available.
Action items in blue have been carried over.	

Email Decisions Made Since the Last Meeting*

- Cove Spring Reconnect – Approve an additional \$27,465 in habitat enhancement funding for this project to build 300 feet of lined channel to complete the project in 2015. This brings the total cost of the project to \$45,000.
- Oneida Boater Take-Out – Approve an additional \$2,800 in habitat enhancement funding, based on contractor estimate to complete the project. This brings the total cost of the project to \$6,800.

** see Land Trust Updates for land and water acquisition project decisions made via email and complete record of voting.*

Decisions Made at This Meeting

- Approve the 2015 whitewater boater flow calendar (Attachment 1).
- Approve an addition to the project ranking form (Attachment 2).

Review of Agenda and Meeting Notes

Stenberg reviewed the day's agenda and the ECC's 2015 calendar. November meeting notes were approved with clarifications from Teuscher and Mladenka.

Boater Flow Schedule

Stenberg asked for comments on the draft 2015 whitewater boater flow calendar, distributed to ECC members via email prior to the meeting (Attachment 1). Colburn said American Whitewater supported approval of the draft calendar. Stenberg asked for consensus. ECC members unanimously approved. The 2015 calendar will be posted to PacifiCorp's web site.

Project Updates

BCT Broodstock Pond at Grace – Travertine has been found at the proposed broodstock pond site. Stenberg said additional test holes will need to be dug before planning can move forward. The pond will

likely be a more organic shape, he said. Teuscher said he would still prefer two smaller ponds to one larger pond and would like that option to remain open.

Co-Op Creek – Lyman said this project is likely to go forward next year.

Cottonwood Creek– DeRito showed a map of the project area and photos via overhead. He said the Treasureton structure is now complete but some repairs are needed to the fish screen. Davis is also complete, he said. A hoist was stolen from that structure over the summer. Barbed wire fencing is in place. Stenberg suggested adding a video surveillance sign to help prevent vandalism. DeRito noted there is no headgate associated with the structure, which was a problem this year during high water. USFWS took care of the needed repair at that time. He noted that forester Lori Stone is proposing to put a bridge (culvert) back in place at this location for an unrelated project she is working on. He has been in touch with her, and there is potential to use their contractor to do a little additional work there at the same time, possibly a new headgate structure. This may be proposed as a future habitat enhancement project, he said. Final cost for the current project was at about \$237,000 for design and build (a portion from ECC), DeRito said. Teuscher said the screen tender has reported that the paddle wheel is not moving most of the time and suggested the ECC plan to replace it in a year or so.

Screen Tender – Teuscher said the screen tender’s work was complete for 2014.

Fox North Hoops – Myler said this landowner has two Gooby bubblers in place on his property that do not work. He is considering consolidating the two diversions into one and using one screen. Additional funding has been identified and the project is moving forward, Myler said.

Cove Spring Reconnect – Stenberg noted that the ECC approved additional funding for this project via email since the last meeting. Work will take place after spring thaw, he said.

Dead Horse Spring – Stenberg said there has been some undermining of a grade control structure that will require repair. Restoration measures are in place and there are lots of fish--probably rainbow trout, which may be from the reference reach.

Harris Spring – Stenberg asked Teuscher about presenting a project design at the next ECC meeting. Teuscher said the area is being considered as a mitigation area for an unrelated project. The ECC will be reimbursed if that project proponent pays for its use as mitigation, he said.

Stauffer Culvert – Teuscher reported that the culvert for this project has been purchased and can go in soon if weather holds or if not, in spring.

Oneida Narrows Takeout – Stenberg said he has a contractor bid for this project and work is to occur in spring.

John Sweers – Stenberg noted that the ECC has approved additional funding for this project for fencing.

Older Projects

Pearl Creek – Teuscher said the landowner declined funding and the project did not go forward. Stenberg said he will free the allocated funding.

Screen Repair Fund – Teuscher reported that about half of the repair fund was spent during 2014.

BCT Trapping – Lyman said this project is complete and a final report will be completed this winter

Hansen Fencing – Stenberg said this project has been cancelled.

Tingey – Stenberg said he needs to check on the status of this project.

Ranking Form

A proposed edit to the project ranking form was drafted by Van Every and distributed via email prior to this meeting. The edit adds a water quality component to item 4 of the ranking form for a total of 5 additional points (See Attachment 2). Stenberg reviewed the change with ECC members and asked for approval. The ECC agreed by consensus to approve the edit to the ranking criteria. A revised form will be posted to website.

Attachment 1 – 2015 Whitewater Boater Flow Calendar

PacifiCorp Energy Black Canyon Boater Flow Schedule 2015 – Grace, Idaho

PLEASE NOTE: The Black Canyon is a Class 5 Boating Opportunity – Experts Only –

The Black Canyon is rated Class 5¹ whitewater, appropriate for expert boaters only. Class 5 whitewater is described as extremely long, obstructed, or very violent rapids, which expose a paddler to added risk. Drops may contain large, unavoidable waves and holes or steep, congested chutes with complex, demanding routes. Rapids may continue for long distances between pools, demanding a high level of fitness. What eddies exist may be small, turbulent, or difficult to reach. At the high end of the scale, several of these factors may be combined. Scouting is recommended but may be difficult. Swims are dangerous, and rescue is often difficult, even for experts. A very reliable Eskimo-roll, proper equipment, extensive experience, and practiced rescue skills are essential.

The Class 5 rating is intended to serve as guidance only. Whitewater boaters should assess their ability to run the Black Canyon based on their individual skill level, river flow level, and weather conditions.

Flows below the dam may change substantially without warning. PacifiCorp assumes no responsibility for damage to equipment or personal injury resulting from any change in flow.

Disclaimer: PacifiCorp is by no means promoting or inviting the public to participate in whitewater boating activities on the Black Canyon of the Bear River.

Black Canyon Boater Program

The structure of PacifiCorp's whitewater boater flow program has been modified by agreement between the Parties to the Bear River Hydroelectric Project Settlement Agreement also known as the Bear River Hydroelectric Project Environmental Coordination Committee (ECC). In 2012, the ECC agreed to change from the previous forecast-dependent flow program to the scheduled program described in this document. Between 2012 and 2014, additional fisheries and water quality studies were performed to further evaluate the effects of boater flows and other factors on aquatic communities in the Black Canyon. The results of these studies are now under review and will inform future decision making concerning the Black Canyon Boater Flow Program. The current season and days of boater flows are described in the following sections.

Whitewater Boater Flow Season (2015)

April 1 through June 5.

¹ American Whitewater International Scale of Whitewater Difficulty

Scheduled Whitewater Release Days and Time

Four boater events will be scheduled during 2015, and will include three two-day events (Saturday and Sunday) and one three-day event (Friday, Saturday and Sunday). During 2015, boater flows are scheduled for the following dates:

- April 11 and 12
- April 24, 25 and 26
- May 16 and 17
- May 30 and 31

On scheduled days, flows of 900 cfs or inflow, whichever is greater, will be provided on each day. Releases will begin at 10 a.m. and end at 4 p.m. Between adjoining release days, night-time flows of 200 cfs will be provided.

Attachment 2 – Revised Project Ranking Form

**Bear River Environmental Coordination Committee
Approval and Ranking Criteria**

Revised – December 2014

Project Name:

Project Proponent:

ECC Sponsor:

Amount Requested:

Date of Proposal:

Checklist

- _____ Project is consistent with BCT plans and/or other fishery management plans/land management plans/other species management plans.
 - _____ Project is within the action area.
 - _____ Project is in conformance with the ECC's Streambank Stabilization Policy.
-

205 Possible Points

1) *Fish species expected to benefit from proposed project (20 points):*

BCT and other native species	20 points
BCT only	15 points
Other native species	10 points
No native species	0 points
TOTAL: _____	

2) *Project (on own merits) is expected to protect or increase distribution and numbers of target native fish species (20 points)*

Greatly on a watershed scale (5 th field HUC)	20 points
Moderately in >2.0 miles of stream or >25% of watershed	15 points
Somewhat in 0.5-2.0 miles of stream or 10-25% of watershed	10 points
Limited in <0.5 miles of stream or <10% of watershed	5 points
Project is not expected to increase distribution/numbers	0 points
TOTAL: _____	

3) *Project is expected to protect or increase distribution and numbers of BCT in priority (per BCT Restoration Plan and/or Idaho Recovery Plan) stream reaches (15 points)*

Greatly in a high-priority reach	15 points
Greatly in a medium-priority reach	10 points
Greatly in a low-priority reach or moderately in a high/ medium-priority reach	5 points
Moderately in a low-priority reach	2 points
Project is not expected to substantively increase distribution/ numbers	0 points
TOTAL: ____	

4) *Project will benefit target fish species by protecting, restoring, or enhancing (mark all that apply) (20 points)*

Stream channel	2 points
Stream banks	2 points
Spawning (2 pts.) and/or rearing (2 pts) habitat	4 points
Fish passage, connectivity	5 points
Bank and channel cover	2 points
Water quality - decrease temperature (2 pts), decrease fine sediment (2 pts), decrease nutrient input (1 pt)	5 points
TOTAL: ____	

5) *Non-fish aquatic/terrestrial species expected to benefit from proposed project (10 points):*

Benefit to non-fish native aquatic and/or terrestrial special designation species	10 points
Other non-fish native aquatic species	5 points
Little value to non-fish native aquatic/terrestrial species	0 points
TOTAL: ____	

6) *Fish and wildlife aquatic and/or riparian habitat expected to benefit from proposed project (15 points)*

Project will protect/restore high quality critical/essential habitat for at risk species or limited habitat important on a landscape scale (i.e., spring systems)	15 points
Project will protect/restore high quality habitat limited in the local area	10 points
Project will protect/restore common habitat in the local area	5 points
Project will do little to protect/restore habitat	0 points
TOTAL: ____	

7) *Effectiveness of the project (15 points)*
(ECC sponsor, state the problem this project would address.
What are the project's merits at site?)

- Project solves original problem 15 points
 - Project partially solves original problem, other problems are likely to be corrected 10 points
 - Project partially solves original problem, other problems are not likely to be corrected 5 points
 - Project does not deal with the cause of problem 0 points
- TOTAL: ____

8) *Time frame for expected benefits (15 points)*

- Project benefits will last >25 years 15 points
 - Project benefits expected to last 5-25 years 10 points
 - Project benefits expected to last <5 years 5 points
 - Project benefits are minimal 0 points
- TOTAL: ____

9) *Expected ecological benefits relative to ECC cost (10 points)*

- Project benefits high relative to cost 10 points
 - Project benefits about equal to cost 5 points
 - Project cost exceeds benefits 0 points
- TOTAL: ____

10) *Cost sharing or in-kind services (percent of project funded from other sources) (20 points)*

- Financial and/or in-kind support exceeds 75% of project costs 20 points
 - Financial and/or in-kind support exceeds 50% of project costs 15 points
 - Financial and/or in-kind support exceeds 25% of project costs 10 points
 - Financial and/or in-kind support is less than 25% of project costs 5 points
 - No financial and/or in-kind support 0 points
- TOTAL: ____

11) *Project compliments existing or proposed projects (15 points)*

Project complements two or more existing or proposed projects and/or significant resource problems	15 points
Project complements one other existing or proposed project and/or significant resource problem	10 points
No complimentary projects	0 points
TOTAL: _____	

12) *Project permitting/compliance responsibilities (10 points)*

Project permitting/compliance responsibilities will lie with others, and not the ECC	10 points
No permitting/compliance responsibilities	10 points
Project permitting/compliance responsibilities assigned to the ECC	0 points
TOTAL: _____	

13) *Development Threat (Likelihood that the property in question will be developed, based on physical aspects of the property as well as location) (20 points)*

Imminent (90% likelihood of development within 5 years)	20 points
Likely (90% likelihood of development within 10 years)	15 points
Possible (90% likelihood of development within 20 years)	10 points
Unlikely (likely to remain undeveloped for the life of the 30 year license)	5 points
Not applicable—property cannot be developed	0 points
TOTAL: _____	

14) *Appropriateness of project goals to maintain or improve overall waterway form and function. (20 points)*

Project implementation will maintain, improve, or have no effect on geomorphic form and function over at least 20 years (with either a positive or no impact on adjacent reaches due to project implementation)	0 points
Project implementation will result in localized stability that may negatively impact adjacent reaches.	- 20 points
TOTAL: _____	

TOTAL POINTS: _____

