

**Bear River ECC
Final Conference Call Notes
January 17, 2018**

ECC Members Participating

	Name	Organization
x	Mark Stenberg	PacifiCorp
x	Lynn Van Every	Idaho Department of Environmental Quality
x	Jim DeRito	Trout Unlimited
x	Corey Lyman	U.S. Forest Service
x	Cary Myler	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
x	David Teuscher	Idaho Department of Fish and Game
x	Allison Michalski	Greater Yellowstone Coalition
x	Ryan Beatty	Bureau of Land Management
	Charlie Vincent	American Whitewater
	Hunter Osborne	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
	Kirk Rick	Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation
	Susan Rosebrough	National Park Service
	Kevin Lewis	Idaho Rivers United

Others Participating

	Name	Organization
x	Eve Davies, PacifiCorp	PacifiCorp
	Matt Lucia, Sagebrush Steppe Land Trust	Sagebrush Steppe Land Trust
x	Kelly Conde, Sagebrush Steppe Land Trust	Sagebrush Steppe Land Trust

Commitments Made during the January 17, 2018 Call	
All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider submitting proposals to WNTI. These are due immediately. Short (proposal) forms for 2018 habitat enhancement projects due Friday, Feb. 2, 2018 to Stenberg, Hugentobler Comments on draft Annual Report due Monday, Feb. 19, 2018 Next ECC Meeting: February 21, 2018, IDEQ Offices, Pocatello, ID
Stenberg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check on status of Mussler project. Email vote for proposed Alexander land exchange. Continue to work with Paris Relief on water swap.
Myler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update Stenberg on Fox appraisal. Keep Stenberg apprised of progress on Fox conservation easement closing. He will need about a one-month notice to obtain PacifiCorp approval.
Beatty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with Stenberg on Western Native Trout Initiative, Cove Springs. Assemble information on adjacent BLM grazing allotments for discussion at Feb. ECC meeting.
Hugentobler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Set up Google doc/pages for Kackley. Post management plan. ECC members will need a gmail account.
Action items in blue have been carried over.	

Email Decisions Made Since Last Meeting

- Approved Sagebrush Steppe Land Trust's updated invoice for 2017/2018 Monitoring and Maintenance, revised to include the Oneida PacifiCorp conservation easement.

A record of voting is included in Land and Water Updates, Attachment 1.

Decisions Made at This Meeting

- Approved final edits to the project ranking form, as shown in Attachment 1 of these notes.

Review of Agenda

Stenberg reviewed the agenda for the call. Previous meeting notes were distributed prior to the call. An email vote will be called to approve the notes once ECC members have had an opportunity to review them. Action items from the December meeting were reviewed. Items carried over appear in blue in the table above.

Habitat Enhancement Project Updates

Bitton – Project is complete. Stenberg said project was changed to include a well.

Stauffer – Stenberg has received an invoice for fencing materials. Project will be completed in spring.

Broodstock Ponds – Stenberg said the drain approved by email vote was added in November. Work is wrapped up for now.

Crane/Georgetown Summit – Stenberg said work on this project is being completed now.

Mussler – No update was available for this proposed new project, as the proponent is no longer with Franklin County Soil and Water Conservation District. Stenberg will call and check in.

Stenberg reviewed ECC fund balances.

Habitat Enhancement Fund

- \$15,816 unobligated
- \$305,000 in fund now
- \$241,799 (minus obligated funds) available now

- \$566,000 in habitat enhancement funding was spent last year
- \$2.6 million has been spent to date

Land and Water Fund

- Current balance just under \$1.5 million
- \$499,782 is available for 2018

- \$154,989 in land and water funding was spent last year
- \$3.6 million has been spent to date

Western Native Trout Initiative's Bear River Conservation Portfolio Proposal - DeRito

Information on this item was routed to ECC members prior to the call. DeRito noted that it is not a Trout Unlimited initiative but is through the Western Native Trout Initiative. He said at the last range-wide meeting, it was decided to focus on the Bear River, to benefit three species (including Bonneville cutthroat trout). The group is seeking information on projects that will benefit BCT in the next 1-3 years and will be developing a profile to take around to potential funders. They are still looking for projects, DeRito said, and there's a simple online form to fill out. He said he has been talking to Hillyard and Teuscher, and they will be submitting something on St. Charles Creek. DeRito said he is also going to talk to Bouwes about Station Creek. Stenberg asked about submitting on the spawning channel. That project can move forward now that LiDAR is done. DeRito said yes. Stenberg also suggested the BLM portion of Cove Spring for a beaver project. Beatty asked if there is access to funds from others. DeRito said yes, they are doing legwork to obtain funding. Beatty asked about timeframe. DeRito said by next Wednesday or about the end of the month, but he hasn't check back on that. Beatty said he will call Stenberg to discuss Cove Spring.

Project Ranking Form

Stenberg discussed proposed final edits to the project ranking form. ECC members reviewed the ranking form and agreed to the following changes:

- Include check boxes to indicate whether landowner is willing to sign enclosure and monitoring agreements, if applicable.
- Delete #13 (permitting responsibility).
- Move #14 (development threat) to end of form to be used for land and water projects only.

A redline of these edits is included in Attachment 2.

Calendar Review

Stenberg said the Draft Annual Report will be complete in the next day or two. The annual report will be posted to the ECC's website for review. The review period will be updated on the ECC's calendar.

Stenberg said the flyer announcing the availability of 2018 habitat enhancement funds has been distributed. He said he will consider the February 2 due date soft. ECC members should send proposals to Stenberg and Hugentobler.

Attachment 1 – Record of Email Voting

Bear River ECC
Record of Email Voting: SSLT Updated Invoice for 2017/2018 Monitoring and Maintenance
Vote Called by Stenberg, January 5, 2018

From: Stenberg, Mark [mailto:Mark.Stenberg@pacificcorp.com]

Sent: Friday, January 5, 2018 3:34 PM

To: Aaron Swift (aswift@RMEF.ORG) <aswift@RMEF.ORG>; Allison Michalski <amichalski@greateryellowstone.org>; 'Beatty, Ryan' <rbeatty@blm.gov>; Bob Zimmer <bzimmer@greateryellowstone.org>; Corey Lyman (clyman@fs.fed.us) <clyman@fs.fed.us>; dan_miller@nps.gov; Davies, Eve <Eve.Davies@pacificcorp.com>; Garry Ratzlaff <Garry@ddcllc.net>; Greg Mladenka <Greg.Mladenka@deq.idaho.gov>; Hillyard,Ryan <ryan.hillyard@idfg.idaho.gov>; Jeremy Jirak (jeremy_jirak@fws.gov) <jeremy_jirak@fws.gov>; 'Kevin Colburn' <kcolburn@amwhitewater.org>; Warren Colyer <wcolyer@tu.org>; Blaine Newman <blaine_newman@blm.gov>; cary_myler@fws.gov; Charlie Vincent <charliev@xmission.com>; Hunter Osborne (hosborne@sbtribes.com) <hosborne@sbtribes.com>; James DeRito <JDeRito@tu.org>; Kathy Rinaldi (krinaldi@greateryellowstone.org) <krinaldi@greateryellowstone.org>; Kevin Lewis <kevin@idahorivers.org>; Kirk Rich (krich@idpr.idaho.gov) <krich@idpr.idaho.gov>; Lee W. Mabey (lmabey@fs.fed.us) <lmabey@fs.fed.us>; Lynn Van Every <Lynn.Vanever@deq.idaho.gov>; Miriam Hugentobler <miriam.hugentobler@gmail.com>; Susan_Rosebrough@nps.gov; Teuscher,David <david.teuscher@idfg.idaho.gov>

Cc: kelly@sagebrushlandtrust.org

Subject: Updated invoice - ECC Email Vote

Hello Everyone,

At our December meeting we approved the annual monitoring invoice from Sagebrush Steppe Land Trust. Kelly realized afterward that 2017 expenses, and the 2018 projections, for the Oneida PacifiCorp Conservation Easement were not included on the invoice. Correcting this oversight adds \$2,390.48 to the invoice request. Please see the attached updated invoice for your approval. Please email approval to Miriam. Thank you!

Mark Stenberg, MBA
PacifiCorp – Renewable Resources
Hydro License Program Manager – Idaho
208 547-7305

January 3, 2018

INVOICE # SSLT2017-1113

Mark Stenberg
Program Manager
822 Grace Power Plant RD
Grace, Idaho 83241

Dear Mark,

This letter is a request for payment in the amount of \$15,084.85 to cover 2017 actual monitoring and management costs and 2018 projected monitoring and management costs on the properties listed below.

Conservation Easements

2018 Projected Costs

Henderson Preserve	\$ 863.43
Harris and Cove	\$2,112.72
Upper Christensen	\$1,821.35
Lower/Riparian Christensen	\$ 719.12
Jensen Mink Creek	\$ 726.85
Riverdale Boyack	\$ 801.13
PacifiCorp Oneida Canyon	<u>\$2,390.48</u>

Conservation Easement Monitoring Total **\$ 9,435.08**

Fee Title Properties

2018 Projected Costs

Kackley Preserve	\$5,135.31
Deep Creek Preserve	<u>\$514.46</u>

Fee Title Property Management **\$5,649.77**

INVOICE TOTAL = **\$15,084.85**

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. Thank you for your ongoing professional assistance.


Matt Lucia
Executive Director

**Bear River ECC
Record of Email Voting
Approval of Updated SSLT Invoice for 2017/2018 Monitoring and Maintenance
Vote Called by Stenberg, January 5, 2018**

	Name	Organization
yes	Lyman	USFS
yes	DeRito	Trout Unlimited
yes	Van Every	IDEQ
yes	Lewis	Idaho Rivers United
	Rich	Idaho Parks and Rec
yes	Teuscher	Idaho Fish and Game
yes	Beatty	BLM
	Osborne	Sho-Ban Tribes
	Rosebrough	National Park Service
	Vincent	American Whitewater
yes	Michalski	Greater Yellowstone
yes	Stenberg	PacifiCorp
yes	Myler	USFWS

Attachment 2: Final Edits to Ranking Criteria

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

Revised – ~~January 2018~~

Project Name:

Project Proponent:

ECC Sponsor:

Amount Requested:

Date of Proposal:

Checklist

- Project is consistent with Bonneville cutthroat trout (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.
 - ~~Project proponent is willing to sign exclusion agreement (if applicable).~~
 - ~~Project proponent is willing to sign right-of-entry agreement (if applicable).~~
-

~~185~~ Possible Points (Habitat Enhancement Projects)

205 Possible Points (Land and Water Projects)

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 is located on a tributary vs the mainstem Bear River (10 points):*

Tributary	10 points
Mainstem	0 points
TOTAL: ____	

3) *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: _____	

4) *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: _____	

5) *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: _____	

6) *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: _____	

7) *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: ____	

8) *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: ____	

9) *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: ____	

10) *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: ____	

11) 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: ____	

12) 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: ____	

~~13) 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) 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: _____

For Land and Water Projects Only:

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

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

TOTAL POINTS:
20