

FINAL Meeting Notes
Lewis River License Implementation
Aquatic Coordination Committee (ACC) Meeting
December 13, 2007
Ariel, WA

ACC Participants Present (14)

Jim Byrne, WDFW
 Jeremiah Doyle, CH2M Hill
 Diana Gritten-MacDonald, Cowlitz PUD
 LouEllyn Jones, USFWS
 Eric Kinne, WDFW
 George Lee, Yakama Nation
 Jim Malinowski, Fish First
 Kimberly McCune, PacifiCorp Energy
 Bryan Nordland (via teleconference)
 Todd Olson, PacifiCorp Energy
 Diana Perez, USDA Forest Service
 Frank Shrier, PacifiCorp Energy
 Steve Vigg, WDFW
 John Weinheimer, WDFW

Calendar:

January 9, 2008	TCC Meeting	Longview, WA
January 10, 2008	ACC Meeting	Merwin Hydro

Assignments from December 13th Meeting:	Status:
Olson: Obtain available ocean recruit data, currently managed by WDFW, prior to the January 2008 ACC meeting to identify where coded wire tags were found.	Complete – 1/9/08
McCune: Provide copies of the Quagga Mussels CD to ACC attendees and return original to Diana Perez, USDA Forest Service.	Complete 12/18/07 – CD is copyright protected so contact to purchase was provided.

Assignments from November 8th Meeting:	Status:
McCune: Schedule a Lewis River Aquatic Fund Pre-proposal Selection Meeting conference call on Tuesday, December 4, 2007 and distribute the details to the ACC.	Complete – 11/8/07
Haspiel: Notify PacifiCorp in writing that the Pine Creek Nutrient Enhancement project approved in the 2007 funding cycle will be postponed one year and consequently, due to the postponement, the Pine Creek Nutrient Enhancement Pre-proposal project for the 2008 funding cycle will be withdrawn.	Complete – 11/15/07
Shrier: Schedule a representative from Mobrand, Jones & Stokes to attend the December 13th ACC meeting and provide an overview of	Complete – 11/13/07

the Plan to assist the ACC in their review process.	
McCune: Email the USFWS draft Bull Trout Action Plan is to the ACC participants for review and input to assist with developing the Plan.	Complete – 11/16/07

Assignments from June 14th Meeting:	Status:
Shrier: Acquire more detail on the HTI 1997 hydroacoustic study, including what equipment was used and report back to the ACC relating to the differences of the study compared to that of BioSonics hydroacoustic study.	Complete – 11/7/07
Shrier: Review the Acclimation Pond Plan and send revision to the technical committee for final review and approval. The goal for completion is July 2007.	Pending Engineering Review – Plan delayed until Jan. 08

Opening, Review of Agenda and Meeting Notes

Frank Shrier (PacifiCorp Energy) called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Shrier requested a round-table introduction for the benefit of those participating via conference call and reviewed the agenda for the day.

In addition, Shrier requested comments and/or changes to the ACC Draft 11/08/07 meeting notes. No changes were requested The meeting notes were approved without changes at 9:15 a.m.

Relicensing Schedule Update

Diana Gritten – MacDonald (Cowlitz PUD) informed the ACC attendees that the FERC has a new licensing coordinator working on the Lewis River license and Shrier confirmed the new coordinator is Al Michnick. The Department of Ecology is working on a minor amendment to the 401 Water Quality Certification relating to oil sumps, however, these modifications are not holding up license issuance. PacifiCorp currently estimates license issuance in the second quarter 2008.

Habitat Synthesis Tool – Review and Discussion

Shrier informed the ACC attendees that a CD of the Habitat Synthesis Tool was mailed to each ACC participant on December 7, 2007 (**Attachment A**). The purpose of creating the tool was to research all available habitat data such as information on the key tributaries as identified by EDT, and create a tool, which will summarize the available information in such a way to allow for ACC members to determine if certain aquatic funding proposals are meaningful. This tool could then be distributed along with the requests for future Aquatic Fund pre-proposals. This Synthesis is intended to be a living document which will be updated as new and significant information becomes available.

Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (M&E) Presentation – Mobrand Jones & Stokes, Al Giorgi

Al Giorgi (Mobrand Jones & Stokes) provided a PowerPoint presentation for the ACC attendees in order to give an overview of the M&E Plan, which is currently in a 90-day

review and comment period. **Comments are due on or before Friday, January 18, 2008.** Both the PowerPoint presentation and the Draft M&E Plan can be located on the Lewis River website at the following link:

<http://www.pacificorp.com/Article/Article71045.html>

Giorgi informed the ACC attendees that the M&E Plan is made up of 20 objectives which are based on the Lewis River Settlement Agreement (SA) and are consistent with the Draft Hatchery Supplementation (H&S) Plan.

He reviewed the Overall Downstream Survival (ODS) flow chart, and a variety of techniques to address the twenty objectives. Giorgi expressed that the driving factor in the SA is the overall downstream survival which is dependent on collection efficiency, capture survival and reservoir survival.

Giorgi discussed the ODS telemetry based evaluation to include illustrations of general location of radio telemetry antennas used to calculate ODS (the statistical design and calculations are further described in the Appendices of the M&E Plan).

The following ODS methods were discussed to include:

- Collect migrant fish @ Swift Downstream Facility (SDF)
- Tag 44 X 6 weeks X 3 spp
- Detect at Swift Downstream Facility & other locations
- Use formulae in Appendix B of the M&E Plan
- Lab control- tag performance and handling effects

General discussion took place regarding the methodology of using radio telemetry tags, PIT tags and hydroacoustic tags and its benefits, the special resolution of acoustic tags, the size of fish needed for telemetry tags, the behavioral information received with hatchery fish, tagging of only actively migrating fish, the lifespan of radio tag (20-30 days is possible), the precision of different release numbers, the importance of obtaining an entire suite of estimates with one tool which a PIT tag will not provide, and consideration of adaptive management of M&E Plan over the 5 year period based on initial results.

ODS parameters were reviewed such as survival through the fish collector, survival through the transport system and survival through Swift Reservoir to Swift 1 Dam.

Giorgi discussed the Swift Downstream Facility (SDF) collection efficiency to include the percentage of juvenile anadromous fish of each of the species designated in SA section 4.1.7 that is available for collection and that is actually collected. He pointed out that in this study; a juvenile that is available for collection is one that is found (detected) within the zone of influence (ZOI) of the SDF entrance. Standard is 95% or greater than. The collection efficiency is based on radio tagged fish.

Giorgi discussed each of the following objectives to provide additional detail and assistance for ACC participants review and comment of the M&E Plan:

Objective 3 - Determine the percentage of juveniles available for collection that are not captured by the SDF and that enter the turbines.

Objective 4 - Estimate juvenile and adult bull trout collection survival (CS).

Objective 5 – Determine juvenile injury rates during collection at the SDF.

Objective 6 - Quantify the number, by species, of juvenile and adult fish collected at the SDF.

Objective 7 - Quantify the number, by species, of juvenile and adult fish collected at the SDF.

Objective 8 - Determine juvenile migration timing.

Objective 9 - Quantify adult upstream passage survival.

Objective 10 - Estimate adult trap efficiency at each upstream fish transport facility.

General discussion took place about the time frame of the M&E Study (which is due approximately 3 years into the new licenses), SA requirements, adaptive management after standards are met, percentage of sub-sampling, adult injury component, estimates of ocean recruits using a combination of methodologies (Age 2 recruits, adult equivalent run, catch plus escapement).

Jim Malinowski (Fish First) expressed a need to know what the current return rates are for the hatchery produced fish and requested information from WDFW. Olson communicated that PacifiCorp will obtain available ocean recruit data, currently managed by WDFW, prior to the January 2008 ACC meeting to identify where coded wire tags were found.

Objective 11 - Quantify the number, by species, of adult fish collected at the Projects.

Objective 12 – Develop estimates of ocean recruits.

Objective 13 - Determine performance measures for index stocks.

Objective 14 - Determine compliance of upstream and downstream passage facilities with hydraulic design criteria.

Objective 15 - Determine spawn timing, distribution and abundance of transported anadromous adults.

Objective 16 - Evaluate lower Lewis River Wild Fall Chinook and Chum populations.

Objective 17 – Monitor bull trout populations

Objective 18 - Determine interactions between reintroduced anadromous salmonids and bull trout.

Objective 19 - Document project compliance with flow, ramping rate and flow plateau requirements.

Objective 20 - Determine when reintroduction goals are achieved.

Lewis River HGMPs Update

James Dixon (WDFW) provided an email regarding the current status of the HGMPs for ACC review ([Attachment B](#)), dated December 12, 2007.

Dixon also provided via email a draft version of the Lewis River Type S Coho HGMP for ACC review and comment **on or before Friday, December 28, 2007**, which Kimberly McCune (PacifiCorp Energy) forwarded to all ACC participants.

Update on the other HGMPs:

NOAA fisheries have finalized drafts of the Late winter steelhead program and the spring Chinook program. The remaining HGMPs, the type N Coho and the segregated winter and summer steelhead HGMPs, should be updated by the beginning of January 2008. The agency will then send these HGMPs out for public review before approving for general distribution.

<Break 11:00am>

<Reconvene 11:15am>

Shoreline Management Plan Discussion – Draft Shoreline Categories and Allowable Uses

Olson provided a PowerPoint overview of the Shoreline Management Plan titled, “*Lewis River Projects Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) – Draft Shoreline Classifications and Allowable Uses*”, which can be viewed on the Lewis River website at the following link: <http://www.pacificorp.com/Article/Article76313.html>

Olson informed the ACC attendees that PacifiCorp is committed to developing a forward looking Shoreline Management Plan, encompassing the spirit and objectives of the Lewis River Settlement Agreement. In addition, the SMP will serve as a tool to assist in effectively analyzing appropriate shoreline uses within the Project boundaries, as well as provide a supportable and defensible means for shoreline management and permitting decisions.

Olson also providing a memorandum outlining the purpose of the SMP, the goals and objectives, draft classifications and draft allowable use categories (**Attachment C**). Olson discussed the following elements which make up the development of a shoreline management plan:

- Management Goals and Objectives
- Land Use Classifications
- Allowable Uses
- Permitting Policies & Standards
- SMP Update Policies
- Consultation Procedures

He further discussed the draft shoreline management classifications to include:

- Resource Management
- Integrated Use
- Project Works

For those areas designated as resource management areas consideration was given to species protection and sensitive habitats for protected and sensitive species. Integrated use shoreline areas are those with no known significant environmental/cultural resources or associated resource management goals that would preclude existing uses or would deny permitting allowable shoreline uses in the future. Areas designated as project works are any areas necessary to meet operational requirements. PacifiCorp must maintain strict

control over all infrastructures that are essential to Project operations and to which, due to safety, operational, or other constraints, public access may be legitimately restricted.

Olson reviewed the draft allowable uses by shoreline classification and requested input from the ACC attendees. General discussion took place regarding the preference for multi-slip docks where allowed rather than single family docks.

LouEllyn Jones (USFWS) expressed that riprap or similar form of erosion control should be avoided for managing certain species of fish. Riprap will only increase habitat for predators of protected species. Olson responded that the use of riprap will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis in permitted areas. Jones suggested PacifiCorp provide preferred methods of erosion control such as to add bioengineering for natural erosion control rather than saying riprap.

Discussion took place regarding conditions for permitting, incentives for neighborhood docks to streamline the permitting process, grace periods relating to violations or need for dock removal, time limit for existing docks to be brought up to construction standard of new docks, clarification is needed when existing docks must be brought up to standard, photos of existing facilities needed, and size of existing docks (surface square footage limit).

Olson reviewed draft maps of Merwin, Yale and Swift 1 which illustrated the suggested resource management, project works and integrated shoreline classification areas.

Olson informed the ACC attendees that PacifiCorp will make it very clear in the dock permitting process that the Company is not liable for large woody debris or anything that may happen to the docks due to the operation of the reservoir; to include that PacifiCorp does not guarantee year round usage of the dock due to fluctuation of reservoir levels.

In addition, incidental use of private neighborhood docks will be considered to respond to the need of emergency fuel outage or other similar unexpected emergencies.

Olson expressed that PacifiCorp has very little ownership on Swift Reservoir; however, much of the reservoir is identified as resource management due to steep slopes and the need for erosion control. Certain cove areas are designated for project works in order that PacifiCorp may collect large woody debris. Preliminary plans are being assessed to install a log boom for debris collection, as a protection measure for the Swift floating fish collector.

Olson informed the ACC that a draft of the SMP will likely be released to the public in late January 2008 and PacifiCorp plans to conduct another public meeting shortly thereafter.

Additional discussion led to consideration of county plans such as the Skamania County Sub-basin Plan to confirm if integrated use areas conform to the County Plan.

Olson requested the ACC attendees provide comments on the draft SMP classifications and allowable uses **on or before Friday, December 28, 2007**. PacifiCorp will provide

revised maps illustrating any changes to the shoreline classifications at the January 10, 2008 ACC meeting for ACC review prior to release to the general public.

OPB Video – Invasive Species, Quagga Mussels, Diana Perez (USDA Forest Service)

Are we ready for bioinvasion?? Diana Perez (USDA Forest Service) presented a short yet insightful DVD for the ACC attendee's, which was an overview of the Quagga mussel invasion of Lake Mead. The narrator communicated that the Quagga Mussel is an extremely prolific breeder, and they have found their way into the intake and generators of the Hoover Dam. It will only take one boat to escort the Quagga into the Oregon and Washington rivers thus causing a massive colonization.

The narrator also strongly encouraged subject matter experts to incorporate a proactive approach to protecting their rivers from exotic species.

Several ACC attendees requested a copy of the DVD which Kimberly McCune (PacifiCorp Energy) will provide.

Aquatic Funding Pre-proposals – Discussion and Comment

Olson provided an update of the December 4, 2007 conference call aquatic funding meeting notes (**Attachment D**) and informed the ACC attendees that the projects selected for full proposal are:

Applicant	Proposed Project
Cowlitz Indian Tribe	Mud Creek Enhancement
Cowlitz Indian Tribe & WDFW	Two Forks Off-Channel Habitat Reconnection
USDA Forest Service	Muddy River Riparian/Floodplain Improvement
USDA Forest Service	Clear Creek Road Decommission (2575200)
USDA Forest Service	Muddy River Riparian Brushing and Thinning
USDA Forest Service	East Fork Lewis River Instream Structures Steelhead
PacifiCorp Energy	Panamaker Creek Road Closure and Culvert Removal

PacifiCorp will be notifying the parties shortly that they have been selected for full proposal and an opportunity will be provided at the January 2008 ACC meeting to present additional information relating to their projects.

In addition, Olson presented a memorandum titled, *Lewis River – Resource Project Approval; Intent of the Settlement Agreement*, dated December 7, 2007 (**Attachment E**) for ACC review. The purpose of the memorandum is to provide some guidance and clarification relating to aquatic resource project approval and aquatics fund expenditures, particularly concerning the Lewis River North Fork vs. Lewis River East Fork and inform

the ACC the intent of the Lewis River Settlement Agreement Concerning the Relicensing Agreement Concerning the Relicensing of the Hydroelectric Project.

Study Updates

Shrier provided the following study updates, unless noted otherwise:

Yale Entrainment – comments were due 12/10/07; if anyone has comments we need them now. WDFW & USFWS have comments which PacifiCorp asked to receive as soon as possible.

Swift Constructed Channel Concept Design and Swift Upper Release Design – Permit process may cause considerable delay, however, given the delay in license issuance construction will likely take place in 2009. PacifiCorp plans to contact the head of the habitat program at WDFW and request clarification as to when projects can go through the state's Streamline permitting process.

Hatchery Upgrades – PacifiCorp continues to move forward in the design of Lewis River hatchery ponds 13, 14, 15, and 16, and upgrades at Speelyai hatchery. Dependent on the date of FERC license issuance, certain Speelyai pond upgrades may occur in 2008,

Hatchery and Supplementation Plan (H&S) – Lewis River Type S Coho HGMP provided to ACC for comment on 12/12/07. NMFS now have finalized drafts of the Late winter STHD program and the spring Chinook program. The remaining HGMPs, the type N Coho and the segregated winter and summer steelhead HGMPs, should be updated by the beginning of January 2008. PacifiCorp will provide copies of HGMPs to Kevin Malone and present draft H&S Plan back to the ACC in February or March 2008 for continued review after NMFS approval of the HGMPs.

Acclimation Pond Plan – Completed scope of work internally. PacifiCorp will hire a consultant to complete conceptual designs. The Plan will go out to the ACC for review and comment. Project is on schedule.

Agenda items for January 10, 2008

- Lewis River Baseline Monitoring Discussion (postponed from 12/13/07 meeting)
- Shoreline Management Planning Update
- Study/Work Product Updates
- Relicensing/BiOp Update

Public Comment Opportunity

No public comment was provided.

Next Scheduled Meetings

January 10, 2008	February 14, 2008
Merwin Hydro Facility	Merwin Hydro Facility
Ariel, WA	Ariel, WA
9:00am – 3:00pm	9:00am – 3:00pm

Meeting Adjourned at 12:30pm

Handouts

- Final Agenda
- Draft ACC Meeting Notes 11/08/07
- **Attachment A** – Letter to ACC Participants regarding the release of the Habitat Synthesis Tool, dated December 7, 2007
- **Attachment B** – Email from James Dixon (WDFW) regarding the HGMP status update, dated December 12, 2007
- **Attachment C** – Paper for December 2007 Meetings, Shoreline Management Plan
- **Attachment D** – Lewis River Aquatic Fund Pre-proposal Review Meeting Notes, December 4, 1007
- **Attachment E** - Lewis River – Resource Project Approval; Intent of the Settlement Agreement, dated December 7, 2007

December 7, 2007

Subject: Lewis River Habitat Synthesis Tool

Attn: ACC Participants

On December 14, 2006 the Aquatic Coordination Committee (ACC) requested the formation of a Habitat Synthesis Sub-committee and assigned them the task of conducting workshops to memorialize the knowledge base of the sub-committee. This task consisted of gathering existing data and reviewing other planning documents in the Lewis River and Lower Columbia for evaluating habitat improvement projects in the Lewis River basin.

The first Sub-committee meeting took place on January 4, 2007 and has continued throughout the balance of this year. Members include Adam Haspiel (USDA Forest Service), Jim Byrne (WDFW), Bernadette Graham-Hudson (LCFRB), Jeremiah Doyle (CH2M HILL), George Gilmour (Meridian Environmental) and Frank Shrier and Erik Lesko (PacifiCorp). The purpose of these workshops was to research all available habitat data such as information on the key tributaries as identified by EDT, and create a tool, which will synthesize the available information in such a way that will allow for ACC members to determine if certain aquatic funding proposals are meaningful. This tool could then be distributed along with the requests for future Aquatic Fund pre-proposals.

While we did not quite make the timing with the requests for 2007/2008 pre-proposals, we are pleased to announce that the tool is now available for your use and is enclosed.

The Utilities and representatives of the Lewis River Aquatic Coordination Committee are currently in the process of identifying the 2008 projects which are to be selected for submittal of full proposals. The Lewis River Habitat Synthesis Tool will be used to finalize the list of successful projects in early April 2008.

This Synthesis is intended to be a living document which will be updated as new and significant information becomes available. If you have any questions, please contact me at (503) 813-6622.

Sincerely,



Frank Shrier
Lead Aquatic Scientist
PacifiCorp Energy

McCune, Kimberly

From: McCune, Kimberly
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2007 3:47 PM
To: Adam Haspiel (ahaspiel@fs.fed.us); Athena Sanchez (pebbles@yakama.com); Bernadette Graham Hudson (bghudson@lcfrc.gen.wa.us); Bill Bakke; 'Brett Swift'; Bryan Nordlund; Clifford Cassese; Curt Leigh; Dan Barrett (spchinook@comcast.net); Darlene Johnson (woot@cascadenetworks.com); Diana MacDonald; dperez@fs.fed.us; Eric Kinne; 'George Lee'; hubere@ci.woodland.wa.us; James Dixon (dixonjfd@dfw.wa.gov); 'Jeff Breckel'; Jeremiah.Doyle@CH2M.com; Jim Byrne (byrnejbb@dfw.wa.gov); Jim Eychaner; 'Jim Malinowski'; 'Joel Rupley'; 'John Clapp'; John Weinheimer; Kathryn Miller (kmiller@tu.org); Lesko, Erik; LouEllyn Jones; Mariah Stoll-Smith Reese; Melody Tereski; Michelle Day; Nathan Reynolds; Olson, Todd; Pat Frazier (frazipaf@dfw.wa.gov); Paul Pearce (pearce@co.skamania.wa.us); Rich.Turner@noaa.gov (Rich.Turner@noaa.gov); 'Ruth Tracy'; 'Ryan Lopossa'; Shannon Wills; Shelley_Spalding@fws.gov; Shrier, Frank; Steve Manlow (smanlow@lcfrc.gen.wa.us); Steve Vigg; Susan Rosebrough; Taylor Aalvik (taalvik@cowlitz.org)
Subject: FW: Lewis River HGMPs
Attachments: Lewis Type S coho-JD 12-12-07.doc



Lewis Type S
ho-JD 12-12-07.

Attn: ACC Participants

In accordance with James' email below please find attached the Draft Hatchery and Genetic Management Plan (HGMP), Lewis River Type S Coho for your review and comment. James Dixon would like to receive comments on or before Friday, December 28, 2007.

In addition, James has also provided a status report of the other HGMPs for your information.

Thank you.

Kimberly L. McCune - PacifiCorp Energy
Hydro Resources Project Coordinator
Phone: 503-813-6078
Fax: 503-813-6633
kimberly.mccune@pacificorp.com

-----Original Message-----

From: James Dixon [mailto:dixonjfd@DFW.WA.GOV]
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2007 1:52 PM
To: McCune, Kimberly
Cc: Andy Appleby
Subject: Lewis River HGMPs

Kimberly,

Please forward this to all ACC participants. Thank you

*-----

All,

Attached, find a draft version of the Lewis River Type S coho HGMP for your review. There are a couple of incomplete sections in the document: one is table 9.1.1 (in-hatchery-survival). I am waiting on an updated table from the hatchery crew. the other is the

incomplete bibliography. I need to still add a couple of citations to it. Both of these sections are in red. Please review this document and make comments as you see fit, preferably using track changes. If you could have it back to me by the 28th, that would be great. If you need more time, Please let me know.

Update on the other HGMPs:

NOAA fisheries now has finalized drafts Of the Late winter STHD program and the spring Chinook program. When ACC review of this type S coho program HGMP is completed, that will be forwarded as well. The remaining HGMPs, the type N coho and the segregated winter and summer steelhead HGMPs, should be updated by the beginning of January.

Thanks for your help with review. Please contact me with any questions. I will be out of the office from Dec. 13th through the 25th and will be returning messages after that.

James Dixon
WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
360-902-2676

Terrestrial and Aquatic Coordination Committees

Paper for December 2007 Meetings

Prepared by PacifiCorp Energy

Purpose of Shoreline Management Plan

The intent of a Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) is to ensure that a Licensee's actions conform to the Project license requirements (expected) and are consistent with the purposes of protecting and enhancing the scenic, recreational, and other environmental values of the Project. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) guidelines recommend that a Shoreline Management Plan use existing resource information to designate Shoreline Management Classifications (SMC) and guidelines for implementation. These guidelines provide a framework for determining what proposed shoreline facilities or activities are most appropriate in relation to existing shoreline uses, environmental resources, and operational requirements of a Project.

The Lewis River SMP formalizes the processes and criteria that PacifiCorp will use to manage and balance private and public use of Project lands with the natural and cultural resources and hydroelectric generation at the Projects. The SMP's primary goal is to provide support and rationale for consistent land management policies and permitting decisions, both in the short term and over the life of the Project license.

Shoreline Management Plan Goals and Objectives

The SMP will serve as a tool to assist in effectively analyzing appropriate shoreline uses within the Project boundaries, as well as provide a supportable and defensible means for shoreline management and permitting decisions.

The objectives of the Lewis River SMP are to:

- Provide a means by which PacifiCorp may manage its shoreline resources in compliance with the Settlement Agreement and its FERC licenses,
- Establish an equitable and reasonable balance between public and private uses of the shoreline,
- Protect and maintain the shoreline's natural and cultural resources,
- Establish Shoreline Management Classifications (SMC) and Allowable Uses to aid in the management of Project lands,
- Acknowledge the types and locations of existing and future recreational opportunities and enhancements,
- Describe the SMP amendment and monitoring process,
- Provide a reference and/or linkage to other Project-related studies, management plans, and permitting regulations,

- Provide support and rationale for permitting processes and regulations within the Project boundaries,
- Identify shoreline user responsibilities related to use and maintenance of shoreline uses as well as permit and other regulatory requirements,
- Alert property owners adjacent to the Project boundaries of Best Management Practices (BMP) that they may voluntarily implement on non-Project lands and which PacifiCorp may require them to implement within the Project boundaries.

Draft Shoreline Management Classifications for Project Reservoirs

1. Integrated Use

Shoreline areas with no known significant environmental/cultural resources or associated resource management goals that would preclude existing uses or would deny permitting allowable shoreline uses in the future.

2. Resource Management

Shoreline areas designated for specific resource management, species protection, and environmental purposes. Generally, shoreline areas under PacifiCorp ownership fall under the Resource Management classification. This classification is also applied to other shoreline areas to further protect areas identified by resource agencies as sensitive habitats for protected and sensitive species.

3. Project Works

Shoreline areas designated as Project works such as dams, powerhouses, and other structures as well as any areas necessary to meet operational requirements. PacifiCorp must maintain strict control over all infrastructures that are essential to Project operations and to which, due to safety, operational, or other constraints, public access may be legitimately restricted. Shoreline uses within this classification are strictly limited to those necessary for operation and maintenance of Project facilities. PacifiCorp reserves the right to assess the appropriateness of public access within this classification on a limited basis.

Draft Allowable Use Categories

PacifiCorp recognizes the following as allowable uses; **however, this does not mean that all uses listed below are appropriate for all shoreline management classifications.** Additionally specific design criteria have been developed for the following uses that are a condition of permit issuance as part of the SMP.

- Multi boat slips
- Single family docks
- Retaining walls
- Riprap and other “naturalized” shoreline stabilization measures
- Public boat ramps (including private ramps w/public access)
- Marine trestles, railways, trams, & lifts
- Moorings
- Dredging
- Log booms

- Water withdrawal
- Water elevation gaging stations
- Vegetation management
- Shoreline planting & Vegetation removal
- Pathways
- Stairways
- Walkways
- Public recreation sites
- Private picnic/event facilities
- Private beaches/common use areas
- Installation and maintenance wildlife support facilities
- ≤ 50 % replacement, repair, and maintenance (**in kind**) of **existing** uses and structures

FINAL Meeting Notes
Lewis River License Implementation – Aquatic Fund Pre-proposal Review
Aquatic Coordination Committee (ACC) Meeting
December 4, 2007
Conference Call – in Only

ACC Participants Present (8)

Jim Byrne, WDFW
 Bernadette Graham Hudson, LCFRB
 Adam Haspiel, USDA Forest Service
 Kimberly McCune, PacifiCorp Energy
 Todd Olson, PacifiCorp Energy
 Diana Perez, USDA Forest Service
 Frank Shrier, PacifiCorp Energy
 Steve Vigg, WDFW

Assignments from November 30th Meeting:	Status:
McCune: Email all ACC participants the Lewis River 2007/2008 Aquatic Fund Evaluation Matrix and provide a 7-day comment period for absentee participants	Complete – 12/4/07

Opening, Review of Agenda and Meeting Notes

Todd Olson (PacifiCorp Energy) called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m. He informed the attendees that the intent for the meeting today is to review the ACC funding pre-proposal comments and decide whether we want to go forward with requesting full proposals. PacifiCorp will provide a 7-day review comment period for all ACC participants not in attendance.

In addition, PacifiCorp will carry all ACC questions forward to proponents and they will be asked to specifically address these questions in their full proposal write up.

Olson addressed each project individually with the use of two matrixes (**Attachment A – Utilities Evaluation and Attachment B – ACC Evaluation**). Attachment B outlined comments received from:

Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board (LCFRB)	Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW)
US Fish and Wildlife (USFWS)	USDA Forest Service (USFS)

Project No. 1 – Mud Creek Enhancement

Responding ACC representatives were split in the call for a full proposal. Those opposing chose not to hinder a request for full proposal, but requested that the Cowlitz Indian Tribe provided additional information related to the legal aspects-status of fines levied by Ecology against the operators of the quarry and the timing of distribution of

funds to project-area restoration. A better description of the benefits to anadromous fish is also needed.

Decision – Proceed to full proposal.

Project No. 2 – Two Forks Off-Channel Habitat Reconnection

Responding ACC representatives were in agreement to seek a full proposal. Within the full proposal, Cowlitz Indian Tribe is requested to describe the current conditions in the off-channel area, including riparian and Large Woody Debris.

Decision – Proceed to full proposal.

Project No. 3 – Muddy River Riparian/Floodplain Improvement

Formally presented as two separate projects, the U.S. Forest Service proposed to the ACC that these projects (No. 3 & 5) could be combined as many of the actions needed for the projects are the same. WDFW requested additional information relating to where in the basin the project is proposed or does it extend into the tributaries? The Lower Columbia River Fish Recovery Board requested that the distance and area to be treated be described; is it the entire riparian area or portions? If portions how will areas be prioritized? It should also be noted that USFW's preference should this project be selected for funding was funds should not come from the bull trout portion of funding allotment.

Decision – Proceed to full proposal with consideration for combining with project number 5.

Project No. 4 – Clear Creek Road Decommission (2575200)

Responding ACC representatives were in agreement to seek a full proposal. Within the full proposal the USFS needs to provide a better explanation of benefits for ESA listed species and anadromous reintroduction.

Decision – Proceed to full proposal.

Project No. 5 - Muddy River Riparian Brushing and Thinning

ACC attendees expressed that they would like to see project numbers 3 & 5 combined to address overlap and perhaps to realize cost savings in the NEPA and mapping processes.

Decision – Proceed to full proposal with consideration for combining with project number 3.

Project No. 6 – East Fork Lewis River Instream Structures Steelhead

Responding ACC representatives were split in the call for a full proposal. The project is located outside the fund priority area; however the project does meet fund objectives. Those opposing chose not to hinder a request for full proposal, but requested that the

USFS provided additional information related to the nexus of mitigation for hydroelectric project impacts, project's fit to recovery plans or other agency efforts.

Decision – Proceed to full proposal.

Project No. 7 - Pine Creek Nutrient Enhancement

This project has been withdrawn by the USFS.

Project No. 8 - Bull Trout Restoration and Management Plan for the Lewis Rive

With the exception of the USFS, responding ACC representatives selected a do not solicit full proposal response for this project in light of the fact that the Synthesis Tool is ready for use and the USFWS is preparing a Bull Trout Action Plan specifically for the Lewis River. The USFS has elected to not oppose this response.

Decision – Do not proceed to full proposal.

Project No. 9 - IP (Yale Wetland) Road Culvert

With the exception of the USFWS, responding ACC representatives selected a do not solicit full proposal response for this project.

Decision – Do not proceed to full proposal.

Project No. 10 - Woodland Park Culvert Replacement

Responding ACC representatives were in agreement to not seek a full proposal.

Decision – Do not proceed to full proposal.

Project No. 11 - Panamaker Creek Road Closure and Culvert Removal

Responding ACC representatives were in agreement to seek a full proposal. PacifiCorp will be asked to clarify where the large log jam is in relation to the proposed work, identify any in-kind contributions, and to consider cost sharing of the project.

Decision – Proceed to full proposal.

Meeting adjourned at 10:55 am

MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 7, 2007

TO: Aquatic Coordination Committee

FROM: Kimberly McCune

SUBJECT: Lewis River – Resource Project Approval; Intent of Settlement Agreement

The purpose of this memo is to provide some guidance and clarification relating to aquatic resource project approval and aquatics fund expenditures, particularly concerning the Lewis River North Fork vs. Lewis River East Fork and inform the Aquatic Coordination Committee (ACC) the intent of the Lewis River Settlement Agreement Concerning the Relicensing of the Hydroelectric (SA), dated November 30, 2004.

Upon review of the documents referenced below I've included text which specifically addresses the ACC's, the SA Parties' and FERC's intent when evaluating and funding resource projects in the Lewis River basin.

Settlement Agreement Concerning the Relicensing of the Lewis River Hydroelectric Projects FERC Project Nos. 935, 2071, 2111, 2213

7.5.3.1 Guidance for Resource Project Approval and Aquatics Fund Expenditures.

a. Resource Projects must be consistent with applicable Federal, State, and local laws and, to the extent feasible, shall be consistent with policies and comprehensive plans in effect at the time the project is proposed. These may include, but are not limited to, Washington's Wild Salmonid Policy, the Lower Columbia River Bull Trout Recovery Plan, and the Lower Columbia River Anadromous Fish Recovery Plan.

b. The Aquatics Fund shall not be used to fund Resource Projects that any entity is otherwise required by law to perform (not including obligations under this Agreement or the New Licenses for use of the Aquatics Fund), unless by agreement of the ACC.

c. The Licensees shall evaluate Resource Projects using the following objectives:

- (1) benefit fish recovery *throughout the North Fork Lewis River*, with priority to federal ESA-listed species;
- (2) support the reintroduction of anadromous fish throughout the Basin; and
- (3) enhance fish habitat in the Lewis River Basin, *with priority given to the North Fork Lewis River*.

For the purposes of this Section 7.5, the North Fork Lewis River refers to the portion of the Lewis River from its confluence with the Columbia River upstream to the headwaters, including tributaries *except the East Fork of the Lewis River*.

In addition, the above-referenced guidelines are repeated in the *Aquatics Fund – Strategic Plan and Administrative Procedures – September 2005*.

Final Meeting Notes Lewis River License Implementation – Aquatic Fund Pre-proposal Review – November 30, 2006

In accordance with the ACC 11/30/06 meeting notes during a review of the East Fork Lewis River Instream Structures Steelhead proposal, *“the general consensus is that the East Fork is a lower priority at this time”*.

Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Lewis River Projects (FEIS) Docket Nos. 935, 2071, 2111, 2213, Executive Summary - March 24, 2006

Upon review of the FEIS for the Lewis River projects the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) discusses on page xix that *“a major goal of the SA is the restoration of anadromous salmonids to the Lewis River Basin “to achieve genetically viable, self-sustaining, naturally reproducing, harvestable populations above Merwin dam greater than minimum viable populations” (section 3.1 of the SA)”*.

The FERC further states on page xxii,

... “We do not recommend some of these measures because they (1) do not appear to have a clear nexus to the projects (are not tied to either project effects or purposes), (2) are located outside of the project boundaries”....

“PacifiCorp and Cowlitz PUD may still elect to provide these measures as terms of the SA, but we do not recommend them as license conditions”.

These measures include:

- *Improvements to five river access sites outside of the Merwin Project boundary along the lower Lewis River - There is no physical nexus between the lower river sites and the Merwin Project, located 5 miles upstream.*

References

PacifiCorp and Cowlitz PUD. 2004. Settlement Agreement Concerning the Relicensing of the Lewis River Hydroelectric Projects. FERC Project Nos. 935, 2071, 2111, and 2213.

PacifiCorp and Cowlitz PUD. 2005. Aquatic Coordination Committees, Aquatics Fund Strategic Plan and Administrative Procedures. FERC Project Nos. 935, 2071, 2111, and 2213

PacifiCorp and Cowlitz PUD. 2006. Aquatic Coordination Committee, Lewis River License Implementation – Aquatic Fund Pre-proposal Review, November 30, 2006.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. 2006. Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Lewis River Projects (FEIS) - Executive Summary, FERC Project Nos. 935, 2071, 2111, and 2213, March 24, 2006.