

**FINAL Meeting Notes**  
**Lewis River License Implementation – Aquatic Fund Pre-proposal Review**  
**USFWS Meeting**  
**December 5, 2006**  
**Conference Call – in Only**

**ACC Participants Present (5)**

Lou Ellyn Jones, USFWS  
 Joe Hiss, USFWS  
 Shelley Spalding, USFWS  
 Kimberly McCune, PacifiCorp Energy  
 Frank Shrier, PacifiCorp Energy

<b>Assignments from November 30th Meeting:</b>	<b>Status:</b>
McCune: Add discussion time in the 12/14/06 ACC Agenda (time permitting) for USFWS to discuss revision suggestion to Aquatic funding pre-proposals No. 2 and No. 13.	Complete – 12/05/06

**Opening, Review of Agenda and Meeting Notes**

Frank Shrier (PacifiCorp Energy) called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. He informed the attendees that the intent for the meeting today is to review the ACC funding pre-proposal comments and ACC decisions from the 11/30/06 conference call. Shrier further communicated that this meeting is not intended to decide Yes or No on funding a particular project.

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

Cowlitz Indian Tribe (CT)	American Rivers (AR)
Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board (LCFRB)	Trout Unlimited (TU)
US Fish and Wildlife (USFWS)	USDA Forest Service (USFS)
Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW)	

USFWS expressed that they are in agreement with accepting the ACC decisions from the conference call on 11/30/06 with the exception of Projects No. 2 and No. 13. Also, for Project No. 4 (Scot’s Broom removal) the USFWS disagrees with the decision to not move forward but can live with the ACC’s decision.

Rather than simply not proceeding with full proposals Shelley Spalding (USFWS) specifically expressed that they would like to revise project pre-proposals 2 and 13 in a way that would create an entirely different project such as one that includes some sort of an independent science review panel, with perhaps three experts to determine priority of the on-the-ground projects. Additionally, Spalding expressed that there is considerable value with the combination of local experts and a review panel of experts for more global knowledge.

Shrier suggested PacifiCorp add time on the Agenda at the next ACC meeting on 12/14/06 (time permitting) for USFWS to discuss their original suggestion regarding modifying project proposals 2 and 13, present this suggestion to the ACC and ask if they are willing to take this alternative approach.

USFWS also agreed to proceed to full proposal for Project No. 9 with the following consideration:

**Project No. 9 - Rush Creek Gravel Restoration**

USFWS suggested that a geomorphologist review the proposal.

McCune informed the attendees on the conference call that 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.

**Meeting Adjourned at 10:45 am**

Lewis River Aquatic Fund - Utilities' Evaluation of 2006/2007 Project Proposals										
Applicant	Project Title	Project Schedule	Benefit	Bull Trout	Project Partners	Funding	Cost Share?	Consistency with Fund Objectives	Selected by Utilities for Full-Proposal	Comments
U.S. Forest Service	East Fork Lewis River Instream Structures Steelhead	2008	Restore spawning areas, and create cover and resting areas for adults through LWD placement in East Fork Lewis		USFS, Skamania County Title II, LCFRB	\$80,000	Yes	1. No; 2. Probable; 3. No	No	While this project is favorable because of immediate habitat improvement, it is located outside initial area of concern.
U.S. Forest Service	Bull trout Restoration and Management Plan for the Lewis River	2007	Detailed Management Plan with recommended actions to restore bull trout habitat and populations	Yes	USFS, USFWS, NOAA Fisheries, WDFW	\$40,000	Yes	1. Probable; 2. Probable; 3. No	No	Utilities favor on the ground actions that provide near-term benefits to aquatic habitat.
U.S. Forest Service	Dispersed Camping and Day Use Road Restoration	2008	Close areas to camping and decommission access roads to reduce opportunity for illegal harvest of bull trout	Yes	USFS, Clark-Skamania Flyfishers	\$45,000	Yes	1 - 3. Yes	Yes	Although this is not a habitat enhancement per se, it is a protection of fishery and habitat resources
U.S. Forest Service	Muddy River Floodplain Nutrient Enhancement	Winter of 2007/08 and Winter of 2008/09	Enhance nutrient levels in the Muddy River Floodplain to increase vegetation growth and improve riparian canopy.		USFS, Fish First, Mt. St. Helens Institute	\$78,000	Yes	1 - 3. Yes	Yes	
U.S. Forest Service	Scotch Broom Removal on the Muddy River Floodplain	2007 - 2008	Noxious plant removal to improve re-establishment of native vegetation.		USFS, Skamania County Title II, MSHI	\$48,000	Yes	1. Probable; 2. Probable; 3. No	No	Unlike the nutrient enhancement projects, this proposal has less benefit to stream/land riparian interface.
U.S. Forest Service	Pine Creek Nutrient Enhancement	2007	Enhance nutrient levels along Pine Creek to increase aquatic productivity, food resources, and riparian growth.		USFS, Fish First, Mt. St. Helens Institute, Pope and Talbot Timber Company	\$39,000	Yes	1 - 3. Yes	Yes	
U.S. Forest Service	PIT Tag Detectors for Bull Trout in Upper Lewis River	2007 - 2008	Determine where bull trout are migrating during spawning season.	Yes	USFS, USFWS, WDFW	\$70,000	Yes	1. Probable; 2. No; 3. No	No	Utilities favor on the ground actions that provide near-term benefits to aquatic habitat.
U.S. Forest Service	9015 Culvert Replacement	2008	Re-open 1 mile of habitat for anadromous fish production		USFS	\$100,000	Yes	1 - 3. Yes	Yes	
U.S. Forest Service	Rush Creek Gravel Restoration	2007 or 2008	Restore dwindling supplies of native gravels to increase bull trout and anadromous fish spawning success.	Yes	USFS, Fish First, Mt. St. Helens Institute	\$20,000	Yes	1 - 3. Yes	Yes	
Cowlitz Indian Tribe	Martin Access Riparian Forest and Off-channel Habitat Enhancement	2007 - 2008	Enhance the overall abundance of functional habitat in the lower Lewis River.		WDFW	\$26,000	Yes	1. Yes; 2. Probable; 3. Yes	Yes	
Cowlitz Indian Tribe	Plas Newydd Riparian Forest Enhancement	2007 - 2008	Enhancement and preservation of scarce functional habitat in the lower Lewis River.		Plas Newydd Farm	\$29,300	Yes	1. Yes; 2. Probable; 3. Yes	Yes	
Cowlitz Indian Tribe	Two Forks Access Riparian Forest Enhancement	2007 - 2008	Preserve river bank stability for shade and functional off-channel habitat.		WDFW	\$26,200	Yes	1. Yes; 2. Probable; 3. Yes	Yes	
Stillwater Sciences, Inc.	Prioritizing bull trout habitat restoration for the Lewis River: Development of a decision support tool to guide identification and selection of cost effective restoration projects	2007	Development of a model to evaluate approaches (strategies and specific projects) to bull trout recovery. Model will help identify the benefit of various restoration projects.	Yes		\$50,000	No	1. Yes; 2. Probable; 3. No	No	Utilities favor on the ground actions that provide near-term benefits to aquatic habitat.
					<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$651,500</b>				
Fund Objectives:	1. Benefit fish recovery throughout the North Fork Lewis River, priority to federal ESA-listed species				<b>Bull Trout Funds</b>	<b>\$225,000</b>				
	2. Support the re-introduction of anadromous fish throughout the basin									
	3. Enhance fish habitat in the Lewis River Basin, with priority given to North Fork Lewis River									

Lewis River Aquatic Fund - ACC Evaluation of 2006/2007 Project Proposals								
ACC Decision	Project Title	WDFW	AR - TU	LCFRB	USFWS	USFS	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	
No	1 East Fork Lewis River Instream Structures Steelhead	No - occurs outside initial area of emphasis	No - like to see money and projects focused on the North Fork	No	No - would rather see projects in the North Fork	Yes	No - falls outside area of concern.	
No	2 Bull trout Restoration and Management Plan for the Lewis River	No - mgmt plans already exist for bull trout in the Lewis River	No - would like to see more work on the ground.	No	Yes - recommend proposal #2 and #13 combine elements of both proposals.	Yes - important so we can properly protect existing bull trout habitat and populations and prioritize bull trout restoration projects.	No - On-the-ground restoration is more appropriate use of money.	
Yes	3 Dispersed Camping and Day Use Road Restoration	No - remote locations and show little indication of activity.	Yes	Yes - addresses important limiting factor for Bull Trout.	Yes	Yes - will protect bull trout habitat by closing dispersed camping sites that negatively affect bull trout populations.	Yes - will enhance the protection of valuable resources and habitat.	
Yes	4 Muddy River Floodplain Nutrient Enhancement	Yes - improving the habitat will also improve fish habitat.	Yes - includes multiple partners.	Yes - questions whether this project should be given priority for funding.	Yes	Yes - will accelerate growth of poor growing riparian vegetation.	No - proposal does not directly benefit fish recovery and fish habitat enhancement.	
No	5 Scotch Broom Removal on the Muddy River Floodplain	No - funding should be part of USFS O&M budget.	No - invasive species removal important but project seems expensive.	No	Yes - scotch broom will help ensure survival of planted trees.	Yes - will eliminate scotch broom that is out-competing and excluding native vegetation.	No - does not directly benefit fish recovery and fish habitat enhancement.	
Yes	6 Pine Creek Nutrient Enhancement	Yes - would like to review result of 2006 nutrient enhancement efforts.	Yes - only if enhancement project is able to be completed this year.	Yes - questions whether this project should be given priority for funding.	Yes - will provide nutrients to help in establishing the riparian buffer.	Yes - will make ongoing project a multi-year project.	Yes - beneficial to fish recovery but require more information.	
Yes	7 PIT Tag Detectors for Bull Trout in Upper Lewis River	Yes - could provide confirmation of additional spawning locations.	Yes - support the funding for purchase of equipment but not \$25k for personnel.	No - lack of nexus to actual recovery efforts.	Yes - provides a landscape approach to determine bull trout spawning.	Yes - could provide useful information that may help inform our restoration efforts.	No - On-the-ground restoration is more appropriate use of money.	
Yes	8 9015 Culvert Replacement	No - very high up in the drainage.	Yes - good project especially if continue to experience higher stream and run off lows.	Yes - more information is needed to assess if this project is a reasonable investment.	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Yes	9 Rush Creek Gravel Restoration	Yes - snorkel observations have demonstrated lack of spawning gravel.	Yes - if others are interested but if not, we do not support a full proposal.	Yes - more information is needed to assess if this project is a reasonable investment.	No - not sure that gravel recruitment and supplies from upper watershed are limiting or that placed gravel will stay in the system.	Yes - provide opportunity to restore gravel in Rush Creek.	Yes	
Yes	10 Martin Access Riparian Forest and Off-channel Habitat Enhancement	Yes - further discussion is needed regarding WDFW funding contributions to project.	Yes - excellent project for habitat protection and enhancement activities.	Yes - provides for significant enhancement of off-channel habitat in the lower Lewis.	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Yes	11 Plas Newyd Riparian Forest Enhancement	Yes - could protect good riparian habitat in a habitat poor area.	Yes	Yes - provides for significant enhancement of off-channel habitat in the lower Lewis.	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Yes	12 Two Forks Access Riparian Forest Enhancement	Yes - could protect good riparian habitat in a habitat poor area.	Yes	Yes - provides for significant enhancement of off-channel habitat in the lower Lewis.	Yes	Yes	Yes	
No	13 Prioritizing bull trout habitat restoration for the Lewis River: Development of a decision support tool to guide identification and selection of cost effective restoration projects	No	No - do not think we need another model.	No	Yes - recommend proposal #2 and #13 combine elements of both proposals.	No	No - On-the-ground restoration is more appropriate use of money.	