FINAL Meeting Notes Lewis River License Implementation Aquatic Coordination Committee (ACC) Meeting March 11, 2010 Ariel, WA

ACC Participants Present (14)

Eli Asher, LCFRB
Jeremiah Doyle, PacifiCorp Energy
Diana Gritten-MacDonald, Cowlitz PUD (via teleconference)
Adam Haspiel, US Forest Service
David Hu, US Forest Service
LouEllyn Jones, USFWS
Eric Kinne, WDFW
George Lee, Yakama Nation
Erik Lesko, PacifiCorp Energy
Jim Malinowski, Fish First
Kimberly McCune, PacifiCorp Energy
Todd Olson, PacifiCorp Energy
Frank Shrier, PacifiCorp Energy
Shannon Wills, Cowlitz Indian Tribe (via teleconference)

Calendar:

April 8, 2010	ACC Meeting (Decision Making Meeting)	Merwin Hydro
May 13, 2010	ACC Meeting	Merwin Hydro

Assignments from March 11, 2010 Meeting:	Status:
The next ACC meeting on Thursday, April 8, 2010 will be an	
aquatic fund project decision making meeting. Each ACC	
member must be present or have identified a proxy before the	
meeting.	
McCune: Confirm availability of the \$2,000 in the large woody	Complete – 3/11/10
debris (LWD) fund to offset the expense of LWD hauling and email	
Haspiel (USFS).	
McCune: Email an invite to all interested parties to include site visit	Complete – 3/17/10
details to Swift Upper Release on Tuesday, March 30, 2010; meet at	
the Merwin Hydro Control Center at 10:00am and arrive at the site no	
later than noon.	

Assignments from April 9, 2009 Meeting:	Status:
ACC: Further investigate WDFW carcass survey methods established	Pending as of 3/11/10
in 1978 and determine "next step" regarding modifications needed, if	
any, to the 1978 methods.	

Opening, Review of Agenda and Meeting Notes

Frank Shrier (PacifiCorp Energy) called the meeting to order at 9:10am and requested a roundtable introduction for those participating via teleconference. Shrier reviewed the agenda for the day and requested any changes/additions. No changes or additions were requested.

Shrier requested comments and/or changes to the ACC Draft 2/11/10 meeting notes. No changes were requested. The meeting notes were approved without changes at 9:15am.

Response to Flow Reductions or Interruptions Discussion (Attachment A) -6.1.6(c)

Erik Lesko (PacifiCorp Energy) provided a cursory review of the *Response to Flow Reductions or Interruptions at the Swift Bypass Reach Upper Release Point and Canal Drain* (Plan) document, which was emailed to the ACC and the Services on February 23, 2010.

Eric Kinne (WDFW) would like to know if there is a routine calibration to ensure the alarm that alerts the Hydro Control Center is working properly. Lesko expressed that he will confer with the appropriate PacifiCorp personnel and update the document accordingly. A number of ACC attendees asked to see a picture of the canal drain, of which Shrier provided via Power Map during the meeting. Lesko will also add a map into the Plan as part of the revision.

Swift Upper Release Flow Discussion

Lesko and Shrier informed the ACC attendees that PacifiCorp does not have to shut down flows to install the pump. The scheduled start-up date is March 30, 2010. If the valve does not arrive when anticipated (late March) the flows will be reestablished regardless. Representatives from the Department of Ecology have asked to be present during the water-up of the new system..

Kimberly McCune (PacifiCorp Energy) will email an invite to all interested parties for Tuesday, March 30, 2010, to meet at the Merwin Hydro Control Center at 10:00am. All attendees will travel together to the secure area for arrival no later than 12:00pm.

Aquatic Project Proposal Discussion Meeting

Olson provided a cursory review of the Utilities evaluation matrix (**Attachment B**). He informed the ACC attendees that today that the Utilities are requesting initial feedback to be followed by formal comments on or before March 26, 2010.

All comments during this portion of the meeting can be reviewed in the Lewis River Aquatic Fund ACC Evaluation Matrix, dated March 11, 2010 (Attachment C).

Jim Malinowski (Fish First) expressed concern that approximately 70% of the projects for the 2009/2010 cycle are downstream of Merwin. He thought the priority was upstream of Merwin and would like to see priority given to such projects.

George Lee (Yakama Nation) communicated that there is a finite amount of money available and the Yakama Nation's priority is spring Chinook in the upper basin. He would like to see the Aquatic funds combined with other entities funds. The Yakama Nation's concern is that once these funds are gone they are gone.

Diana Gritten-MacDonald (Cowlitz PUD) echoed the comment in that we should perhaps save some money for the future, after reintroduction begins in 2012.

```
<Break 10:40>
<Reconvene 10:50am>
```

Study Updates

Shrier, Lesko, and Doyle provided the following study updates:

Hatchery Upgrades –

Lewis River Hatchery Ponds 13 & 14 – See attached 2010 Hatchery Upgrade Schedule (**Attachment D**).

Speelyai Burrows Pond (2nd Bank) – See attached 2010 Hatchery Upgrade Schedule (Attachment D).

Swift Net Pens – Expecting receipt of net pens and structures by April 2010; permitting in process. Need to be ready to go by June 26, 2010.

Hatchery & Supplementation Plan Subgroup – Working on the Wild Winter Steelhead 2010 Plan; well within the collection curve; the hatchery is holding seven fish which have assigned to North Fork Lewis River; going out again on Monday, March 15, 2010 for additional collection.

Release Pond Status – Working with property owner to secure easement and entry agreement.

Acclimation Pond Plan – PacifiCorp is creating scope for consultants to complete needed survey work which is necessary for NEPA; PacifiCorp intends to contract in approximately 30 days.

Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Subgroup – Initial comments from Subgroup due March 12, 2010. Next step is to complete a draft M&E Plan for an additional ACC 30-day review and comment period. The final M&E Plan will be sent to the FERC on or before June 26, 2010.

New Topics

Adam Haspiel (US Forest Service) communicated that he has spoken to PacifiCorp personnel about obtaining 20 logs with root wads which are left over from the Constructed channel project. Haspiel would like permission from the ACC to take these logs and use them for a habitat enhancement project. No objection from the ACC, permission granted.

In addition, McCune will confirm availability of the \$2,000 in the LWD fund to offset the expense of hauling and email Haspiel.

Agenda items for April 8, 2010

- Review March 11, 2010 Meeting Notes
- Aquatic Project Proposal Decision Meeting
- Response to Flow Reductions or Interruptions 6.1.6 (c)
- ➤ Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Update
- ➤ Study/Work Product Updates

Public Comment

None

Next Scheduled Meetings

April 8, 2010	May 13, 2010
Merwin Hydro Control Center	Merwin Hydro Control Center
Ariel, WA	Ariel, WA
9:00am – 3:00pm	9:00am – 3:00pm

Meeting Adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

Handouts

- o Final Agenda
- o Draft ACC Meeting Notes 2/11/2010
- Attachment A Response to Flow Reductions or Interruptions at the Swift Bypass Reach Upper Release Point and Canal Drain, dated February 23, 2010
- Attachment B Lewis River Aquatic Fund Utilities Evaluation Matrix, dated February 25, 2010
- Attachment C Lewis River Aquatic Fund ACC Evaluation Matrix, dated March 11, 2010
- o Attachment D 2010 Lewis River Hatchery Upgrade Schedule

RESPONSE TO FLOW REDUCTIONS OR INTERRUPTIONS

at the

SWIFT BYPASS REACH

UPPER RELEASE POINT AND CANAL DRAIN

1 Introduction

Section 6.1.6 (c) of the Lewis River Settlement Agreement stipulates the requirement to deliver plan(s) to the U. S Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service (collectively the "Services"), Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and the Lewis River Aquatic Coordination Committee (ACC) prior to establishing flows into the Swift bypass reach. This plan provides the procedures for flow interruptions at either the Canal Drain or the Upper Release Point whether planned or unplanned. Section 6.1.6 (a) and (b) of the agreement provides separate sections for both emergency and non-emergency events as follows:

Non-emergency

"If a non-emergency maintenance or replacement of release point facilities is required, and such activities could decrease or interrupt scheduled releases, the Licensees shall notify the Services, WDFW, and the ACC as far in advance as practicable. The Licensees shall utilize temporary replacement facilities (e.g., pumps, siphons) for the period of potential flow reduction or interruption to maintain release of scheduled amounts of water."

Emergency

"If emergency maintenance or replacement of release point facilities is required, or if any other event of Force Majeure occurs, and such activities or such event will decrease or interrupt scheduled releases, the Licensees shall notify the Services, WDFW, and the ACC as soon as practicable. The Licensees shall utilize temporary replacement facilities (e.g., pumps, siphons) for the period of potential flow reduction or interruption to maintain release of scheduled amounts of water to the extent practicable under such emergency or Force Majeure conditions. The Licensees shall take action to maintain or replace the release point facilities and to restore their normal operation as soon as is practicable."

2 Upper Release Point

2.1 Overview

The Upper Release is located just downstream of the Swift No. 1 powerhouse consists of an approximately 500-foot long siphon pipe that draws water from the Swift No. 2 Canal and discharges at a concrete outlet structure into a fish spawning channel. A siphon was installed at the Upper Release site because subsurface conditions prevented the installation of a gravity system. The invert of the siphon inlet is at elevation 586. The inlet has a removable trash rack and a 48-inch by 108-inch slide gate. The inlet gate can be operated locally by an electric actuator. The siphon outlets though a 48-inch by 48-inch slide gate. The outlet gate is controlled by an electric actuator that has local and automatic control. The invert outlet of the siphon pipe is elevation at 588. The outlet structure weir has an elevation of 591.75. The siphon is primed from a 4-inch waterline from the cooling water piping in the Swift No.1 Plant with excess water flowing through a priming vent. A vacuum pump system cycles as necessary to remove air that may collect in the pipe. Seal water for the vacuum pump is provided by a 1-inch waterline from the cooling water piping in the Swift No.1 Plant.

The flow from the Upper Release is controlled by the downstream slide gate. The slide gate is an AC motor operated steel gate which is powered from a control panel located on the intake structure. The panel has a push button control to raise and lower the gate and a selector switch for 'local', 'off', or 'remote' operations. In remote setting, the Programmable Logic Control (PLC) will automatically lower or raise the gate. In the local setting, the operator uses the push buttons to raise or lower the gate. The gate can be operated manually if AC failure occurs or for a tag-out safety point by the use of a hand wheel placed on the end of the worm gear for the head gate. In remote control, the gate position is controlled by the PLC to maintain flows above the minimum required flow.

The Upper Release electrical feed is provided a single 480-volt breaker from the Swift Motor Control Center 3. The breaker energizes an exterior 480- volt panel and 480/120-volt transformer to power the Upper Release equipment. The siphon also has an internally mounted ultrasonic flowmeter. The 8-path flowmeter has redundant sensors to prevent the need to dewater the pipe in the event that a sensor stops working. The flowmeter panel is located in the Swift 1 Powerhouse.

2.2 Emergency Flow Reduction Procedure:

In the event of an emergency flow reduction or interruption the PLC system will alarm at the Hydro Control Center (HCC) located near Merwin dam at Merwin headquarters. The HCC operator will initiate remote operation of the Swift dam spill gate to reestablish flow and prevent potential fish loss. The amount of flow to be released from the spill gate is not precise or accurate. However, sufficient flow will be provided initially (through visual observation) and verified as soon as practical with a staff gage to ensure the amount of flow is meeting minimum flow requirements of the Combined Flow Schedule.

Once flow has been established via the spill gate, the Licensees will evaluate the reason for the flow reduction. The siphon will be brought back on line as soon as possible. If the issue cannot be resolved within five days, the Licensees will make plans to temporarily pump or siphon water from the power canal to reestablish flows into the bypass. Once flows are reestablished from the power canal through the temporary siphon or pumps the spill gate will be closed.

Notifications and documentation will be provided per the Lewis River Settlement Agreement Section 6.1.6.

2.3 Non-Emergency Flow Reduction Procedure:

Planned events require prior notification to the WDFW, Services and ACC. For non-emergency (planned) outages, the Licensees will use temporary pumps or siphons to convey water to the bypass (i.e., no use of spill gates will occur) prior to any planned outage. Temporary pumps or siphons will be in place until the upper release point is functional and providing flow as stipulated in the Combined Flow Schedule. In the rare event that the temporary pump or siphon fails, the Swift No. 1 spill gate will be cracked open to provide sufficient flow and will be operated as described in Section 2.2 above.

3 Canal Drain

3.1 Overview

The canal drain is located approximately one mile from the Swift No. 1 tailrace. The canal drain was part of the original construction. The drain consists of a 30-inch corrugated metal pipe (CMP) that was lined in 2005 to reduce corrosion. The inlet is at approximately at elevation 585 feet and does not have a trash rack. There is an Armco Slide Gate Model 20-10C on the inlet that is operated manually with a hand wheel. The drain discharges into the Constructed Channel that was required by the FERC license.

Since the required flow release from the canal drain remains constant throughout the year (14 cfs), the canal drain opening will be fixed to release required flows at the lowest possible canal stage in the canal. Canal stage will be monitored at HCC and an alarm will sound when the water stage approaches the minimum level. Flow from the canal drain can be verified by a rated staff gage located in the Constructed Channel near the Canal Drain discharge. The current rating table for the staff gage is located in Appendix A.

3.2 Emergency Flow Reduction Procedure

The canal drain is a gravity-fed pipe with a manual gate. Failure of this type of equipment is highly unlikely. In the event of the canal becoming devoid of water in an emergency, there would be a delay in the amount of time before the Constructed Channel would not be receiving 14 cfs of water from the power canal drain. It is estimated that the power canal has sufficient water volume to last up to 3 days at 14 cfs flow rate from the canal drain. If other problems occur such as a blockage or pipe collapse that result in an unplanned loss of flow, the Licensees

will, as soon as practical, install temporary pumps or siphons to provide a minimum of 14 cfs flow into the constructed channel. Because there would be a delay in setting up temporary pumps or siphons, the Licensees will conduct fish salvage of the constructed channel at any time a flow interruption or reduction occurs that is not resolved in 30 minutes or less. The Licensees will transport any stranded fish into the bypass reach or power canal. Notification to the WDFW, Services and ACC will be made as soon as possible following any emergency event.

3.3 Non-Emergency Flow Reduction Procedure

Planned events require prior notification to the WDFW, Services and ACC. For non- emergency (planned) outages, the preference would be to maintain continuous 14 cfs flow into the Constructed Channel via the power canal drain. In any event that this is not possible the Licensees will use temporary pumps or siphons to maintain a continuous 14 cfs flow into the Constructed Channel.

4 Reporting

The Licensees shall document the duration (in days or hours), rate (in cfs), and volume (in acrefeet) of flow reduction to the extent practicable, and shall provide such documentation to the Services, WDFW, and the ACC. If any unplanned events occur, Licensees will report event and actions taken to the parties as soon as practicable. All events will be identified in the subsequent Aquatic Coordination Committee – Terrestrial Coordination Committee Annual Report.

Notifications for both emergency and non-emergency events shall be in compliance with Section 6.1.6 (a) and (b) of the Settlement Agreement.

Appendix A – Staff Gage Rating Table for Canal Drain

Rating Table 4.0

PacifiCorp Hydro Resources Swift Canal Drain

Staff No. A

Table Created: 12-11-09 Rating to be used after 12-10-09

	Discharge (cfs)												
Stage (ft)	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.1 ft		
											Stage		
1.5	3	4	4	5	5	6	6	7	7	8	5.1		
1.6	8	9	9	10	10	11	11	12	12	13	5.1		
1.7	13	14	14	15	15	16	17	17	18	18	5.1		
1.8	19	19	20	20	21	21	22	22	23	23	5.1		
1.9	24	24	25	25	26	26	27	27	28	28	5.1		
2	29	29	30	30	31	31	32	32	33	33	5.1		
2.1	34	34	35	35	36	37	37	38	38	39	5.1		
2.2	39	40	40	41	41	42	42	43	43	44	5.1		
2.3	44	45	45	46	46	47	47	48	48	49	5.1		
2.4	49	50	50	51	51	52	52	53	53	54			

Note: Rating based on flow data collected between 1.67 ft and 2.0 ft on the staff gage.

Operations and Resource Planning JLK

	Lewis River Aquati	ic Fund - Utilities' Evaluation of	2009/2010 Pro	ject Proposals					Consistency with	Benefit to	Scientific	Success Potential	Cost	Total Score		
								Cost			Validity	Success Fotential	Effectiveness	Total Score	Selected by	
No.	Applicant	Project Title	Project Schedule	Benefit	Bull Trout	Project Partners	Funding	Share?	Fund Objectives	Priority Fish					Utilities for Ful Proposal	Comments
- 1,00	Olympic Resource	9015/30 Rd Fish Passage		This project involves removal of two culverts	No	None	\$ 235,000.00		Yes			ll.				
	Management	Upgrade		and installation of two bridges to allow fish passage which affects 2.3 miles of fish habitat												
				on tributaries to Pine Creek/Lewis River/Swift						х	X	X	x	X	N	
				Reservoir.										2.5	1	
	USDA Forest	Sheep Bridge Removal	2010/2011	Removal of remaining timbers to clean up river	Yes	Gifford Pinchot National Forest	\$ 7,500.00	Yes	Yes, but benefit is							
	Service			and remove hazardous material					low.							
										X	X	X	X	X	N	
											••			Λ	11	
	USDA Forest	Pepper-Lewis Side Channel	2010/2011	LWD placement to create a pool capable of	No	Potential: Fish First, Swift	\$58,000 (reduced	Yes	Yes							Project will also benefit juvenile spring Chinook as well as immature bull trout. Project based on Tier 1 reach
	Service	Instream Habitat Restoration		rearing a combination of juvenile coho salmon and steelhead trout.		community Action Team,	to \$41,300)									and EDT analysis and ACC Synthesis Matrix. Project has most of the permitting completed. It has significant
				and steelnead trout.		WDFW, Salmon Recovery Board funds and FS Whole				12	16	4	4	36	Y	in-kind contributions.
						Watershed Joint Venture Fund										
1	USDA Forest	2010 Nutrient Enhancement on	2010	Adult carcasses from various hatchery reared	No	Gifford Pinchot National Forest,	\$ 30,776.00	Yes	Yes							Project has permits, and carcasses should be available. Concern benefit is only for bull trout until re-
	Service	Pine Creek		and collected salmonids species will be		Clark Skamania Fly Fishers, Mt.	,,,,,,,,,,									introduction of salmon and steelhead and is therefore short-lived. Not sure project addresses a limiting factor
				distributed by hand in areas accessible to vehicles, inaccessible areas would be seeded by		St. Helens Institute and ORM				8	12	4	3	27	Y	for bull trout.
2				helicopter.												
	USDA Forest	Pine Creek Instream and	2010	LWD placement instream in Pine Creek to	Yes	Gifford Pinchot National Forest	\$72,000 (reduced	Yes	Yes							
	Service	Floodplain Structures for Bull		stabilize stream banks to capture suitable sized spawning gravel for adult bull trout and		and Title II Funds	to \$65,000)									
		Trout and Steelhead		spawning gravel for adult bull trout and steelhead.												No mention of coho in the write-up, they will benefit in the future from this if project is successful as well. Redd superimposition concerns would not be between bull trout and STHD as they spawn in different habitat
										12	12	4	4	32	Y	and STHD spawn 5 months later. Superimposition concerns would be between bull trout and coho as their
										12	12	4	4	32	1	spawn time directly overlaps and they dig redds in the same margin areas. Question the efficacy of placing
																LW into such a wide, unstable floodplain and stability of structures. Concerns over project success. Immediate benefit to bull trout, future benefit to other re-introduced species. Significant in-kind contributions.
3	Lower Columbia	NE Lawis PM 13 5 Off Channel	2010/2011	Re-connection and enhancement of approx.	No	LCFRB, Inter-fluve and Sam	\$214,695	Yes	Vac	-						Funds should not be used for noxious weed control. Cost seem high, not much in-kind support. Support flow
	Fish Enhancement	Habitat Enhancement	2010/2011	1,500 lineal feet of backwater/ off-channel	NO	Kysar (landowner)	(reduced to	168	ies							through (future) option, but habitat currently has inlet and outlet and is currently being used. Project
	Group			habitat, riparian and wetland re-vegetation and			\$212,720)									addresses lack of off-channel habitat in lower river. LCFRB high priority area for restoration. Benefits to 0
				reconnection of a perennial tributary to mainstem to restore fish passage.						16	16		2	20	3.7	and 1 age fish. Improves riparian area. Land owner participation. Funds are for construction; design and permitting covered by in-kind or others.
										16	16	4	3	39	Y	P
4	USFWS	Bull Trout Population Structure	2010/2012	Expand network of radio telemetry receivers in	Yes	WDFW, PacifiCorp, USFS and	65000 (reduced to	Ves	Maybe, project does							Prohibitive costs and benefit is limited over existing knowledge or alternative methods. Data gathering, Only
	CSI WS	and Habitat Use in Tributaries to	2010/2012	tributaries to Swift Reservoir and NF Lewis	103	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	\$59,500; combined	103	not directly "enhance							benefits bull trout - can't make the benefits connection to other listed species. Project does not provide
		Swift Reservoir and the NF Lewis River		River.			with project #6		fish habitat", or				_	2.2	2.7	tangable on-the-ground benefit. Not sure that study will give clear answers that will direct site-specific in-
		Lewis River							support re- introduction of	4	12	4	2	22	N	stream projects.
									anadromous salmon							
5																
	USFWS	Bull Trout Population Structure in the Lewis River Basin	2010/2011	Describe population structure of bull trout using genetic analysis to better prioritize	Yes	WDFW, PacifiCorp, USFS and Cowlitz Indian Tribe	Combined with project #5	Yes	Maybe, project does not directly "enhance							
		in the Bewis Rever Busin		recovery actions in the Lewis River.		COWINE INCIDENT	project #5		fish habitat".							
										X	X	X	X	X	N	
6																
		Clear Creek Habitat	2010	Removal of 1.2 miles of spur road, including	No	GP Task Force and GP National	\$ 73,725.00	Yes	Yes							
	Task Force	Improvement Project		culvert removal, slope shaping and stabilization, scarification of the roadbed and		Forest				X	X	X	X	X	Y	
				revegetation.						.,	•		.,	Λ	1	
	Cowlitz Indian	Eagle Island Habitat	2011/2013	Placement of medium to large jams and	No	Cowlitz Indian Tribe,	\$ 74,300.00	Yes	Yes							Note the funds would be returned to ACC if full funding is not secured from Salmon Recovery Funds. High
	Tribe	Enhancement		individual pieces of LWD through a 1,200 foot		Interfluvve, Clark County	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,									value of ACC funds leveraged to gain whole project funding. Project is part of greater restoration of Eagle
				long side channel and restoration of riparian plant communities to restore vital spawning		WDFW and LCFRB										Island. High value towards Lewis River recovery goals.
				and rearing habitat along Eagle Island.						16	16	1	5	41	Y	
										10	10	4	3	41	1	
7																
'						Resource Funds	\$ 359,096.00									
						(recommended projects)										
				1		Bull Trout Funds	\$ 65,000.00									
	Fund Objectives:			ewis River, priority to federal ESA-listed species		(recommended projects)	. 52,550.00									
		Support the re-introduction of anac Enhance fish habitat in the Lewis I		oughout the basin n priority given to North Fork Lewis River		Total Aquatic Funds	\$ 424,096.00									
	I .		Duom, with	1			,0,0,000		0			1	1		i	

Lewis River Aquatic Fund ACC Evaluation Matrix 2009/2010 March 11, 2010

		Lewis River Aquatic F	und - ACC Ev	aluation of 2009/2010 Project Project	posals						
ACC			Funding								
Decision	Applicant	Project Title	Request	WDFW	Fish First	LCFRB	Yakama Nation	USFS	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	USFWS	Trout Unlimited
	1 Cowlitz Indian Tribe	Eagle Island Habitat Enhancement		Supports this project.	Supports this project given ACC funds are seed money for other sources.	Abstained involvement in this decision since he was part of the design process.		Concerned about probability to secure remaining funds.	Neutral but want to consider lower river projects.	Supports this project.	
	2 Lower Columbia Fish Enhancemen Group	NF Lewis RM 13.5 Off- t Channel Habitat Enhancement		really high. May support in a phased approach.	project; too much money spent below Merwin.	Concerned about high cost of the project and recreational earth moving as a fix to mitigate for erosion. Not likely to support.	Does not support this project.	Not highest priority; concerned about high cost of project; maybe funding in part.	Neutral but want to consider lower river projects.	Concerned about the high cost of this project and the sustainability. Does not support this project.	
	3 USDA Forest Service	Pepper-Lewis Side Channel Instream Habitat Restoration		Concerned about the cost share of trees and the administrative staff expense. Generally supports.		Would like confirmation on availability of LWD. Generally supports	Supports this project.	Would like confirmation if LWD is available for instream work			
	4 USDA Forest Service	Pine Creek Instream and Floodplain Structures for Bull Trout and Steelhead		Good project; concerned about structures staying intact. Supports.	Supports this project.	Thought the administrative portion of the budge was very high. Generally supports.	Supports this project.		Supports this project.	Supports this project.	
	5 USDA Forest Service	2010 Nutrient Enhancement on Pine Creek	\$ 30,776.00	Do we really know where nutrients need to be placed at this point prior to reintroduction? Reluctant to support.	Big proponent; strongly supports.	y Does not think the funding for this project should come out of the BT funds; not sure if it's the best use of these funds; very difficult to prove the effectiveness of nutrient enhancement Does not support.	given USFS	Why is the cost to benefit ratio still a concern? Shannon Wills shared this opinion that benefit is waning. No juvenile fish rearing ir those waters now, which helps him understand the concern to proceed with this project. Unclear on level of support.	Does not support this project; benefit to cost ratio is not worth it.	Supports this project.	
	6 US Fish & Wildli Service	fe Bull Trout Population Structure habitat Use in Tributaries to Swift Reservoir and the NF Lewis River	\$ 59,500.00	Does not support a monitoring study project. I think the project is valuable but not an on-the-ground project.	Neutral - does not support this project but will not stand in the way if others do.	Important to fund but does not meet the fund objectives. In addition, very large administrative costs. Does not support.	Supports this project.		Supports the concept but leaning toward concurring with the Utilities, does not support.	We do not currently have available data on bull trout like we do for other species. Would like to hear from the Utilities regarding their logic to not fund this project. Olson responded that this project tells us where the fish are going but it does not tell us why they are going in and what their specific habitat needs are. A one year study does not get us to identifying specific habitat projects needed in a tributary.	

1

2010 HATCHERY PROJECTS - CONSTRUCTION WINDOWS

Construction Window Days

			-											
PROJECT			-											
			JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
LEWIS RIVER HATCHERY														
Pond 14 Conversion	March 15 - Sep 1	165				SCH	to be in P	16 and rac	eways				į	
Pond 13 Conversion	May 1 - Sep 1	120					(Coho to be	held in P1	5				
Upstream Intake Pipe Testing and Repair	May 1 - May 31	30												
MERWIN HATCHERY														
Rearing Pond Flow Improvement	June 1 - July 31	60			<u> </u>							i !	i !	
Modify Release Ponds to Accommodate Adu	June 1 - July 31	60			! !							! ! !		
Purchase Flat Bed Truck and (250g) Tanks	by March 1	1												
Ozone Upgrades (Pending)	November	30							Derby					
SPEELYAI HATCHERY														
Expand Adult Fertilization Area	Jan 1 - May 1	120												
Burrows Pond Conversion (Bank 2)	July 1 - Nov 1	120												
NET PENS														
Purchase Pens and Nets	Jan1 - Jan 31	30			<u> </u>							<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
Site, Permit and Install Pens	Feb 1 - Sep 1	210			ļ									

NOTES:

^{*} Partition screens for Ponds 13 and 14 should be ordered as soon as possible so they can be used for juvenile rearing at P15 during construction

^{*} Mobilization can be done earlier to save time from schedule

^{*} Permitting may delay some projects