

**Meeting Notes
Lewis River License Implementation
Aquatic Coordination Committee (ACC) Meeting
September 9, 2010
Ariel, WA**

ACC Participants Present (9)

Pat Frazier, WDFW
 Adam Haspiel, USDA Forest Service
 David Hu, USDA Forest Service (teleconference)
 Eric Kinne, WDFW
 Erik Lesko, PacifiCorp Energy
 Jim Malinowski, Fish First (teleconference)
 Kimberly McCune, PacifiCorp Energy
 Frank Shrier, PacifiCorp Energy
 Shannon Wills, Cowlitz Indian Tribe (teleconference)

Calendar:

October 14, 2010	ACC Meeting	Merwin Hydro
November 11, 2010	ACC Meeting	Merwin Hydro

Assignments from September 9, 2010 Meeting:	Status:
Arnold Adams: Provide a more detailed explanation of the proposed changes to the Merwin Upstream fish collection schedule and distribute to the ACC for its consideration.	Pending
Shrier: Insert a comment box in each task of the Implementation M&E Effort Matrix providing explanatory detail of next steps, current status, etc.	Pending

Assignments from August 12, 2010 Meeting:	Status:
McCune: Mail copies of Trout Identification brochure to Shannon Wills and LouEllyn Jones.	Complete – 7/13/10

Assignments from April 8, 2010 Meeting:	Status:
Haspiel: Present more detailed design of the Pine Creek Instream aquatic fund project to the ACC when available.	Pending

Opening, Review of Agenda and Meeting Notes

Frank Shrier (PacifiCorp Energy) called the meeting to order at 9:15am, reviewed the agenda for the day and requested any changes/additions. No changes/additions were requested.

Shrier requested comments and/or changes to the ACC Draft 8/12/10 meeting notes. No changes were requested. The meeting notes were approved without change at 9:20am.

Aquatic Fund 2010/2011 Announcement Letter

Shrier informed the ACC attendees that the 2010/2011 Aquatic Fund Announcement letter ([Attachment A](#)) was provided to all interested parties on September 3, 2010.

Release Ponds 60% Design Comments and Status

Shrier reminded the ACC attendees that PacifiCorp solicited comments from the ACC and the National Marine Fisheries Services (NMFS) on August 20, 2010. PacifiCorp received comments from WDFW, which PacifiCorp largely addressed over the telephone. Eric Kinne (WDFW) communicated that WDFW has plans to submit its comments in writing. Bryan Nordlund (NMFS) also provided comments to PacifiCorp.

In addition, general discussion took place regarding specific design of the release ponds to include loading, inflow, pond size, mortality check and volitional release. Shrier noted that PacifiCorp requested a water right of 8cfs to ensure that an adequate amount is available.

Due to certain challenges PacifiCorp is experiencing in regard to land acquisition that will adequately support the release ponds, PacifiCorp will notify the FERC by the deadline of September 30, 2010 and inform them of the current status and request an extension.

Implementation Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Effort Matrix

Shrier reminded the ACC that PacifiCorp emailed the *Implementation M&E Effort Matrix* on August 12, 2010 and asked if the ACC had any additional comments. No additional comments were provided.

Jim Malinowski joined

Shrier indicated that for ease of review he will insert a comment box for each task providing explanatory detail of next steps, current status, etc and finalize the Matrix.

Study Updates

Erik Lesko (PacifiCorp Energy) and Shrier provided the following study updates:

Hatchery Upgrades –

Lewis River Hatchery Ponds 13 & 14 – Construction is under way on both ponds; walls are in place and P13 is scheduled to be completed this month and P14 in October

Speelyai Burrows Pond – On schedule for completion in November 2010.

Merwin Rearing Ponds – Running into a considerable amount of underground piping which is slowing down construction but still on schedule at this time.

Merwin Adult Holding Ponds – Excavation is nearly complete, on schedule.

Swift Net Pens – Cowlitz County permit is still pending; install is planned immediately upon receipt of permit.

Hatchery & Supplementation Plan – Draft Annual Operating Plans will be available to the ACC on or before September 17, 2010 at which time approximately a three week review will be provided. Subgroup meetings will be scheduled shortly thereafter to finalize the plans prior to December 31.

Habitat Preparation Plan (HPP) – Lesko will check with hatchery staff and determine schedule for transportation of 2000 early coho; another HPP will come out in Spring 2011.

Acclimation Pond Plan – Progressing on schedule; met with US Forest Service’s monument manager and identified concerns and visual objectives; on target and working on getting operation plan in place. Most of the surveys are finished. Fish Survey of Crab Creek still on schedule for September 16, 2010.

Merwin Upstream Trap and Transport Status – the trap will be ready but we need to work out the schedule details specific to an operational start date. Contractor wants permission for divers to enter anytime during the construction window. The USFWS is fine with this but PacifiCorp has not yet heard from NMFS.

New Topics

- *Merwin Upstream Fish Collection*: Shrier informed the ACC attendees that PacifiCorp is in the process of procuring a construction contract and the contractor is concerned about not being able to meet the December 26, 2012 deadline with all the facilities ready to function even with working two crews. Shrier requested the ACC to begin thinking about options (delay operational start date, collect fish then sort at Lewis River hatchery, etc.) given a potential delay. Arnold Adams (PacifiCorp Energy) will provide a more detailed explanation of the proposed changes to the schedule and distribute to the ACC for its consideration.
- *Carcass Disposal Stakeholder Meeting* – Malinowski informed the ACC attendees that on behalf of Fish First he attended a carcass disposal stakeholder’s meeting and made a strong case for the value of nutrient enhancement activity. Malinowski is of the opinion that many stakeholders (including USFWS) consider carcass only waste. There will be two more meetings of which Malinowski will email the details to Shannon Wills (Cowlitz Indian Tribe) so that she might attend. Malinowski also expressed that a strong argument could be made that recovery of salmon and steelhead would be more cost effective with the addition of carcass nutrients.
Pat Frazier (WDFW) expressed that there was a regional fisheries enhancement group (RFEG) legislative bill put forward to maximize funds generated for RFEG’s from surplus hatchery fish returning to WDFW facilities while maintain donations to statewide food bank. Wills explained the financial benefits of selling eggs and using the funds toward carcass distribution for nutrient enhancement.

Frazier referred Wills and Malinowski to the head of hatchery division to discuss the RFEG efforts.

- *Pine Creek Hole*: Adam Haspiel (USFS) communicated to the ACC attendees that he notices more fisherman at this location and would like WDFW to put closure on the rules and would appreciate law enforcement emphasis at Pine Creek Hole.
- *SA 4.1.9, Review of New Information Regarding Fish Transport into Lake Merwin and Yale Lake*: PacifiCorp proposes to have BIS Consulting come to our October 14th ACC meeting and layout a potential decision making pathway (what the tool is and how it works) as we work to address future fish passage efforts, in accordance with SA 4.1.9. The ACC agreed that it would be worthwhile to invite BIS to make a presentation next month.

Agenda items for October 14, 2010

- Review September 9, 2010 Meeting Notes
- BIS Consulting Presentation
- Release Pond Update
- Revised Monitoring and Evaluation Effort Matrix
- Merwin Upstream Fish Collection Schedule
- Aquatic Fund Pre-proposals
- Study/Work Product Updates

Public Comment

None

Next Scheduled Meetings

October 14, 2010	November 11, 2010
Merwin Hydro Control Center	Merwin Hydro Control Center
Ariel, WA	Ariel, WA
9:00am – 3:00pm	9:00am – 3:00pm

Meeting Adjourned and departed for Hatchery Ponds 13 & 14 site visit at 10:40 a.m.

Handouts

- Final Agenda
- Draft ACC Meeting Notes 8/12/2010
- **Attachment A** – 2010/2011 Aquatic Fund Announcement letter, dated September 3, 2010

September 3, 2010

Subject: Availability of Funds for Aquatic Related Projects in the Lewis River Basin

Dear Interested Party,

PacifiCorp owns the Merwin, Yale, and Swift No. 1 hydroelectric projects on the Lewis River in southwest Washington. Public Utility District No. 1 of Cowlitz County, Washington (Cowlitz PUD) owns the Swift No. 2 hydroelectric project, also located on the Lewis River. These projects are operated as a coordinated system. On November 30, 2004, the Lewis River Settlement Agreement established the Lewis River Aquatics Fund (Fund). On June 26, 2008, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission acknowledged this fund as a stipulation of project operating licenses. The purpose of the Fund is to support resource protection measures via aquatic related projects (Resource Projects) in the Lewis River basin. The projects are evaluated for funding according to their:

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

Species that are targeted to benefit from Resource Projects include Chinook, steelhead, coho, bull trout, chum, and sea-run cutthroat.

This letter is to provide you the opportunity to submit proposals for Resource Project funding. The total Fund amount available this year is limited to \$487,401.13 for Resource Projects and \$270,533.74 for Bull Trout Projects. The selection of Resource Projects will be conducted in two phases. To be considered, applicants must submit a completed Pre-Proposal Form (see attachment A for Form) **by close of business October 4, 2010**. Pre-Proposals will be evaluated with some projects appropriately selected for further consideration (see attachment B for evaluation criteria). If selected, applicants will be notified in early December, and be requested to submit a formal proposal by mid-January. The Utilities and representatives of the Lewis River Aquatic Coordination Committee will finalize the list of successful projects in early April 2011. Shortly thereafter the Utilities will submit the final list to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to meet the submittal deadline of April 15, 2011.

Please give attention to this excellent opportunity. If you should have any questions feel free to contact Mr. Frank Shrier, PacifiCorp, (503) 813-6622. We look forward to your response in early October.

Sincerely,



Todd Olson
Director, Compliance Hydro Resources

cc: Diana Gritten-MacDonald, Cowlitz PUD
Mailing List
Attachments

Aquatic Fund Announcement Mailing List – Sept. 3, 2010

Bill M. Bakke
The Native Fish Society
P.O. Box 19570
Portland, OR 97280

Bob Nelson
Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Inc.
45 Overmeyer Rd
Raymond, WA 98577

Salley Sovey
United States Bureau of Land Mgmt.
915 Walla Walla Ave
Wenatchee, WA 98801

Claire Lavendel
USDA Forest Service
10600 NE 51st Circle
Vancouver, WA 98682

Kathryn Miller
Trout Unlimited
227 SW Pine Street, Suite 200
Portland, OR 97204

Michelle Day
NMFS
1201 NE Lloyd Blvd., Suite 1100
Portland, OR 97232-2778

Brett Swift
American Rivers
320 SW Stark St Ste 412
Portland, OR 97204-2634

Ken S. Berg
United States Fish and Wildlife Service
510 Desmond Drive SE, Ste. 102
Lacey, WA 98503-1263

John Clapp
Lewis River Citizens at-Large
9315 NE Etna Road
Woodland, WA 98674

Steve Branz
City of Woodland
100 Davidson, Box 9
Woodland, WA 98674

Ryan Lopossa
Cowlitz County Department of Public
Works 207 4th Ave North
Kelso, WA 98626

Jody Lando
Senior Quantitative Ecologist
Stillwater Sciences
404 SE 6th Avenue
Portland, OR 97214

Ilene L. Black
North County Emergency Medical Svc.
227 Frasier Rd.
Amboy, WA 98601

Darlene G. Johnson
Woodland Chamber of Commerce
P.O. Box 1808
Woodland, WA 98674

Mariah Stoll-Smith Reese
Lewis River Community Council
14900 Lewis River Rd.
Ariel, WA 98603

Jim Eychaner
Washington Recreation and
Conservation Office
P.O. Box 40917
Olympia, WA 98504-0917

Susan Rosebrough
National Park Service
909 First Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104-1060

Susan Cierebiej
Washington Dept. Fish & Wildlife
600 Capitol Way North
Olympia, WA 98504-0001

James Malinowski
Fish First
PO Box 127
Amboy, WA 98601

Ruth Tracy
USDA Forest Service
10600 NE 51st Circle
Vancouver, WA 98682

Diana M. Gritten-MacDonald
PUD #1 of Cowlitz County, WA
PO Box 3007
Longview, WA 98632-0307

Noel Johnson
Lewis River Citizens at-Large
6412 NW Amidon Road
Woodland, WA 98674

Nathan Reynolds
Cowlitz Indian Tribe
PO Box 2547
Longview, WA 98632

Don Stuart
Cowlitz-Skamania Fire Dist. No. 7
11670 Lewis River Road
Ariel, WA 98603

Pat Spurgin
Yakama Nation
P.O. Box 151
Toppenish, WA 98948

Betty Sue Morris, Chair
Clark County, 1013 Franklin Street
PO Box 5000
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000

Aquatic Fund Announcement Mailing List – Sept. 3, 2010

William Iyall
Cowlitz Indian Tribe
PO Box 2547
Longview, WA 98632

Jeff Breckel
Lower Columbia River Fish Recovery
2127 8th Avenue
Longview, WA 98632

Gary Stuart
Cowlitz-Skamania Fire District No. 7
11310 Lewis River Road
Ariel, WA 98603

Bob Rose
Yakama Nation
P.O. Box 151
Toppenish, WA 98948

Kemper M. McMaster
Wildlands of Washington
2713 NW 140th St
Vancouver, WA 98685

Adam Haspiel
USDA Forest Service
10600 NE 51st Circle
Vancouver, WA 98682

Ken Hogan
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20426

Steve Vigg
Washington Dept. Fish & Wildlife
600 Capitol Way North
Olympia, WA 98501

Joel Rupley
Clark County
PO Box 5000
Vancouver, WA 98666

Shannon Wills
Cowlitz Indian Tribe
PO Box 2547
Longview, WA 98632

LouEllyn Jones
US Fish & Wildlife Services
510 Desmond Drive SE, Suite 102
Lacey, WA 98503-1263

Paul J. Pearce
Skamania County
PO Box 790
Stevenson, WA 98648

Dave Burlingame
Cowlitz Indian Tribe
PO Box 2547
Longview, WA 98632

Bernadette Graham Hudson
Lower Columbia River Fish Recovery
2127 8th Avenue
Longview, WA 98632

Tony Pranger
ANE/Elkhorn Forestry, Inc
PO Box 1864
Oregon City, OR 97045

Evan Haas
Habitat Restoration Coordinator
Lower Columbia River Estuary Par.
811 SW Naito Parkway, Suite 410
Portland, OR 97204

Eric Holman
USDA Forest Service
10600 NE 51st Circle
Vancouver, WA 98682

Olympic Resource Management
321 Maurin Road
Chehalis, WA 98520

Erich Gaedeke
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
805 SW Broadway, Suite 550
Portland, OR 97205

Attachment A

PRE-PROPOSAL FORM

Lewis River Aquatic Fund

Form Intent:

To provide a venue for an applicant to clearly indicate the technical basis and support for proposed project. Specifically the project's consistency with recovery plans, Settlement Agreement Fund objectives, technical studies and assessments which support the proposed action and approach.

Proposal format:

Please complete the following form for each proposal. Maps, design drawings and other supporting materials may be attached. The request is to be brief in response with a total completed form length of no more than 3 pages of text.

The deadline for Pre-Proposal Form submission is **October 4, 2010**. Please submit materials to:

Frank Shrier
PacifiCorp – LCT 1500
825 NE Multnomah
Portland, OR 97232

1. Applicant organization.
2. Organization purpose
3. Project manager (name, address, telephone, email, fax).

Note: Please attach a resume or other description of the education and experience of the persons responsible for project implementation.

4. Project Title

5. Summary of Project proposal

Note: Please include description of how project addresses Lewis River Aquatic Fund priorities and identify any impacts to other resource areas (e.g. wildlife, recreation, etc.).

6. Project location (including River/Stream and Lat/Long coordinates if available).
7. Expected products and results (Please attach any drawings).
8. Benefits of proposed Project
9. Project partners and roles.
10. Community involvement (to date and planned).
11. Procedure for monitoring and reporting on results.
12. Project schedule (anticipated start date, major milestones, completion date).
13. Funding requested (estimated cost for project design, permitting (including necessary resource surveys), construction, and monitoring).
14. Type and source of other contributions (Identify cash (C) and/or in-kind (IK), and status, pending (P) or confirmed (Co)).
15. If you have technical assistance needs for this project, please briefly describe such needs.

Attachment B

Lewis River Aquatics Fund – Individual Project Evaluation Sheet

For each Evaluation Criteria listed below, a determination of “meets” or “does not meet” or a score of 1 to 5 is assigned by project evaluator. If during the Pre-Proposal review the project receives a “does not meet” response to any “Consistency with Fund Objectives and Priorities” component, the proposal will be dropped from further evaluation and funding. A 1 is the lowest score (does not or very unlikely to meet objectives), a 5 the highest score (greater likelihood of meeting objectives). Scores are multiplied by the assigned weighting then totaled for a single project score.

<p>A. Consistency with Fund Objectives and Priorities (Meets or Does not meet):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Benefit fish recovery throughout the North Fork Lewis River, priority to federal ESA-listed species (Bull Trout, Chinook, Steelhead, and Chum) 2. Support the re-introduction of anadromous fish throughout the Basin (Spring Chinook, Winter Steelhead, Coho, and Sea-run Cutthroat) 3. Enhance fish habitat in the Lewis River Basin, with priority given to the North Fork Lewis River. 	
<p>B. How does the project benefit priority fish species and stocks? (Spring Chinook, Winter Steelhead, Coho, Bull Trout, and Sea-run Cutthroat) (40 % weight):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the proposal clearly describe the expected fish benefits of the project? ▪ Does the proposal clearly identify the salmonid species and stocks that would benefit from the project? ▪ Does the project address a limiting factor(s) to the target species, a limiting life history stage, or an important habitat process or condition? ▪ Will the project provide long-term benefits? Does the project provide tangible, on-the-ground benefits? ▪ Is the project generally consistent with the intent (strategies, measures, actions, and priorities) of applicable recovery and planning documents (e.g. Lower Columbia Salmon Recovery Plan)? 	<p>Score = _____ multiplied by 4.0 = _____</p>

<p>C. Scientific validity and technical quality of proposed project (40% weight):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the problem to salmonids and the associated objectives of the proposed project clearly described? • Does the proposal employ appropriate techniques, adequate design and proper siting? • Is it clear how the proposed project will meet its intent and purpose? • Is it likely that the project will achieve stated objectives? • Does the project provide for implementation monitoring? If so what monitoring protocols will be used? Are the benefits or outcomes from the project measurable (e.g. number of trees planted or amount of structure placed)? • Have watershed processes and a larger global aspect been considered in developing the proposal? • How does the project fit within the fish needs as identified through watershed planning documents, recovery plans, etc? • Has the project proposal received professional review? • Does the proposal identify any negative or positive impacts to other resource areas (e.g. wildlife, recreation, etc.)? 	<p>Score = _____ multiplied by 4.0 = _____</p>
<p>D. Ability for the project proponent to successfully implement proposed project (10% weight)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does proposal include both appropriate numbers of personnel and experienced team members? • Has the applying party submitted proposals in previous years? If their proposal received funding, has it been successfully implemented? • Will the project be able to obtain the necessary permits in a timely manner? 	<p>Score = _____ multiplied by 1.0 = _____</p>
<p>E. Cost effectiveness and timeliness (10% weight)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project have matching funding or in-kind participation? Is there collaboration between numerous parties? • Is the project budget identified by work effort (administration, materials, labor, etc.) and is it appropriate? • Does the project have a reasonable cost relative to the anticipated benefits? • Is the project self-maintaining once completed? If not, how will maintenance be achieved? • Can the project activities be planned and initiated in one year? 	<p>Score = _____ multiplied by 1.0 = _____</p>
<p>Total Weighted Score</p>	<p>XX</p>