

**FINAL Meeting Notes
Lewis River License Implementation
Aquatic Coordination Committee (ACC) Meeting
February 9, 2006
Conference Call**

ACC Participants Present (11)

Jim Byrne, WDFW
 Adam Haspiel, USDA Forest Service
 LouEllyn Jones, USFWS
 Janne Kaje, Steward & Associates
 George Lee, Yakama Nation
 Erik Lesko, PacifiCorp
 Tammy Mackey, (American Rivers, Trout Unlimited)
 Kimberly McCune, PacifiCorp
 Frank Shrier, PacifiCorp
 Karen Thompson, Gifford Pinchot National Forest
 John Weinheimer, WDFW

Calendar:

March 9, 2006	ACC Meeting	Merwin Hydro
March 20, 2006	TCC Meeting	Longview, WA

Assignments from February 9 Meeting:	Status:
McCune: Incorporate all requested meeting note changes to 1-9-06 notes and email to the ACC for an additional 7-day review period.	Complete – 2/9/06
McCune: Email H&S Plan public comments to the ACC for their review.	Complete – 2/9/06
McCune: Email the Merwin Trap Facility Design Criteria Document to the ACC as recommendations by the engineering subgroup.	Complete – 2/14/06
Lesko: Speak with the hatchery folks regarding George Lee’s concerns of spring Chinook and get back to Lee at a later date.	Pending
Olson/McCune: Send out a package of the funding proposals to include PacifiCorp’s evaluation during the week of 2/13/06.	Complete – 2/20/06
Olson/Shrier: Send out questions to Adam Haspiel (USFS) and Karen Thompson (USFS) relating to further clarification needed on the funding requests.	Complete – 2/23/06
Haspiel: Double check if fish carcass can be dropped in Smith Creek and report back to ACC.	Complete – 3/10/06
McCune: Email information to the ACC from Karen Thompson (USFS) regarding Title 2 funds.	Complete – 2/9/06

Assignments from January 12th Meeting:	Status:
McCune: Invite Lars Mobernd of Mobernd-Jones & Stokes to ACC conference call scheduled on 2/9/06	Complete – 2/1/06
Olson/McCune: Send a letter to the Settlement Agreement (SA) parties outlining the extension period for review and comment of the Draft Hatchery & Supplementation Plan.	Complete – 1/19/06
McCune: Include Dan Barrett in ACC email distribution and mail him a hard copy of the Draft H&S plan and pertinent documents.	Complete – 1/12/06
Lesko/Olson: Formally respond to comment received from Steve Manlow (LCFRB), dated 11/29/05 regarding the Construction of Upper Release Point – Swift Canal and copy the ACC.	Complete – 1-27-06

Opening, Review of Agenda and Meeting Notes

Frank Shrier (PacifiCorp) conducted a review of the Agenda for the day and asked if the ACC would like any changes. LouEllyn Jones (USFWS) requested the addition of a land acquisition update, which the ACC approved.

Shrier requested any comments and/or changes to the ACC 1-12/07 Draft meeting notes. Janne Kaje (Steward & Associates) requested the addition of text to add further clarification to the section entitled, Draft Hatchery & Supplementation Discussion. Kimberly McCune (PacifiCorp) will insert Kaje's requested changes from his email dated 2/7/06, and redistribute to the ACC for review. In addition, Jones requested the correction of a meeting date and modification and addition of text to add further clarification to the section entitled, Land Acquisition Update. McCune will incorporate all requested changes and email to the ACC for an additional 7-day review period. The final version to include all ACC revisions will be posted to the Lewis River website on Monday, February 20, 2006.

LouEllyn Jones (USFW) – Land Acquisition Update

Jones provided an update to the ACC grant for land acquisition to protect bull trout, elk and other species in certain areas of concern.

Further land acquisition details were discussed with the ACC, which is considered confidential and proprietary and not for public viewing.

Draft Hatchery & Supplementation (H&S) Plan Discussion

Shrier informed the ACC that Lars Mobernd and Kevin Malone with the consulting firm Mobernd Jones & Stokes were unable to participate in the conference call today due to scheduling conflicts.

John Weinheimer (WDFW) indicated that he has received twelve (12) public comments thus far regarding the H&S Plan. It was assumed that many public responders were commenting as a result of the article in the Columbia dated 1/19/06. Some of the concerns addressed in the public letters related to making sure there was trout fishing opportunities above Swift, to not place adranomous fish above the dam, and their was some opposition to eliminating the hatchery program. Weinheimer will include these

public comments with WDFW comments and also email to McCune so she can distribute to the ACC.

H& S Plan comments are due on or before February 10, 2006.

Aquatic Fund Evaluation

McCune informed the ACC that PacifiCorp has received five (5) final proposals from USFS; Olympic Resource Management did not submit a final proposal (their local representative left the company for a different job at the end of the year).

PacifiCorp has completed its preliminary review of the final proposals; we will be sending out a package of the proposals and our evaluation early next week. The schedule is that we are to provide this information in mid-February and get to ACC comments in mid-March and approve the final projects at our April ACC meeting.

Shrier and Lesko provided a quick overview of PacifiCorp's current thoughts (as outlined below) and requested input from the ACC.

The 5 projects are:

Fish Culvert Replacement FR8322 – Funding request is for \$80,000 with a cost share of \$47,000 of which \$27,000 is still to be acquired. PacifiCorp supports this project, although more information has been requested from USFS regarding where is the other \$27,000 coming from and is there certainty of getting these funds. Adam Haspiel (USFS) communicated that the PacifiCorp funds will be the leveraging the forest service needs to acquire the addition \$27,000. PacifiCorp will send out questions to Haspiel and Karen Thompson (USFS) for clarification.

Muddy River Road Decommission – Funding request is for \$46,000 with a cost share of \$98,000 which has been secured. PacifiCorp supports this project.

Nutrient Enhancement in the Muddy River – Funding request is for \$38,000 with a \$27,000 cost share. Although, PacifiCorp is a little hesitant in that will we see a “demonstrated benefit to resources” which FERC is asking for. We could support this project if we could move the project location to Pine Creek. Haspiel expressed that he did not think USFS would have a problem shifting to Pine Creek; however, there are more forest service lands on Muddy River so it would be easier to get permission. More coordination is required with ORM on their lands surrounding the Pine Creek area. In addition, Haspiel expressed that they would be able to increase the riparian growth with nutrient enhancement in the Muddy.

Kaje said that one could argue that since most of the fish are going up the Muddy than perhaps this is where the nutrient enhancement should be focused. Shrier said that the fish currently going up the Muddy river will provide the nutrient enhancement.

Lesko said that Pine Creek has demonstrated bull trout use. Haspiel said that perhaps we could expand to do both the Muddy River and Pine Creek. Shrier asked if Smith Creek was precluded on this as it might be a good focus because of its influence on the Muddy.

Haspiel informed the participants that the Smith Creek reaches the point of the monument boundaries which is pretty much hands off. Haspiel will double check if fish carcass can be dropped in the Smith Creek.

Thompson encouraged the ACC if they have any funding ideas for Title 2 monies now is the time. Thompson to email information to McCune and she will distribute to the ACC.

Pine Creek Instream Structures – Funding request is for \$95,000 with a \$92,000 cost share of which \$50,000 is still to be acquired. PacifiCorp has some reservation about this project due to bank stabilization and would like the input of the ACC. Currently PacifiCorp has not made a decision on this project.

Haspiel communicated that the length of the logs to anchor themselves, i.e., 125' log with only 25' in the water with a number of logs in each structure; no anchoring of the logs into the banks with cable, etc. The location of the log structures will be above the prime bull trout spawning grounds on forest service lands. If additional funds are secured, the forest service will expand the project into private lands and ORM lands.

Jones expressed concern about the log structures on unstable bands and above spawning areas.

Lesko asked the ACC if any thought has been given to bank stabilization prior to adding the log structure habitat. Haspiel thought the log structures would actually add to the bank stabilization.

Rush Creek Instream Structures – Funding request is for \$100,000 with a \$72,000 cost share of which \$50,000 is still to be acquired. Although very large LWD will be used, there is a high likelihood that placed structures will be blown out. PacifiCorp proposes not to fund this project.

PacifiCorp expressed concerns about this project providing any value to putting LWD above the bridge as bull trout does not use this area. Haspiel indicated that no spawning gravel was up above the bridge and Shrier indicated there is virtually no gravel in the creek.

Lesko communicated that he has not noticed a lot of adults, but some juveniles. He has also seen some LWD up there but will this project be a direct benefit to bull trout.

Jim Byrne (WDFW) said that there are lots of fish in Rush Pool, but WDFW has not seen as many in the creek itself. He asked the Forest Service if all the projects need NEPA and if so how long does it take. Haspiel indicated that all the projects require NEPA. The nutritional enhancement should only take a few weeks, the road decommission is very close to NEPA completion as well as the fish culvert project. He further expressed that the NEPA process for Pine and Rush Creek will be a fairly lengthy process. The USDA Forest Service may contract with a consultant to complete the NEPA for Rush Creek.

Haspiel's ballpark estimate for NEPA is 6 months for Rush & Pine Creek, 3 months for the nutritional enhancement project, and 2-3 months for the culvert and road

decommissioning projects. Implementation for Pine and Rush Creek is approximately July 2007.

Byrne asked the ACC if we are obligated to spend the aquatic funds this year (2006) or can we defer to use the funds as seed money for next year for conservation easement acquisition. Shrier said yes, the funds can be carried over to subsequent years with interest. The ACC can decide to use the entire amount for land acquisition although the \$300,000 or so would not go very far toward purchasing lands.

It is PacifiCorp intent that once we finalize funding of these projects, we will work with USFS to further define the scope of work (ie planning) and the associated costs.

Yale Entrainment Study Update

Shrier communicated to the ACC that we are gathering data as we speak. One video camera operating and the second will be installed next Wednesday, 2/15/06. We are also getting fish entrainment occurring. No species identification yet.

Merwin Tailrace Fish Behavior Study

Shrier communicated that some of the fish are already trapped. PacifiCorp lost three antennas in the January spill event. Antennas are being repaired Wednesday, 2/15/06.

PacifiCorp expects to provide a draft of the study to the ACC by the end of March 2006. Curt Leigh (WDFW) suggested PacifiCorp delay sending a draft report until we finish collecting the spring Chinook data, which would delay the report until late June or early July. This delay would put a bit of a crunch on the design portion of the project.

No objection to the delay was received from the ACC.

Spawning Gravel Study Update

Shrier informed the ACC that comments are due on or before February 14, 2006.

Limiting Factors Analysis for Merwin and Swift

Shrier informed the ACC that a request for proposal was sent out to consultants in January 2006.

Merwin Trap Facility Design Criteria Document – Engineering Subgroup

McCune will email the Merwin Trap Facility Design Criteria Document to the ACC as recommendations by the engineering subgroup.

Habitat Preparation Plan

Erik Lesko (PacifiCorp) asked the ACC if there was any opposition to using a portion of spring Chinook rather than just Coho. This would provide opportunity to see where

spring Chinook go in the system. Kaje thought it was a good idea to mix it up if no issues with the hatchery.

George Lee (Yakama Nation) will send their comments. Currently they are opposing the addition of spring Chinook until he gathers more information. The Yakama Nations uses spring Chinook from the Lewis River for subsistence. Lesko will speak with the hatchery folks and get back to Lee at a later date regarding his concerns.

Modified Mandatory Conditions and Prescriptions – Update

FERC approved NMFS requested extension. Comments are now due no later than 2/20/06. Comments are also due from the USFWS no later than 2/21/06. Both Biological Opinions need to be submitted to FERC.

401 Water Quality Certification - Update

- WDOE 401 certification public review draft available for viewing on 2/13/06.

New Topics/Issues

None

Agenda items for March 9, 2006

- Further discussion - Draft Hatchery & Supplementation Plan comments
- Aquatic Fund Proposal Discussion
- Study Updates
- Update on Relicensing Process
- Facility Design Criteria Document Discussion

Next Scheduled Meetings

March 9, 2006
Merwin Hydro Facility
9:00a.m. – 3:00p.m.

April 13, 2006
Merwin Hydro Facility
9:00am – 3:00pm

Meeting Adjourned at 11:00a.m.

Handouts

- Final Agenda
- Draft Meeting Notes 1/9/06

PacifiCorp response to comments received on preliminary design of the upper release point – Swift Canal.

During the comment period, only one commenter provided comments. Steve Manlow, Salmon Recovery and Watershed Program Manager, Lower Columbia Fish Recover Board provided the following comments in an email dated November 29, 2005 to Erik Lesko at PacifiCorp.

1. The specifications for the intake do not indicate whether the structure would be screened.

No screening of the intake is anticipated for two reasons. First, the Company is currently designing screening and juvenile bypass systems at the intake to Swift No. 1. This facility once completed will limit the entrainment of fish into the power canal. Secondly, fish that may be present in the canal do not have the opportunity to spawn. And while it is clear that fish residing in the canal do feed and grow they do not contribute to recruitment of their particular species. The upper release point (as well as the lower release point) will provide a means for any fish present in the canal to safely connect to Yale reservoir and the opportunity to spawn and provide recruitment to their respective species.

2. If fish are entrained into the system, mortality or injury could result from the energy dissipation process, or from entrapment on the riprap apron.

Final designs of the outlet structure will take this concern into account and provide a safe means for fish that may be entrained into the intake to pass freely without serious impact injury. ACC approval is not required.

3. The plan view and cross sectional drawings of the lower channel show a linear design with no habitat features. We recommend the channel be designed to incorporate habitat features, including pool-riffle sequences (if gradient allows), and LWD to maximize habitat benefits.

The channel depicted in the conceptual design drawings do not indicate any habitat structure or sinuosity. At a minimum, however, WDOE has proposed that such consideration be given to the final design to at least provide the opportunity for fish that migrate to this point the opportunity to spawn. PacifiCorp and Cowlitz PUD will be discussing this proposal as part of the 401 water quality certifications.