

**FINAL Meeting Notes
Lewis River License Implementation
Aquatic Coordination Committee (ACC) Meeting
March 8, 2007
Ariel, WA**

ACC Participants Present (18)

Jim Byrne, WDFW
 Brad Caldwell, WDOE
 Clifford Casseseka, Yakama Nation (via conference call)
 Jeremiah Doyle, PacifiCorp Energy
 Diana Gritten-MacDonald, Cowlitz PUD
 Adam Haspiel, USDA Forest Service
 Kaitlin Lovell, Trout Unlimited
 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
 Karen Thompson, USDA Forest Service (via conference call)
 Steve Vigg, WDFW
 John Weinheimer, WDFW
 Shannon Wills, Cowlitz Indian Tribe

Calendar:

March 9, 2007	Habitat Prioritization Synthesis Subgroup Meeting	Merwin Hydro
March 14, 2007	TCC Meeting	Conference Call
April 12, 2007	ACC Meeting and Habitat Prioritization Synthesis Subgroup Meeting	Merwin Hydro

Assignments from March 8th Meeting:	Status:
McCune: Email all absent ACC participants and request comment on the Lewis River Aquatic Fund Project Proposals, which are due by March 16, 2007.	Complete – 3/9/07
McCune: Email the final draft of the Lewis River Late Winter Steelhead - Hatchery and Genetic Management Plan (HGMP) to the ACC for review and comment.	Complete – 3/8/07

Assignments from February 8th Meeting:	Status:
McCune: Email Lewis River Neighbors letter to ACC.	Complete – 2/9/07
McCune: Email document provide by Jim Malinowski titled, “ <i>Export of Lewis River Basin Marine Derived Nutrients that could otherwise</i> ”	Complete – 2/8/07

<i>support Salmon Recovery”.</i>	
ACC: Provide comments and/or questions regarding the H&S timeline on or before Friday, February 16, 2007.	Complete – 2/16/07
Shrier: Suggest two dates in the month of April to conduct an acclimation pond site tour for the Tribal Council members and other interested ACC participants.	Complete – 2/9/07
McCune: Post the Hatchery Pond 15 30% design, PowerPoint presentation and photos on the Lewis River website for ACC review and comment.	Complete – 2/12/07

Assignments from December 14th Meeting:	Status:
Shrier: PacifiCorp to form technical committee consisting of the USFS, the Tribes and Utilities in order to nail down the acclimation sites.	On going

Opening, Review of Agenda and Meeting Notes

Frank Shrier (PacifiCorp Energy) called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

Todd Olson (PacifiCorp Energy) provided an explanation of the term “safety tailboards” to the ACC attendees and informed them that tailboards will be conducted on all site visits/field trips. In addition, Olson informed the attendees that during the meetings they are confined to the meeting room, restrooms, and parking areas. All other areas require PacifiCorp approval and Personal Protection Equipment (PPE).

Shrier conducted a review of the agenda for the day and requested a round-table introduction for those participating via teleconference.

Jim Malinowski (Fish First) requested that we discuss the Aquatic Fund Proposals before lunch as his schedule requires he leave the meeting at noon. Shrier said that the agenda is very full today, however we would do the very best we can.

Shrier requested comments and/or changes to the ACC Draft 2/8/07 meeting notes. No additional changes were requested.

The ACC attendees present accepted these meeting notes at 9:10am.

Relicensing Schedule Update

No new update since that last ACC meeting. The NMFS BiOp is pending. The new license is not expected prior to June or July 2007.

Swift Surface Collector Design Update – Will Shallenberger

Will Shallenberger (PacifiCorp Energy) conducted a PowerPoint presentation overview relating to the Swift Surface Collector Design to include the Lewis River re-introduction program, the release site, collection & sorting and the Swift release point (a more detailed summary, designs and photos can be viewed at the following link):

<http://www.pacificorp.com/File/File73031.pdf>

Shallenberger also informed the ACC attendees of the SA (4.4.1) requirements as follows:

4.4.1 Modular Surface Collector. By six months after the fourth anniversary of the Issuance of the New License for the Swift No. 1 Project or the Swift No. 2 Project, whichever is later, PacifiCorp shall construct and provide for the operation of a passage facility at the Swift No. 1 Dam, including a modular surface collector, to collect, sort, tag, and transport downstream migrating Transported Species.

Shallenberger also discussed the Key Questions:

1. Where can we catch the fish?
2. How do we catch them?
3. How do we sort and transfer them?
4. How do we moor and service the facility?

The design efforts to address key questions:

1. Collection Location
2. Collector Design
3. Fish Sorting & Transfer
4. Facility Mooring & Access

A map and photos were shown illustrating the Swift Reservoir Forebay Area, Intake & Spillway Area, the construction site in 1957, topographic view of the collector location, and the intake channel characteristics which illustrates how narrow the channel is.

Shallenberger discussed factors considered in locating the collector: fish behavior, flood passage/dam safety, reservoir fluctuation and reservoir flow patterns. A video file was shown to illustrate flow pattern and velocity contours at full reservoir, maximum powerhouse flow and no collector. He provided an illustration of a wind analysis without and with 7.3 mph wind applied from the east to west.

The collector location status was reviewed to include the location at channel entrance, the discharge to reinforce existing reservoir patterns, that the modeling is just an indicator of reservoir conditions and that the discharge design will be flexible to avoid flow pattern that deter fish collection .

Shallenberger identified collector design factors that include the hydraulic conditions for fish collection and floatation. He walked the ACC attendees through the collection hydraulics, collection enhancement structure, primary attraction flow with the use of water pumps, the secondary dewatering pumps and the sorting area. Shallenberger also informed the ACC that the fish channel hydraulics is well understood by the engineering subgroup and that the next steps are to review and discuss the hydraulics inside the collector, the discharge configuration and the collector structural design and marine architecture.

Shallenberger also presented a review of the Fish Sorting & Transfer Factors to include the wetted separator, storage capacity, subsampling and limited handling. He discussed the location of the fish screens, dewatering location, fry separator, smolt separator, fry & adult holding tank, fry & smolt hopper and provided a photo of the sorter at the Cowlitz Falls facility.

Shallenberger discussed that the wetted separator system is proven technology and can be installed on the collector. He also expressed that the subgroup is refining the configuration and that the transfer system is dependent on which mooring is selected. He further communicated that the mooring and access factors to be considered are constructability, safety and efficiency of operations. Illustrations and a photo was provided for viewing to illustrate a variety of ideas such as an alternative dock and trestle location, marine railway, and a trestle example of the Oakland Bay bridge. Performing constructability evaluation. He also informed the ACC attendees that the subgroup is currently evaluating the safety and operations processes relating to the Mooring and Access.

The next steps include the preparation of the 30% design package and then initiating the 60% design effort which will include additional sorting design, incorporate mooring approach, structural design of collector, and evaluation of measures that would be phased in based on collector performance.

Lower Constructed Channel Update – Northwest Hydraulic Consultants (nhc)

Derek Ray (nhc) presented a PowerPoint presentation titled, “Lower Constructed Channel Habitat Options from a geomorphic overview (a more detailed summary, designs and photos can be viewed at the following link):
<http://www.pacificorp.com/Article/Article73030.html>

Ray first presented the details about the channel to include the length, width, gradient, flow control at inlet, seepage flow from Swift canal, gravel and boulders with significant fine sediment inputs and the outlet drains to Lewis River. He discussed the physical assessment to include the form, process and function, and the biological assessment to include the fish species present, future species and limiting habitat types.

Ray discussed certain physical habitat assessment items; the area is an early succession riparian community, there is constant discharge, there is generally low gradient and fine sediment transport. There is beaver activity and the habitat is surprisingly unstable.

The biological habitat assessment also discussed the fish assumed to benefit at present, and as anadromous stocks are re-introduced. Ray also pointed out the limiting habitat conditions such as the residual depth of pools, the lack of gravel, fine sediments and low velocities for spawning, the potential velocity barrier at mouth, the lack of effective in-channel wood for cover and the long-term stability is compromised by site and riparian conditions.

The conclusion of the habitat assessment is that the Constructed Channel exists as a functioning channel that appears to support a variety of fish species as well as other

aquatic organisms. However, there are limitations to the productivity of the site that could be improved upon with a moderate intervention.

Ray also provided photos for review illustrating overland flow which is creating rotting alder, saturated conditions, and fine sediments.

Ray informed the ACC attendees that the physical habitat goals include the enhancement of existing habitat, the promotion of long-term channel stability and habitat elements, improvement of riparian health and diversity, reduction of fine sediment input and improvement of flushing and/or storage of fine sediments.

The biological habitat goals include the enhancement of existing habitat, the creation of additional spawning, improvement of riparian health and diversity, improvement of quality and diversity of rearing habitat, reduction or elimination of barriers to migration and increasing instream habitat diversity.

The proposed habitat plan was designed to function within the existing processes, minimize adverse impacts to the site, be constructible, provide various design components that can be implemented independently and allow post-construction modification without machine access.

Ray communicated that the proposed habitat options are made up of the following components:

- Outlet channel realignment
- Porous rock weirs
- Inlet channel realignment
- Coniferous riparian planting
- Channel narrowing using LWD
- Raised planting pads
- Off-channel ponds and pools

He discussed the purposes of riparian planting that includes acceleration of natural succession, greater diversity in the riparian community, improvement of habitat for non-aquatic species, and making use of raised planting pads and access routes. He also discussed the method by including a mixed planting of species, but the focus would be mostly conifers and some fruit bearing species.

Ray also showed examples of log structure and constructed channels on the Howlow River on Vancouver Island, and he discussed the interaction with a mature riparian community, channel form, nutrient cycles and shading.

WDOE representative, Brad Caldwell, indicated that it may be beneficial to add more spawning gravel in strategic locations as it is limiting in the bypass reach. Ray suggested that the proposed structures would help capture, hold and clean (through increased water velocities) gravel, but added that gravel supplementation in certain areas is possible.

Jim Malinowski (Fish First) questioned the wisdom of laying rootwads on the channel banks instead of anchoring them by burying the stems in the bank. He also asked why rock vanes were not being used instead of the rock weirs. Ray responded that the area was too marshy to support the construction equipment needed for proper rootwad

placement and installation of rock vanes. Malinowski responded that the log mats is a common method to support equipment in marshy areas and should be considered.

2006/2007 Aquatic Fund Proposals – review of comments and selection of approved projects

Shrier reviewed each Project Proposals with the ACC attendees and specifically requested comment and/or approval/disapproval from Yakama Nation, Trout Unlimited and American Rivers, as comments were not received prior to today’s meeting.

The outcome of the project by project discussion is as follows:

U.S. Forest Service (USFS)	Dispersed Camping and Day Use Road Restoration	\$77,000	Approved
USFS	Muddy River Floodplain Nutrient Enhancement	\$88,000	Disapprove
USFS	Pine Creek Nutrient Enhancement	\$43,150	Approved
USFS	PIT Tag Detectors for Bull Trout in Upper Lewis River	\$81,000	Disapprove
USFS	9015 Culvert Replacement, and Rush Creek Gravel Restoration	\$120,000	Disapprove
USFS	Rush Creek Gravel Restoration	\$20,000	Approved
Cowlitz Indian Tribe	Martin Access Riparian Forest and Off-channel Habitat Enhancement	(\$26,200); may increase to \$30K for Beaver protection	Approved
Cowlitz Indian Tribe	Plas Newydd Riparian Forest Enhancement	\$29,400; may increase to \$30K for Beaver protection	Approved
Cowlitz Indian Tribe	Two Forks Access Riparian Forest Enhancement	\$26,400; may increase to \$30K for Beaver protection	Approved

ACC comments can be viewed on the Lewis River website at the following link:
<http://www.pacificorp.com/File/File73032.pdf>

Comments were also received from Rhidian Morgan regarding the Cowlitz’ Project Proposals, which has been attached to these meeting notes as **Attachment A**.

NMFS and USFWS were not present at the meeting, and in keeping accordance with the *Terrestrial and Aquatic Coordination Committees Structure and Ground Rules* document (as indicated below), they and other absent parties who wish to provide a decision response have a period of 7 days to respond.

Decision Making. *To account for the absence of a Representative during a decision making process, decisions will be considered “informal” for a period of 7-continuous days post-decision, unless extended by the Committee. If all committee Representatives are present or have provided a proxy, the informal period is not needed. The*

Coordinators will notify absent parties of the “informal” decision via email promptly after the TCC or ACC meeting and request a decision response by the end of the 7 day period. If a Representative fails to respond in the 7-day period, their silence will be considered as no objection to the decision.

McCune will email all absent ACC participants and request comment by March 16, 2007.

Olson provided an update of aquatic fund balances as of 12/31/06:

Aquatic Resources: \$351,804.14

Bull Trout: \$248,700.65

The Lewis River Aquatic funding tables can be located on the Lewis River website at the following link: <http://www.pacificorp.com/File/File73033.pdf>

2006 ACC/TCC Annual Report Update

Olson provided an update of the 2006 Draft ACC/TCC Annual Report, which will be mailed to the ACC & TCC participants the week of March 12, 2007 for a 30-day review and comment period.

Status of Hatchery & Supplementation (H&S) Plan – Hatchery Genetics Management Plan Update

James Dixon (WDFW) informed PacifiCorp (via email) that the final draft of the Lewis River Late Winter Steelhead - Hatchery and Genetic Management Plan (HGMP) is ready for review and comment on or before Friday, March 23, 2007. McCune will email the document to the ACC.

Erik Lesko, (PacifiCorp Energy) noted the Hatchery and Supplementation Plan cannot be completed without completed HGMPs.

Working Lunch <12:30pm>

Annual Bull Trout Report & Plan Discussion

Lesko presented a PowerPoint titled, “Lewis River Bull Trout Monitoring Program Results”. This presentation was intended to assist the ACC in reviewing both the bull trout plan and report (a more detailed summary and photos can be viewed at the following link): <http://www.pacificorp.com/File/File73036.pdf>

Lesko provided a map of the Yale Tailrace capture site and discussed the Yale Tailrace netting and transportation. He discussed how the fish were measured and tagged with Floy tags before transporting them up river. Lesko provided a graph that illustrated the number of bull trout captured at the Yale Tailrace from 1995 to 2006 (June 1 to August 31 is the capture period). He discussed that stomach analysis’ was conducted of rainbow trout to see if they are eating bull trout. The results are in the 2006 Annual Bull Trout Report – February 2007, which can be viewed on the Lewis River website at:

<http://www.pacificorp.com/File/File71908.pdf>. To date, PacifiCorp has not found any rainbow trout stomachs containing bull trout.

He reviewed the Swift Reservoir spawning estimates from 1994 – 2006 illustrating an increase in spawner abundance and very recently a gradual leveling off and decline in spawner abundance. He also provided a graph illustrating the proportion of Cougar Creek peak counts to the number of bull trout transported and the percent contribution to the Cougar Creek peak counts from 1995 to 2006. A bull trout temperature survey was also completed at P8 (tributary to Pine Creek) indicating temperature variations between P8 and Pine Creek. Both creeks were found to be favorable to bull trout rearing and spawning.

The following programs were identified for implementation in 2007. A detailed description of each of these programs can be found in the 2007 Annual Bull Trout Monitoring Plan. Many of these programs are identical to previous years with the exception of presence-absence surveys for bull trout in several tributary streams of the Lewis River and Pine Creek. In addition, an expanded survey is proposed for Rush Creek.

1. Swift Reservoir Bull Trout Spawning Estimate
2. Yale and Swift No. 2 Tailrace Netting and Transportation
3. Pine Creek Tributaries Bull Trout Surveys
4. Swift Creek Bull Trout Surveys
5. Rainbow Trout Stomach Analysis
6. Cougar Creek Spawning Estimate
7. Bull Trout Surveys of the Swift Bypass Reach
8. Upper Rush Creek Survey
9. Upper Lewis Tributary Surveys

Study Updates

Shrier provided the following study updates:

Yale Entrainment Study – working with consultants in getting results finalized. Expecting to distribute draft report by the end of April 2007.

Large Woody Debris – Inter-Fluve is beginning to develop the study plan.

Merwin Sorting Facility Design – 30% design nearly ready to be distributed.

Acclimation Pond Plan – Expect to have a report out to the ACC by the end of March 2007. PacifiCorp conducting an acclimation pond site tour for the Tribal Council members and other interested ACC participants on April 13, 2007.

Habitat Synthesis Tool – The Subgroup are conducting their 3rd meeting on Friday, March 9, 2007.

Hatchery Upgrades (Pond 15) – 30% design out to ACC on February 12, 2007 and comments are due on March 12, 2007.

Speelyai Hatchery Addition - Complete with the exception of painting and minor electrical work.

Agenda items for April 12, 2007

- Review of 2006 ACC/TCC Annual Report
- Acclimation Pond Plan
- DNA Sampling for Lewis River mykiss
- Habitat Synthesis Tool Update
- Study/Work Product Updates
- Relicensing/BiOp Update
- HGMP Update

April 12, 2007	May 10, 2007
Merwin Hydro Facility	Merwin Hydro Facility
Ariel, WA	Ariel, WA
9:00am – 3:00pm	9:00am – 3:00pm

Meeting Adjourned at 1:45pm

Handouts

- Final Agenda
- Draft ACC Meeting Notes 2/8/07
- Comments from Rhidian Morgan regarding the Cowlitz' Project Proposals, dated March 7, 2006 - **Attachment A**.

Malinowski, James

From: Rhidian Morgan [mossback@plasnewydd.org]

Sent: Wed 3/7/2007 9:41 PM

To: Malinowski, James

Cc:

Subject: Lewis River Proposal

Attachments:

Jim: I noticed your comment for Fish First regarding the Cowlitz proposal. (1) I am glad Fish First is in the process. (2) If the Pacific process approves the use of whips, then it is bad science. The Beaver are active and the Pacific science team knows about the problem. Plas Newydd has urged, repeatedly, to take the fat out of the proposal and to use the NRCS "willow pole planting" technique. We can supply the poles and the augurs, and the use of "poles" anticipates the beaver question. (3) I do not understand why the process is accepting the Cowlitz proposal, without criticism. Rhidian Morgan, Plas Newydd < mossback@plasnewydd.org >.