

**FINAL (REVISED) Meeting Notes
Lewis River License Implementation
Aquatic Coordination Committee (ACC) Meeting
April 13, 2006
Ariel, WA**

ACC Participants Present (19)

Craig Burley, WDFW
 Jim Byrne, WDFW
 Clifford Casseseka, Yakama Nation
 Michelle Day, NMFS (via teleconference)
 Diana Gritten-MacDonald, Cowlitz PUD
 Adam Haspiel, USDA Forest Service
 LouEllyn Jones, USFWS
 Janne Kaje, Steward & Associates (via teleconference)
 Eric Kinne, WDFW
 George Lee, Yakama Nation
 Erik Lesko, PacifiCorp
 Tammy Mackey, American Rivers and Trout Unlimited
 Jim Malinowski, Fish First
 Kimberly McCune, PacifiCorp
 Todd Olson, PacifiCorp
 Frank Shrier, PacifiCorp
 Karen Thompson, Gifford Pinchot National Forest
 John Weinheimer, WDFW
 Shannon Wills, Cowlitz Indian Tribe (via teleconference)

Calendar:

March 20, 2006	TCC Meeting	Longview, WA
April 13, 2006	ACC Meeting	Merwin Hydro

Assignments from April 13th Meeting:	Status:
Olson/McCune: Notify the ACC via email that the next ACC meeting (5/11/06) is dedicated to H&S discussions and include the issues/agenda items to be resolved.	Complete – 4/21/06 and 5/11/06
Day: Email electro-anesthesia information she has to Kimberly McCune (PacifiCorp) for distribution to the ACC.	Complete – 4/20/06
Olson: Provide a final Funding Proposal Report to include the ACC agreed upon modifications.	Complete – 5/8/06
Lesko: Contact Michelle Day and inform her that PacifiCorp is discussing shutting ladder down for 2-3 month period to construct pond 15.	Complete – 4/20/06

Assignments from March 9th Meeting:	Status:
Malone: Frame the question to the ACC and cite information he used (such as the HSRG website). Kimberly McCune (PacifiCorp) will	Complete – 3/14/06

email to the ACC for their further comment.	
Malone: Draft language for the ACC review and comment on the topic of adaptive management to achieve a balance of flexibility versus structure for decision making.	Complete – 4/11/06
Olson: Follow up with Michelle Day (NMFS) and LouEllyn Jones (USFWS) and Rich Turner (NMFS) to confirm the process after the 4/11/06 submittal.	Complete
Olson: Follow up with Adam Haspiel (USDA Forest Service) regarding conditions around contracting and fund distribution.	Pending

Opening, Review of Agenda and Meeting Notes

Shrier conducted a review of the Agenda for the day and asked if the ACC would like any changes. No changes were requested.

Shrier requested any comments and/or changes to the ACC 3/9/06 draft meeting notes. Craig Burley (WDFW) requested minor clarification on page 3 to read as follows:

Burley said that it may be helpful to talk about issues surrounding juvenile collection. He suggested to the ACC that in order to make the process successful the ACC should consider a phased approach for a reintroduction program; a way to get from where we are now to our goal and identify the key triggers in order to be successful.

Curt Leigh (WDFW) submitted modifications via email on 3/21/06, which the ACC adopted. The revised paragraph on page 4 will read as follows:

Leigh expressed that he does not have an issue with the initial production and release methods as proposed by Malone in his plan for steelhead in the Plan, but he wants the Plan to specifically identify why and where it deviates from the SA, then the ACC must have opportunity to review, discuss and maybe approve those deviations. Olson suggested highlighting this topic as a summary within the H&S Plan where the action deviates but the intent is to conform to the SA.

In accordance with **Attachment 1**, American Rivers and Trout Unlimited letter dated 4/10/06 regarding the Lewis River Hatchery & Supplementation Plan, the 1/12/06 meeting notes (page 3) will be modified to read as follows:

Delete “American Rivers and Trout Unlimited were silent on the issue at the ACC meeting” and replace with “American Rivers and Trout Unlimited had no comment on the jack issue at this time”.

And, the 3/9/06 ACC meeting notes (page 5) will be modified as follows:

The ACC, with the exception of American Rivers and Trout Unlimited, was in agreement that jacks are not adults and therefore should not be included in the ocean recruit estimate. Olson agreed to not include jacks in determining the benchmark, however he indicated that there is value to having jacks included in a separate analysis to give biologists insight on the larger global view as they provide some contribution.

The meeting notes were adopted with the above-referenced changes at 9:25am and will be posted to the Lewis River website with the referenced [Attachments 1 & 2](#).

Frank Shrier (PacifiCorp) requested each participant introduce themselves to the group, including the conference call attendees.

Update on Relicensing Process

Shrier informed the ACC that the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) was issued by FERC on 3/24/06. FERC is waiting for the Biological Opinion from NMFS, USFWS and the 401 Certifications from WDOE.

Lewis River Hatchery & Supplementation Plan (H&S Plan) Process Update

Todd Olson (PacifiCorp) updated the ACC on conversations he has had with LouEllyn Jones (USFWS) and Michelle Day (NMFS). Services agreed that it was important to include the ACC in continued efforts to finalize the H&S Plan. As such the ACC representatives were notified of the document's availability on the company's website and were sent hard copies of the document. The actual process by which we all work together had yet to be defined and needed to be discussed by the Services and ACC; hopefully at today's meeting we could, at a minimum, set an H&S Plan meeting date.

Burley asked that PacifiCorp Energy staff review the Settlement Agreement to identify specific articles that require the completed H&S Plan for implementation of the articles and to use this analysis to determine the completion data of the H&S Plan. The ACC can then use this information to back plan a schedule for completing the H&S Plan.

Tammy Mackey (American Rivers (AR) and Trout Unlimited (TU)) reviewed their letter dated 4/10/06 addressed to the ACC ([see Attachment 1](#)). Mackey communicated to the ACC that AR and TU have three issues with the Hatchery & Supplementation Plan as noted in their letter:

***Issue One:** After further discussion, we (AR and TU) believe that jacks should be included in the ocean recruit calculation to reflect an important life history necessary to support the diversity of the species. This diversity criteria is required by NOAA Fisheries as a measure of recovery under the Endangered Species Act. Failure to capture this life history in the ocean recruit calculation would in effect undercut the recovery efforts required in the settlement agreement (and the ESA) by failing to capture one of the key criteria, diversity, necessary to reach recovery.*

While we realize that jacks are not an integral part of the fishery, they are critical to the survival and recovery of the species which the ocean recruit calculation serves to capture as well.

***Issue Two:** We agree with the March 3, 2006 memo from Kevin Malone (Jones & Stokes) regarding the fact that Table 1's juvenile production numbers were an agreed upon starting point for the H&S Plan to achieve the adult targets, they were not the agreed upon target relative to recovery. Instead, Section 8 of the Settlement Agreement*

specifically stated that the H&S Plan and the programs shall be consistent with the priority objective of recovery. The Settlement Agreement did not presume or agree that in fact the numbers in Table 1 were actually consistent with recovery. Instead the Settlement Agreement relied on the H&S Plan to lay out the basis for the numbers, the assumptions made and any new science that would demonstrate the consistency of those numbers with the goal of recovery.

That analysis is entirely lacking. Indeed, as we stated in our original comments, the additional listing of Lower Columbia River coho as a threatened species, a number of new studies regarding success of hatchery practices that have been released, and the adoption of the interim Lower Columbia River recovery plan certainly begs review of the production numbers relative to the recovery needs of the wild salmon in the watershed. This was exactly the expectation spelled out in Section 8. It may very well be the case that the juvenile production numbers in Table 1 are appropriate to meet the adult targets within the recovery constraints of the Settlement Agreement, or it may be that they are too high and must be reduced to meet the priority objective of recovery. It is impossible to reach any conclusion without the analysis required by the Settlement Agreement.

Issue Three: *we still have significant concerns regarding the operation of the hatchery programs with regard to the reintroduction efforts in the upper basin. We do not feel that the discussion in the March 3rd memo from Kevin Malone (Jones & Stokes) adequately addresses the concerns we raised in our original comments. We would like to request that these topics – the use of a segregated versus an integrated program, the source of the broodstock and the supplementation strategy– be discussed in much greater detail with TU and AR present at a future ACC meeting.*

Burley expressed to the ACC that jacks are important to the population but with respect to mitigation he has a different perspective as far as the jacks in the accounting. The discussion was when we calculate the mitigation requirement we should focus our count on the adult ocean recruits, which are not defined as jacks.

Mackey expressed that we don't want to see jacks not allowed to pass upstream. She also stated that the issue of Integrated Stocks has not been studied enough. Several ACC representatives noted it was not their intent to keep jacks from being transported above the dams; rather it was to not include them in the determination of ocean recruits.

Jim Malinowski (Fish First) indicated that the Lewis River Settlement Agreement (SA) is clear that we are targeting adults, not jacks. We want to minimize the impact on wild hatchery fish. Fish First would like to see focus on improved survival rates so we don't have to release so many.

Janne Kaje (Steward & Associates) agreed with Burley and Malinowski's comments. The SA provides the flexibility to meet adult targets and adjust downward or upward to meet the demands.

Lesko stated that while it appears the ACC has agreed that counting jacks for the ocean recruit analysis is not going to occur, we should, given the biological value of jacks to

natural populations' count them in the number of fish that we are required to pass upstream of Merwin for purposes including the hatchery and supplementation plan.

Burley stated that we should start with where we want to be then talk process about how to get there.

Clifford Casseseka (Yakama Nation) expressed his concern about the 100,000 assumption from Kevin Malone (Jones & Stokes). Casseseka does not think 100,000 is a sufficient number for reintroduction. He is concerned about what is really going to happen with the hatchery upgrade. He requested more information on what is really going on. Erik Lesko (PacifiCorp) responded that the 100,000 number relates to hatchery capacity and that the upgrades are being designed to provide more hatchery flexibility and better rearing conditions, but not necessarily extra capacity.

Shrier communicated to the ACC that in the SA we agreed to a specific number and we have every intent of meeting the obligations in the SA as there is a provision to increase the numbers if needed. There is no specific timeline in the SA for completion of the H&S Plan, just that it be as soon as practical. However, we need to continue to push ahead.

Olson asked Casseseka to review the H & S Plan and suggest a number he could live with and state the reasons why.

Burley thought that the ACC should convene a subgroup soon to insure we are all comfortable with the H&S Plan.

There was general discussion about the significant amount of work left in order to come to agreement. The SA should be the document that provides direction to determine the specifics of work product to be completed. Olson suggested that the ACC set a date for the first subgroup meeting.

Shrier strongly encouraged the representatives of the Yakama Nation to form the Supplementation subgroup and provide input in the H&S Plan. To date, Yakama Nation has not taken action on this SA provision nor has there been input from Yakama Nation other than Dan Barrett's participation in development of the plan.

Casseseka communicated to the ACC that the Yakama Nation *will not* be forming a Supplementation Subgroup, but would prefer to combine efforts with the ACC to make it work.

The ACC (including the Services representatives) agreed to dedicate the entire next ACC meeting on May 11, 2006 for the Hatchery & Supplementation Plan discussion. Olson or McCune will notify the ACC via email that the next ACC meeting is dedicated to H&S discussions and include the issues/agenda items to be resolved.

Break <10:30am>

Reconvene <10:45am>

Merwin Sorting Facility Discussion – Criteria Document

Shrier provided an update of the Engineering Subgroup activities relating to the Merwin Sorting Facility – Criteria Document. The document was made available for ACC review on 2/14/06. Shrier proposed that the ACC provide questions or comments to PacifiCorp no later than April 27, 2006.

Michelle Day (NMFS) would like further discussion regarding the use of electroanesthesia and if it would be detrimental to wild fish. She would like to hear how we will do the monitoring to determine if there is an adverse affect with use of electro anesthesia. Shrier communicated that there are three anesthetic methods available 1) CO₂ which is more harmful and causes fish to struggle violently, 2) Clove oil, which is not FDA approved, and 3) Electroanesthesia, which the engineering subgroup observed effective use of at Bonneville hatchery.

Olson responded that PacifiCorp would discuss Day's request in more detail and get back to her.

Day will email electroanesthesia information she has to Kimberly McCune (PacifiCorp) for distribution to the ACC.

Aquatic Fund Proposal Discussion (Selection of Funded Projects)

Olson requested feedback and consensus from the ACC on the aquatic projects (see [Attachment 2](#)). There was general discussion about project nexus, definition of project nexus, consequence of not moving forward with funding in year one and clearly indicating the ties of the project benefit within each proposal. Also discussed was the role of FERC in this process once Utilities receive new licenses.

Olson expressed that he would like to reach ACC final approval or disapproval of projects as soon as possible (hopefully today) as he would like to prepare the "2006 Aquatics Fund Annual Report – Proposed Aquatic Fund Projects".

Olson reviewed the aquatic projects referenced below ([also see Attachment 2](#)) with the following comments from the ACC:

Nutrient Enhancement on Muddy River (now on Pine Creek)

- Adam Haspiel (USFS) informed the ACC that the proposal included helicopter use for areas without road access.
- Cowlitz Tribe does not object to funding the nutrient enhancement project and moving it to Pine Creek with the use of carcasses.
- Haspiel and Casseseka need to follow-up on the methodology of black-bagging the carcasses.

- Malinowski expressed that the proposing entity should consider ACC comments then go forward.
- Olson said that USFS should reflect proposal changes and ACC comments into the final proposal.
- All ACC attendees agreed to proceeding with the Nutrient Enhancement on *Pine Creek*.

Lunch <12:10pm>

Reconvene <12:35pm>

Pine Creek Instream and Floodplain Structures for Bull Trout and Steelhead

- The ACC expressed concerns about bank stabilization, anchoring log structures and potential for bank damage if the log structures breaks lose.
- Proposal included helicopter use for log placement.
- Trial installation was recommended to see how well the log structures stay in place.
- Perhaps the use of smaller tributaries with less stream velocity would be the best choice as the initial location for log structure placement.
- Large boulders may also be a consideration yet this is more useful as velocity barriers rather than for spawning gravel collection.
- Concern was expressed that the force of the water would shift log structures without anchoring/ burying the structures.
- Casseseka said that fish adapt to whatever comes down the river, but he is very concerned about man-made habitat rather than natural habitat.
- A cautious approach is recommended, such as a pilot project for 1-2 years. If it's successful than USFS can proceed to a larger area.
- The ACC attendees agreed to a 2-year pilot project to include a few log structures within a 500' – 800' reach, with a funding cost cap of 25% of the total funding. The exact location of reach is yet to be determined by the ACC.
- The ACC attendees agreed that the balance of the funding be set aside for USFS to complete the project based upon the success of the pilot project. The outcome of the pilot project will come back to the ACC for review and final approval to move forward with project completion.

Rush Creek Instream Structures for Bull Trout and Steelhead

- PacifiCorp expressed that Rush Creek has nearly too much large woody debris (LWD). They were concerned that additional log structures could break loose and move downstream creating a barrier instead.
- A small scale pilot project is preferred with monitoring to determine success of capturing spawning gravel.
- Genetically the Rush Creek fish are different than the Pine Creek fish.
- Suggestion was made to select an area in Rush Creek that is not being used at all by spawning bull trout and see if we can capture gravel with the introduction of LWD structures to improve the situation rather than a mass reconstruction.
- The first attempt should be to try to capture gravel first and monitor outcome rather than the addition of gravel. The addition of gravel could be a short term study as it may likely get washed out.
- The question was asked what this project is going to do for the current fish population. Discussion took place regarding the introduction of LWD structures that could be detrimental to existing habitat. The ACC did not have consensus to fund this project so they agreed to *not* proceed with funding the Rush Creek Instream project.

Fish Passage Culvert Replacement – Forest Rd 8322

- ACC attendees agreed to fund this project.

Muddy River Tributary Road Decommission 8322700

- ACC attendees agreed to fund this project.

Haspiel informed the ACC that the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board (LCFRB) funded the Muddy River Road 8322700 Decommission project for \$61,000. The culvert was not submitted for funding by the LCFRB, it was submitted for title II funds, and now that this project has been approved for ACC funding the Forest Service should get the \$25,000 in title II funds.

PacifiCorp will put together a final Funding Proposal Report that reflects the ACC agreed modifications as identified above.

Habitat Preparation Plan (HPP) Discussion

A Draft HPP was emailed to the ACC on 3/23/06. Erik Lesko (PacifiCorp) asked if the ACC had any questions or comments.

General discussion took place regarding concern for having enough fish for food banks, Fish First, Tribal subsistence, HPP and carcass dispersal.

Shrier expressed to the ACC that he does not perceive that this would be a big issue as if we reach a pinch point we could each give a little.

Shrier informed the ACC that they have a 30-day review period at which time the HPP can be approved. **Comments are due on or before April 24, 2006.**

Study Updates

Shrier provided the following study updates:

Constructed Channel – Lesko sending out request for proposal (RFP) for design work within the next couple of weeks. The Yakama Nation expressed the importance of depth of channel and not just the width.

Spawning Gravel Study – The first year final report will be available within the next few weeks and is to include the monitoring plan.

Yale Entrainment Study – This work is on-going and we have been able to see some fish on the video; realizing we are not seeing all of the fish that go through the hydro acoustic. We can detect size and number with hydroacoustics, but not the species. The video is intended to help with species ID.

Merwin Tailrace – Not a lot of fish moving right now. At the request of the Engineering Subgroup we have tagged some wild winter steelhead and are accessing their behavior with Unit #1 off.

Limiting Factors Analysis – A study plan will soon be available to the ACC for their review.

Lewis River Pond Upgrades (potential short term changes to operations) – PacifiCorp discussing shutting ladder down for 2-3 month period to construct pond 15. Lesko will contact Michelle Day and inform her.

2005 ACC/TCC Annual Report

Olson provided an overview of the Annual Report that was sent to the ACC on 4/5/06. **Comments are due on or before May 5, 2006.**

New Topics/Issues

USFWS requested PacifiCorp update telephone conferencing equipment at Merwin Hydro Facility.

Agenda items for May 11, 2006

- Further discussion - Draft Hatchery & Supplementation Plan comments

Next Scheduled Meetings

May 11, 2006
Merwin Hydro Facility
9:00am – 3:00pm

June 8, 2006
TBD
9:00am – 3:00pm

Meeting Adjourned at 3:00p.m.

Handouts

- Final Agenda
- Draft Meeting Notes 3/9/06
- American Rivers and Trout Unlimited letter dated 4/10/06 regarding the Lewis River Hatchery & Supplementation Plan
- Selection of Aquatic Fund 2005 Proposals for funding – Input from ACC Representative dated 4/13/06



Attachment 1

April 10, 2006

VIA EMAIL

George Lee
Confederated Tribes and Bands
of the Yakima Nation
P.O. Box 151
Toppenish, WA 98948

Jim Malinowski
Fish First
P.O. Box 127
Amboy, WA 98601

Diana M. Gritten-MacDonald
Cowlitz PUD
P.O. Box 3007
Longview, WA 98632-0307

Karen Thompson
USDA Forest Service
Cowlitz Valley Ranger District
10024 Hwy 12
Randle, WA 98377

John Weinheimer
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
600 Capitol Way North
Olympia, WA 98501

Janne Kaje
Steward & Assoc.
120 Avenue A, Suite D
Snohomish, WA 98290

Frank Shrier
PacifiCorp
825 NE Multnomah
Suite 1500
Portland, OR 97217

Adam Haspiel
USDA Forest Service
42218 NE Yale Bridge Rd.
Amboy, WA 98601-4646

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

RE: Lewis River Hatchery and Supplementation Plan (FERC Project Nos. 935, 2071, 2111, 2213)

To Aquatics Coordination Committee Members:

We would like to take this opportunity to apologize for missing the March 9th ACC meeting and offer some input into the ongoing discussion of the Lewis River Hatchery and Supplementation Plan (H&S Plan). It is our understanding that the H&S Plan is a “living” document at the moment, with many unresolved matters that will be discussed at future meetings. However, we also understand that the agencies will be receiving an interim plan by April 11th and at some point, the H&S Plan needs to be finalized. We hope that these comments will inform those future discussions and lead to the closure of some matters.

First, we understand from the March 9th meeting minutes that there was agreement not to include jacks in the ocean recruit counts based on a perceived agreement among ACC members at the January 12, 2006 meeting that jacks should not be counted in the ocean recruit calculation. At the January 12th meeting our representative, Tammy Mackey, did not make any commitment on behalf of American Rivers or Trout Unlimited as to whether we agreed or disagreed with that calculation, instead stating that she would have to check in with the organizations. The draft meeting minutes from January 12th did not reflect that lack of commitment and improperly indicated there was agreement on the issue. On February 11th, Ms. Mackey emailed Kimberly McCune to state that the minutes should be changed to reflect that TU and AR were silent on the matter. (See Attached). She also indicated that in fact, after further discussion, we believe that jacks should be included in the ocean recruit calculation to reflect an important life history necessary to support the diversity of the species. This diversity criteria is required by NOAA Fisheries as a measure of recovery under the Endangered Species Act. Failure to capture this life history in the ocean recruit calculation would in effect undercut the recovery efforts required in the settlement agreement (and the ESA) by failing to capture one of the key criteria, diversity, necessary to reach recovery.

While we realize that jacks are not an integral part of the fishery, they are critical to the survival and recovery of the species which the ocean recruit calculation serves to capture as well. Therefore, we would like the minutes of the January 12th meeting changed as requested and do not agree with the apparent consensus statement at the March 9th meeting that jacks should not be included in the ocean recruit calculations. As such, we do not agree with this conclusion in the H&S Plan and also request the March 9th meeting minutes be modified to reflect this disagreement among the parties accordingly.

Second, while we agree with the March 3, 2006 memo from Kevin Malone (Jones & Stokes) regarding the fact that Table 1’s juvenile production numbers were an agreed upon starting point for the H&S Plan to achieve the adult targets, they were not the agreed upon target relative to recovery. Instead, Section 8 of the Settlement Agreement specifically stated that the H&S Plan and the programs shall be consistent with the priority objective of recovery. The Settlement Agreement did not presume or agree that

in fact the numbers in Table 1 were actually consistent with recovery. Instead the Settlement Agreement relied on the H&S Plan to lay out the basis for the numbers, the assumptions made and any new science that would demonstrate the consistency of those numbers with the goal of recovery.

That analysis is entirely lacking. Indeed, as we stated in our original comments, the additional listing of Lower Columbia River coho as a threatened species, a number of new studies regarding success of hatchery practices that have been released, and the adoption of the interim Lower Columbia River recovery plan certainly begs review of the production numbers relative to the recovery needs of the wild salmon in the watershed. This was exactly the expectation spelled out in Section 8. It may very well be the case that the juvenile production numbers in Table 1 are appropriate to meet the adult targets within the recovery constraints of the Settlement Agreement, or it may be that they are too high and must be reduced to meet the priority objective of recovery. It is impossible to reach any conclusion without the analysis required by the Settlement Agreement.


Finally, we still have significant concerns regarding the operation of the hatchery programs with regard to the reintroduction efforts in the upper basin. We do not feel that the discussion in the March 3rd memo from Kevin Malone (Jones & Stokes) adequately addresses the concerns we raised in our original comments. We would like to request that these topics – the use of a segregated versus an integrated program, the source of the broodstock and the supplementation strategy– be discussed in much greater detail with TU and AR present at a future ACC meeting.

We look forward to discussing these matters further with the ACC and reaching an acceptable resolution for everyone. Please do not hesitate to contact any of us if you have further questions regarding our concerns.


Sincerely,



Brett M. Swift
American Rivers



Kaitlin L. Lovell
Trout Unlimited



Tammy Mackey
ACC Representative for American Rivers and Trout Unlimited.

Re: ACC Draft 1.12.06 Meeting Notes (REVISED) - Message (Plain Text)

File Edit View Insert Format Tools Actions Help

Reply Reply to All Forward Print Attachments Delete Undo Redo Bold Italic Underline

Extra line breaks in this message were removed.

From: Tammy M [tammymackey@yahoo.com]

Sent: Sat 2/11/2006 9:19 AM

To: McCune, Kimberly

Cc: Brett Swift; Kaitlin Lovell

Subject: Re: ACC Draft 1.12.06 Meeting Notes (REVISED)

Hi Kim,

The minutes state that the ACC was in agreement that jacks should not be included in the ocean recruit estimate. As I recall, American Rivers and Trout Unlimited neither supported nor opposed the jack counts at the time of the meeting.

After some further research, we have decided that jacks should be included in the ocean recruit estimates.

For purposes of the meeting minutes, please indicate that AR and TU were silent on the issue at the meeting.

Thank you,
Tammy

--- "McCune, Kimberly" <Kimberly.McCune@PacifiCorp.com> wrote:

> Attn: ACC Participants

>

> I have attached a revised version of the ACC Draft 1.12.06 Meeting Notes

> per your request for an additional 7-day review period. This version
> reflects the modifications we discussed during our conference call
> this
> morning.

>

> All requested changes (see pages 3, 4 & 5) are reflected in "track
> changes" for ease of identifying modified text.

>

> Janne: Upon your review please advise if these changes relating to
> the

> Draft H&S Plan more accurately reflect your comments and concerns.

>

> Please provide all comments on or before COB Friday, February 17th.

> After this date the notes will be finalized and posted on the Lewis

McCune, Kimberly

From: McCune, Kimberly
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2006 12:06 PM
To: 'Tammy M'
Cc: Shrier, Frank; Olson, Todd
Subject: RE: ACC Draft 1.12.06 Meeting Notes (REVISED)

Thank you, Tammy.

I'll incorporate the appropriate notation in the 1/12/06 meeting notes.

K

-----Original Message-----

From: Tammy M [mailto:tammymackey@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2006 9:19 AM
To: McCune, Kimberly
Cc: Brett Swift; Kaitlin Lovell
Subject: Re: ACC Draft 1.12.06 Meeting Notes (REVISED)

Hi Kim,

The minutes state that the ACC was in agreement that jacks should not be included in the ocean recruit estimate. As I recall, American Rivers and Trout Unlimited neither supported nor opposed the jack counts at the time of the meeting.

After some further research, we have decided that jacks should be included in the ocean recruit estimates.

For purposes of the meeting minutes, please indicate that AR and TU were silent on the issue at the meeting.

Thank you,
Tammy

--- "McCune, Kimberly" <Kimberly.McCune@PacifiCorp.com> wrote:

> Attn: ACC Participants
>
> I have attached a revised version of the ACC Draft 1.12.06 Meeting
> Notes
> per your request for an additional 7-day review period. This version
> reflects the modifications we discussed during our conference call
> this
> morning.
>
> All requested changes (see pages 3, 4 & 5) are reflected in "track
> changes" for ease of identifying modified text.
>
> Janne: Upon your review please advise if these changes relating to
> the
> Draft H&S Plan more accurately reflect your comments and concerns.
>
> Please provide all comments on or before COB Friday, February 17th.
> After this date the notes will be finalized and posted on the Lewis
> River website.
>
> Best Regards,
>
> Kimberly L. McCune - PacifiCorp

> Hydro Licensing Project Coordinator
> Phone: 503-813-6078
> Fax: 503-813-6633
> kimberly.mccune@pacificorp.com
> <mailto:kimberly.mccune@pacificorp.com>
>
>
>

Do You Yahoo!?
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
<http://mail.yahoo.com>

Attachment 2

Selection of Aquatic Fund 2005 Proposals for funding – Input from ACC Representatives

Proposing Entity	Proposal Name	Fund Project?								
		Utilities	USFS GPNF	CIT	USFWS	WDFW	NOAA	YN	TU and AR	Fish First
USFS	Nutrient Enhancement on Muddy River	Maybe – move to Pine Crk	Yes	Maybe – 3 rd party review		Recommend with modifications – move to Pine Crk		yes	Maybe – need monitoring	Yes
USFS	Pine Creek Instream and Floodplain Structures for Bull Trout and Steelhead	Maybe	Yes	Yes		Modify to be pilot project			Yes	Modify to be pilot project
USFS	Rush Creek Instream Structures for Bull Trout and Steelhead	No	Yes	Yes		Modify to a few structures			Yes	No
USFS	Fish Passage Culvert Replacement – Forest Rd 8322	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes			Yes	Support, but should be funded by USFS
USFS	Muddy River Tributary Road Decommission 8322700	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes			Yes	Support, but should be funded by USFS