

**FINAL Meeting Notes
Lewis River License Implementation
Aquatic Coordination Committee (ACC) Meeting
June 9, 2005
Ariel, Washington**

ACC Participants Present (12)

Taylor Aalvik, Cowlitz Indian Tribe
 Jim Byrne, WDFW
 Michelle Day, NOAA Fisheries
 Janne Kaje, Cowlitz Indian Tribe (Steward & Assoc)
 Jim Malinowski, Fish First
 Tammy Mackey, American Rivers/Trout Unlimited
 Kimberly McCune, PacifiCorp
 Todd Olson, PacifiCorp
 Eugene Stagner, US Fish and Wildlife (via teleconference)
 Brett Swift, American Rivers
 Ruth Tracy, USDA Forest Service
 John Weinheimer, WDFW

Calendar:

June 23, 2005	TCC Site Visit	Merwin, WA
June 24, 2005	TCC Site Visit	Merwin, WA
July 13, 2005	TCC Meeting	Merwin, WA
July 14, 2005	ACC Meeting	Merwin, WA

Assignments from June 9th Meeting:	Status:
Kaje: Submit changes to McCune via email relating to page 6 of the May 19 th meeting notes.	Complete – 6/16/05
McCune/Olson: Insert changes to 5-19-05 meeting notes regarding Implementation Monitoring and Biological Monitoring.	Complete – 6/13/05
McCune: Contact Iyall and request Cowlitz Tribe office to host 8/11/05 ACC meeting.	Complete – 6/13/05

Assignments from May 19th Meeting:	Status:
Shrier: Email a list of potential acclimation pond sites to the ACC for their review.	Complete – 5/20/05
Thompson: Email a project list to McCune for distribution to the ACC for review and discussion, which will represent the highest priority work on USFS land.	Complete – 6/9/05 (Hand delivered)
McCune: Notify absentee ACC representatives of 7-day review and comment period relating to the CC Structure and Ground Rules	Complete – 5/20/05
Shrier and Olson: If approved by PacifiCorp management, draft a letter to Skamania County for ACC review relating to development activity inconsistent with management plan & habitat ordinance.	PacifiCorp will invite counties and request attendance at July meeting
Keefe: Write an addendum to the Merwin Tail Race Study and deliver to Shrier for distribution to the ACC.	Complete – 6/6/05
Shrier: Email comments to the selected Gravel Study consultant the	Complete – 5/25/05

Opening and Review of Agenda

Todd Olson (PacifiCorp) conducted a review of agenda for the day and the ACC meeting notes for May 19, 2005.

Review of Meeting Notes – 5/19/05

Janne Kaje (Cowlitz Indian Tribe - Steward & Assoc.) requested changes/clarification on page 6 of the May 19th meeting notes. Kaje will email changes to Kim McCune (PacifiCorp), which McCune will incorporate and email to the ACC.

Jim Malinowski (Fish First) requested changes relating to clarification of conversation which took place regarding Implementation Monitoring and Biological Monitoring.

Michelle Day (NOAA Fisheries) requested changes of clarification on pages 4, 5 & 6.

Olson provided the status on the assignment relating to the ACC sending a letter to Skamania County regarding development upstream of Swift Reservoir. Olson indicated that PacifiCorp was not comfortable being a signatory to the letter and expressed concern about appearances of the ACC being an advocacy group which we are not.

Jim Byrne (WDFW) provided an update to the ACC of why PacifiCorp was being asked to write a letter regarding Skamania County's approval of certain development activity which appears to be inconsistent with the Lewis River management plan and fish and wildlife habitat ordinances.

Taylor Aalvik (Cowlitz Indian Tribe) provided an update to the ACC that they have completed their own draft letter for internal Tribal review prior to submitting to Skamania County.

Malinowski wants to see the same level of concern and consistency regarding land use regulations from Skamania, Clark and Cowlitz counties. Malinowski did not think it was inappropriate for the utilities (PacifiCorp) to send the message to Skamania County on behalf of the ACC.

Day suggested the ACC invite Skamania County to an ACC meeting and discuss this issue. Malinowski concurred and proposed that Cowlitz and Clark counties all attend the next ACC meeting.

Aalvik requested clarification of who from the counties would be invited to the ACC to discuss this topic. Day said it would be important to have the contact person at the meeting(s).

Brett Swift (American Rivers) requested a quick explanation of what the threat is relating to the counties approval of development. The concern is that development actions may negatively impact important waterways and aquatic habitat that are valuable to the success of aquatic measures in the Settlement Agreement.

John Weinheimer (WDFW) strongly suggested that Skamania County attend these meetings as they have a huge stake of what is going on here (in the ACC meetings), and a huge ability to affect what is going on.

Aalvik too recommended that Clark, Cowlitz and Skamania Counties all be called to request their attendance.

Swift suggested the ACC figure out a mechanism to request the counties participation in the ACC meetings.

Gene Stagner (US Fish & Wildlife) suggested the ACC consider what the county is getting out of the Settlement Agreement/what their interests are.

Funding Process Discussion

Olson led the discussion by showing the ACC the changes PacifiCorp made and how these changes captured the ACC's intent and comments from the previous meeting. The first significant change to the document begins on page 7 which now includes weighting the criteria as part of a project evaluation (i.e.: 30% Fund Objectives & Priorities, 30% Priority Fish Species, 20% Scientific Validity, 10 Project Owner to Successfully Implement, and 10% Cost Effectiveness & Timeliness). An evaluation sheet (Appendix D) with the weighting was also added.

Olson said the intent is that each completed evaluation sheet be very transparent when presented to the ACC for review and project funding approval.

Day said that the ACC wants flexibility – to be able to learn as we go and make changes if necessary.. We should ask at the end, do we have a process that makes sense to us and if so, proceed knowing that we can improve the process as needed.

Ruth Tracy (USDA Forest Service) wants the ACC to avoid analysis paralysis. She recommended we consider narrowing the evaluation rating to a 1-5 rather than 1-10. She further suggested that the wording “long-term success be demonstrated” be changed as this is not measurable for a project that hasn't been done yet.

Olson clarified the two-step process; the Pre-proposal form for the ACC to determine if a project is worthy to continue to a higher level of more scrutiny, which is the Proposal Form.

Byrne indicated that he would like to see more weight devoted to Section C, Scientific Validity and Technical Quality, rather than Sections A & B. Kaje concurred.

Kaje said that Sections A & B are really complementary. However, the meat of the project and where they (the applicant) will have to put together a technical response is Section C. He further commented that to screen each applicant, one could use Section A in the Pre-Proposal.

<Break 10:35am>

<Reconvene 10:50am>

The ACC agreed to have Section A (Primary) be a key component of the Pre-Proposal review and move Section A (Secondary) into Section B. In review of a Pre-Proposal, a proposed project would need to meet the “Consistent with Fund Objectives and Priorities” criteria in order to be considered for further evaluation.

The ACC tentatively approved the following weightings in Appendix D - Individual Project Evaluation Sheet:

Section B – 40%

Section C – 40%

Section D – 10%

Section E – 10%

Olson will make the appropriate changes and present the document back to the ACC for further review. The ACC may determine to modify the weighting again prior to the finished product.

Tracy suggested moving the Request for Proposal activity before Christmas, provide the “yes” or “no” to the applicant after Christmas, and then proceed to Request for Proposals to selected applicants in January.

During the initial year of funding (2005), upon completion and approval of the Aquatics Fund document, the timeline may be expedited as funds are available now. Subsequent years we will use Table 4.1, Funding Process Timeline.

There was general discussion regarding ACC review of proposals when an ACC participant is an applicant. Some ACC participants feel this suggests a conflict of interest and/or perception of bias. Malinowski communicated that PacifiCorp and Cowlitz PUD are ranking the proposals and the ACC will only be discussing those rankings.

Tracy strongly expressed concern that the USDA would be limited in their participation in the ACC during this process given their intent to submit project proposals. Tracy requested further consideration of the language relating to project proponent participation. This topic will be discussed again at future ACC meetings.

Olson indicated that he will revise the document according to ACC comments and email to the ACC for review and further consideration.

<Lunch 12:15pm>

<Reconvene 12:50pm>

Project Lists

The following document was distributed to all ACC attendees:

- *Lower Columbia River Fish Recovery Board (LCFRB)- Draft Upper North Fork Lewis Project List (Preliminary) 5/16/05*

Tracy indicated that they (USDA Forest Service) agreed with LCFRBs priorities with the focus on sub-watersheds (Tier 1 & 2 reaches), Muddy River and Pine Creek.

Day asked what was the purpose of handing out the above document to the ACC? Olson explained that the purpose of the review was for informational reasons rather than a critique of the documents.

Tracy further communicated that USDA Forest Service put together a preliminary restoration plan called the *Lewis River Aquatic Restoration Plan DRAFT*. Hard copies of the Plan were distributed to the ACC attendees. The USDA Forest Service thinks that sediment is an issue so they have identified four focus areas as follows:

- South & Western side of Muddy River
- Upper Clear Creek
- Upper Clear Water
- Lower East Muddy/Lower Clear Creek.

The USDA Forest Service identified roads for decommissioning, fish passage culverts, and opportunities to look at improving riparian or floodplain conditions.

Kaje communicated that the LCFRB list only represents USFS identified projects. There are no projects identified for Merwin and Yale. The Board did not go farther to identify projects on non-USFS lands. The LCFRB list is not a comprehensive list, and the ACC needs to realize this.

Tracy said that the idea of the LCFRB workshop was for anyone to come and present their project ideas by June 16, 2005. The list represents projects available at the time it was created.

Kaje said that the ACC needs to keep in mind that Merwin and Yale have not received the same look and our process will need to evaluate them on the same merits.

Olson explained that the LCFRB is ahead of us in their funding process and we should tweak our project lists from what they learned from their process, i.e. what is the value of their projects as compared to what we are trying to do?

Day clarified that a project can be consistent with the plan but not on the List. The ACC needs to be more comprehensive in our look of projects.

DEIS Discussion

With regards to identifying potential Aquatics Fund projects in comments to FERC's DEIS, Olson communicated that the next step for PacifiCorp is to speak with our FERC counsel. Clarification is needed as to the response FERC may give if projects are identified as only potential and not committed.

Tracy will speak with the appropriate in-house contact regarding the level of specificity regarding the project list.

Acclimation Pond Sites

The ACC reviewed the aerial site maps of potential sites as provided by PacifiCorp and USFS.

Day requested that PacifiCorp check in with the Yakama Nation regarding the Acclimation Pond Sites. She also requested a large basin map. Day questions if the sites selected are spread out enough to be optimal for the objective of acclimating fish to come back to these sites (optimal enough to re-establish fish in a spread out manner).

Kaje requested that PacifiCorp give consideration to locating a site on the Lewis River mainstem in addition to proposed sites on the Muddy and its tributaries. The site should be reasonably accessible at the time we need to get to the location (not be blocked by snow).

Both the Muddy system and mainstem Lewis system should be areas of focus for supplementation and the placement of acclimation facilities, according to Kaje. Olson will have Frank Shrier (PacifiCorp) look around in these areas and report back to the ACC.

Update on Aquatic Studies

Merwin Tailrace Study

The hydroacoustic array is up and running so we can now track fish coming into the tailrace and into the trap. Shrier has ordered tags and tagging equipment. The revised Study Plan has been distributed and PacifiCorp needs to receive any comments ASAP. PacifiCorp is committed to completing the study for a full year to cover all fish runs.

Bathymetry Study

Contractors are working up on Swift reservoir collecting data. Upon completing the surveys on Swift they will move downstream to Yale and Merwin reservoirs. Information should be available this fall.

Gravel Study

A subgroup meeting (June 17, 2005) has been scheduled to go over ACC comments on the Study Plan with PacifiCorp and Stillwater (contractor for this study).

Miscellaneous

Next Scheduled Meetings

Thursday, July 14, 2005 (Merwin Hydro Facility)
Thursday, August 11, 2005 (Merwin Hydro Facility)
Thursday, September 8, 2005 (location TBD)

Agenda items for July 14, 2005

- Review of 6/9/05 meeting notes

- Review of Funding Process Document
- DEIS Discussion
- Update on Hatchery & Supplementation Plan
- Acclimation Pond Sites
- Update on Spawning Gravel Study

Handouts

- Final Agenda
- Draft Meeting Notes 5/19/05
- Revised Merwin Tailrace Fish Behavior Study
- Lewis River Aquatic Funding Process Document (version 060105)
- Lower River Columbia Fish Recovery Board Lewis Draft Project List 5/19/05
- USDA Forest Service Lewis River Draft Aquatic Restoration Plan
- Aerial acclimation pond sites photos