

## McCune, Kimberly

---

**From:** McCune, Kimberly  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 30, 2016 8:17 AM  
**To:** Shrier, Frank; Steve Manlow; Frazier, Patrick A (DFW); Ruth Tracy; Miller, Peggy A (DFW); Michelle Day; Bryce Michaelis; talexander@cowlitz.org; Asher, Eli; Amelia Johnson; Melody Tereski  
**Cc:** Olson, Todd (Todd.Olson@pacificorp.com)  
**Subject:** Aquatic Fund Subgroup Meeting, 8/29/16 - Conference Call

Attn: Aquatic Fund Subgroup

Please be advised that the following participants were in attendance at the special conference call at 2:00pm yesterday:

Meeting called to order at 2:15pm

- Frank Shrier, PacifiCorp
- Kim McCune, PacifiCorp
- Steve Manlow, LCFRB

After consideration of the email string below the following was agreed to for the cover letter, Section B of the Individual Project Evaluation Sheet and Section 3.3.2 of the internal Aquatic Fund Strategic Plan and Admin Procedures document (first bullet):

### **Cover letter (page 2) -**

Higher priority will be given to projects that provide for benefits to priority fish species and stocks. There is an emphasis on Spring Chinook recovery in the upper basin, but not to the exclusion of recovery of other ESA-listed species.

### **Section B – Individual Project Evaluation Sheet (first bullet)**

- Does the project benefit priority fish species and stocks with emphasis on Spring Chinook recovery in the upper basin, but not to the exclusion of recovery of other ESA-listed species?

### **Section 3.3.2 – Aquatic Fund (internal) Strategic Plan and Admin Procedures**

- Does the project benefit priority fish species and stocks with emphasis on Spring Chinook recovery in the upper basin, but not to the exclusion of recovery of other ESA-listed species?

In addition, reference to the current balance of the Bull Trout fund on page 1 of the cover letter will be removed since funding for bull trout projects will not occur in 2017 but will likely resume in 2018.

This email and the August 15, 2016 Meeting Notes will become part of the Aquatic Fund Subgroup meeting notes public record on the Lewis River website.

Thank you for your efforts and participation in the Aquatic Fund Subgroup.

### **Kimberly McCune**

Sr. Business Administrator  
PacifiCorp – Hydro Resources  
825 NE Multnomah St., Suite 1500

Portland, OR 97232  
Ph: (503) 813-6078  
Mobile: (503) 708-4819

---

**From:** Shrier, Frank

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 24, 2016 7:51 AM

**To:** Steve Manlow; Frazier, Patrick A (DFW); McCune, Kimberly; Ruth Tracy; Miller, Peggy A (DFW); Michelle Day; Bryce Michaelis; [talexander@cowlitz.org](mailto:talexander@cowlitz.org); Asher, Eli; Amelia Johnson; Melody Tereski

**Subject:** RE: RESPONSE REQUESTED: AQ Fund revised Announcement Materials

All, I've sent out a Doodle poll request so that we can resolve this question in rapid manner. Once I have a date and time, I will set up a conference line.

---

**From:** Steve Manlow [<mailto:smanlow@lcfwb.gen.wa.us>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 23, 2016 2:10 PM

**To:** Frazier, Patrick A (DFW); McCune, Kimberly; Shrier, Frank; Ruth Tracy; Miller, Peggy A (DFW); Michelle Day; Bryce Michaelis; [talexander@cowlitz.org](mailto:talexander@cowlitz.org); Asher, Eli; Amelia Johnson; Melody Tereski

**Subject:** RESPONSE REQUESTED: AQ Fund revised Announcement Materials

All:

I understand the general emphasis on those species we need to introduce above Swift, and agree with Pat that we need consider multiple species in the upper basin. The only hesitation I have with stating a discreet geographic preference for "projects occurring upstream of swift dam" is that for some species, the population performance bottleneck may occur below the dam. What if lower river rearing habitat is more of a bottleneck than upper basin rearing habitat? Would we be foreclosing opportunities by focusing work in the upper basin? I don't know that this is the case, but it is a question. I think we'd all agree that the focus should be actions that support successful reintroduction of Springers, coho and steelhead in the upper basin, but that doesn't necessarily mean that is where the most beneficial work needs to take place if rearing habitat is a key limiting factor. Maybe it's not? I'd appreciate your thoughts on this.

Steve

---

**From:** Frazier, Patrick A (DFW) [<mailto:Patrick.Frazier@dfw.wa.gov>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 23, 2016 12:17 PM

**To:** Steve Manlow <[smanlow@lcfwb.gen.wa.us](mailto:smanlow@lcfwb.gen.wa.us)>; McCune, Kimberly <[Kimberly.McCune@pacificorp.com](mailto:Kimberly.McCune@pacificorp.com)>; Shrier, Frank <[Frank.Shrier@pacificorp.com](mailto:Frank.Shrier@pacificorp.com)>; Ruth Tracy <[rtracy@fs.fed.us](mailto:rtracy@fs.fed.us)>; Miller, Peggy A (DFW) <[Peggy.Miller@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:Peggy.Miller@dfw.wa.gov)>; Michelle Day <[michelle.day@noaa.gov](mailto:michelle.day@noaa.gov)>; Bryce Michaelis <[bmichaelis@fs.fed.us](mailto:bmichaelis@fs.fed.us)>; [talexander@cowlitz.org](mailto:talexander@cowlitz.org); Asher, Eli <[easher@cowlitz.org](mailto:easher@cowlitz.org)>; Amelia Johnson <[ajohnson@lcfwb.gen.wa.us](mailto:ajohnson@lcfwb.gen.wa.us)>; Melody Tereski <[mtereski@lcfwb.gen.wa.us](mailto:mtereski@lcfwb.gen.wa.us)>

**Subject:** RE: RESPONSE REQUESTED: AQ Fund revised Announcement Materials

Kim and Frank,

I am generally supportive of the direction Steve Manlow is going with his edits, but have some concern that we are connecting spring chinook and projects occurring above Swift Reservoir in the same phrase. During the subcommittee meeting these were two separate thoughts and I think should remain that way. The phrase Steve has added limits the above Swift consideration to only spring chinook. The Swift consideration should include coho and steelhead also.

To keep moving the direction Steve has proposed I have a couple of alternatives for the 1<sup>st</sup> two bullets in Section 3.2, as follows:

1. Leave the 1<sup>st</sup> bullet as is and change the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet to have similar wording as the 1<sup>st</sup> bullet. The 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet would be worded “Emphasis will be placed on projects occurring upstream of Swift Dam but not to the exclusion of projects occurring below Swift Dam.”
2. Delete the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet and reword 1<sup>st</sup> bullet to include consideration for projects above Swift Reservoir. The 1<sup>st</sup> bullet would be worded “Emphasis will be placed on Spring Chinook recovery and projects occurring upstream of Swift Dam but not to the exclusion of other ESA-listed species or projects occurring downstream of Swift Dam”

Personally I prefer Option number 1. I think it is clearer and is more consistent with the intent of the subcommittee. It also fits with the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet under section 3.3.2 that reads “ Is the proposed project upstream of Swift dam?”

If you have an questions or concerns regarding my suggestions feel free to contact me. If we need to discuss this further my schedule is pretty open this week.

Pat F.

---

**From:** Steve Manlow [<mailto:smanlow@lcfrcb.gen.wa.us>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 16, 2016 10:43 AM

**To:** McCune, Kimberly; Shrier, Frank; Ruth Tracy; Miller, Peggy A (DFW); Frazier, Patrick A (DFW); Michelle Day; Bryce Michaelis; [talexander@cowlitz.org](mailto:talexander@cowlitz.org); Asher, Eli; Amelia Johnson; Melody Tereski

**Subject:** RE: RESPONSE REQUESTED: AQ Fund revised Announcement Materials

Frank and Kimberly:

We'd like offer a few comments and suggestions on the proposed wording.

The second added bullet in Section 3.2 (Project Evaluation Guidance at a Program Level) and number 2 in Section 3.3 (Evaluation of Resource Projects) of the administrative procedures document states that proposed projects upstream of Swift dam “...will receive a higher priority than projects downstream of Merwin dam.” The second bullet in Section 3.3.2 also asks the question “Is the proposed project upstream of Swift dam?”. We are concerned that the discrete preference statement for projects in the upper basin may be overly broad in light of all of the variables involved, including project design, potential habitat lift, benefits to fish, cost and certainty of success. A poorly designed project with low certainty of success and biological lift in the upper basin should not be given automatic preference over a well-designed and technically sound project that benefits multiple species (which may include spring Chinook rearing) in the lower basin. It could also lead to a poor expenditure of limited funds. As an alternative, perhaps drop the second bullet point in each of these sections and rework the first one to state “Benefits to priority fish species and stocks with emphasis on Spring Chinook recovery in the upper basin, but not to the exclusion of other ESA-listed species.” Adding the phrase “recovery in the upper basin” would serve to focus the efforts in the upper basin and provide a “recovery” context, but in a manner that does preclude consideration of other important factors in prioritizing work. The automatic preference seems too prescriptive. Similar changes could be made in the other documents.

Please let me know what you think.

Thanks.

Steve

---

**From:** McCune, Kimberly [<mailto:Kimberly.McCune@pacificorp.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 16, 2016 8:43 AM

**To:** Shrier, Frank <[Frank.Shrier@pacificcorp.com](mailto:Frank.Shrier@pacificcorp.com)>; Ruth Tracy <[rtracy@fs.fed.us](mailto:rtracy@fs.fed.us)>; Peggy Miller <[peggy.miller@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:peggy.miller@dfw.wa.gov)>; Frazier, Patrick A (DFW) <[Patrick.Frazier@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:Patrick.Frazier@dfw.wa.gov)>; Michelle Day <[michelle.day@noaa.gov](mailto:michelle.day@noaa.gov)>; Steve Manlow <[smanlow@lcfwb.gen.wa.us](mailto:smanlow@lcfwb.gen.wa.us)>; Bryce Michaelis <[bmichaelis@fs.fed.us](mailto:bmichaelis@fs.fed.us)>; [talexander@cowlitz.org](mailto:talexander@cowlitz.org); Asher, Eli <[easher@cowlitz.org](mailto:easher@cowlitz.org)>  
**Subject:** RE: RESPONSE REQUESTED: AQ Fund revised Announcement Materials  
**Importance:** High

Attn: Aquatic Fund Subgroup

In accordance with our meeting yesterday please find attached the AQ Fund announcement materials and internal Evaluation Criteria document with the requested edits.

Please submit all edits (in track changes) and/or comments to my attention **no later than Tuesday, August 23, 2016**. All documents will be finalized shortly thereafter.

Thank you.

Kim

---

**From:** McCune, Kimberly  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 12, 2016 11:07 AM  
**To:** 'Shrier, Frank'; Ruth Tracy; Peggy Miller; Frazier, Patrick A (DFW); 'Michelle Day'; Steve Manlow; Bryce Michaelis; 'talexander@cowlitz.org'; Asher, Eli  
**Subject:** RE: RESPONSE REQUESTED: AQ Fund Subgroup Announcement Materials  
**Importance:** High

Attn: Aquatic Fund Subgroup

In accordance with our meeting yesterday please find attached a revised cover letter addressing Subgroup comments around Chinook recovery emphasis, while also addressing the intent of the Settlement Agreement. Also attached is the Aquatic Fund – Strategic Plan and Administrative Procedures (process document) and Evaluation Criteria for your review and edits. *Please note that all text in italics within the process document is Settlement Agreement language and cannot be changed.*

Please submit all edits (in track changes) and/or comments to my attention **no later than Monday, August 1, 2016**.

Thank you.

Kim

---

**From:** McCune, Kimberly  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 22, 2016 4:08 PM  
**To:** Shrier, Frank ([Frank.Shrier@pacificcorp.com](mailto:Frank.Shrier@pacificcorp.com)); Ruth Tracy; Peggy Miller; Frazier, Patrick A (DFW); Roberts, Aaron; 'Michelle Day'; Steve Manlow; Bryce Michaelis; 'Nathan Reynolds ([nreynolds@cowlitz.org](mailto:nreynolds@cowlitz.org))'; [talexander@cowlitz.org](mailto:talexander@cowlitz.org); Asher, Eli  
**Cc:** Olson, Todd ([Todd.Olson@pacificcorp.com](mailto:Todd.Olson@pacificcorp.com))  
**Subject:** RESPONSE REQUESTED: AQ Fund Subgroup Announcement Materials

Attn: Aquatic Fund Subgroup

Please find attached the following administrative materials we discussed briefly today for your review and any additional edits:

- Attachment A: Pre-Proposal Form
- Attachment C: Landowner Acknowledgement Form (no changes have been submitted yet for this document)
- Attachment D: Individual Project Evaluation Sheet (please review and submit requested edits)
  
- Aquatic Fund Full Proposal – review content and edit as needed (*italics cannot be changed*)
- Aquatic Fund – Strategic Plan and Administrative Procedures (process document)
  
- *Note - Attachment B: Lewis River Aquatic Fund Priority Reaches (not included with this email)*

Please submit all edits and/or comments to my attention **on or before Wednesday, July 6<sup>th</sup>**. Frank will continue to work on the requested revisions to the Priority Reaches document prior to our next meeting July 11, 2016.

Thank you.

**Kimberly McCune**  
Sr. Business Administrator  
PacifiCorp – Hydro Resources  
825 NE Multnomah St., Suite 1500  
Portland, OR 97232  
Ph: (503) 813-6078  
Mobile: (503) 708-4819