

**FINAL Meeting Notes
Lewis River License Implementation
Aquatic Coordination Committee (ACC) Meeting
September 11, 2008
Conference Call Only**

ACC Participants Present (9)

Clifford Casseseka, Yakama Nation
Diana Gritten-MacDonald, Cowlitz PUD (9:20am – 9:55am)
Eric Kinne, WDFW
George Lee, Yakama Nation
Jim Malinowski, Fish First
Kimberly McCune, PacifiCorp Energy
Bryan Nordlund, NMFS
Todd Olson, PacifiCorp Energy
Neil Turner, WDFW

Calendar:

October 8, 2008	TCC Meeting	Merwin Hydro
October 9, 2008	ACC Meeting	Merwin Hydro

Assignments from September 11th Meeting:	Status:
McCune: Create a redline of the ATE Definition document to illustrate the requested ACC edits, email to the ACC for review and request a decision at the October 2008 ACC meeting.	Complete – 10/9/08
McCune: Make the appropriate changes to the aquatic fund matrix and email the corrected version to the ACC.	Complete – 9/26/08

Assignments from August 14th Meeting:	Status:
Kearney: George Lee (Yakama Nation) requested CLT background and funding information mailed to his attention.	Complete – 8/26/08
McCune: Email Gary Winans PowerPoint “Genetic Work Relating to the Hatchery & Supplementation (H&S) Plan” to all ACC representatives.	Complete – 8/19/08

Opening, Review of Agenda and Meeting Notes

Todd Olson (PacifiCorp Energy) called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Olson reviewed the agenda for the day and requested any changes to the agenda. No changes were requested.

Olson requested comments and/or changes to the ACC Draft 8/14/08 meeting notes. The meeting notes were approved at 9:10am without changes.

License Issuance Update

Olson informed the ACC attendees that PacifiCorp received formal notice from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) in late August stating that they are in receipt of the Utilities Request for Rehearing. In the letter, the FERC noted their need for additional time for review/deliberation of the Utilities request; however, the FERC did not specify how much time.

In addition, PacifiCorp plans to request a stay prior to September 26, 2008 regarding the Exhibit G submission until such time the FERC has had an opportunity to respond to PacifiCorp's request for rehearing with a ruling. In the initial Lewis River licenses FERC asked that all 10,000 acres of wildlife lands be included in the FERC boundary.

ATE Discussion – Definition of ATE (Nordlund Memorandum)

Olson communicated to the ACC attendees that PacifiCorp has not received comments on the ATE definition, as provided by Bryan Nordlund (NMFS); **Attachment A**. Nordlund informed the ACC attendees that the memorandum is a result of discussion at previous ACC meetings. He also noted that the median delay has been increased from 24 hours to 30 hours.

Olson requested clarification from Nordlund regarding the following text in the Definition of ATE Memorandum: *Efficient passage means that trapped fish are transported upstream within 24 hours of trap capture*. Olson understands for example, that the Merwin trap crew would come in on Friday morning, sort those fish, and transport them to the appropriate location. Any fish that came in after that process would be held in the holding tank until Saturday morning and could dependent on numbers of fish to process, etc, actually be held longer than 24 hours. Olson further stated that he understands that the agreement is to transport fish every day. Nordlund replied that yes, this is his understanding as well.

Clifford Casseseka (Yakama Nation) wanted to know what PacifiCorp will do with peak runs on the weekends. Olson responded that the plan is to staff the facility to meet the 24 hour transport requirements and work to move as many fish with minimal delay.

Eric Kinne (WDFW) asked if the 30-hour median delay is a proposal for all species. Olson replied yes and would like the ACC to agree on this. Due to the absence of a number of ACC participants, it was decided to delay the decision/confirmation of the ATE definition until the October 2008 ACC meeting.

Nordlund stated that the 24-hour is the default median delay. The ACC may look at the delay time on a species by species basis and then decide to extend to a 30-hour median delay time.

Modify the text below to read as follows:

*a) Active migrants are fish that are trapped and tagged at the Merwin facility **and released** downstream, minus fish that are sport-caught, minus fish entering the hatchery, minus fallbacks, minus lost tags.*

The ACC discussed what a “fallback” fish was. In the draft ATE definition it is as follows:

b) Fallbacks are fish that do not re-enter the Merwin tailrace.

Some folks thought that to be a fish that went up into the tailrace than went back downstream (i.e. Fell back into the lower river or beyond), whereas others thought it meant a tagged fish that never went back up to the tailrace. Further discussion is needed to reach agreement.

Kimberly McCune (PacifiCorp Energy) will create a redline of the document to illustrate the requested ACC edits, email to the ACC for review and request a decision at the October 2008 ACC meeting.

Continued Review of Aquatic Fund – Strategic Plan and Administrative Procedures (September 2005). *Are changes to the Strategic Plan needed?*

Olson/McCune provided a matrix handout titled, “Review of Aquatic Fund – Strategic Plan and Administrative Procedures (September 2005)”, dated September 11, 2008, (**Attachment B**), which included collective comments received by PacifiCorp thus far as an attempt to help address the list of discussion points.

Olson reviewed Attachment B and informed the ACC attendees that the Utilities comments were out of order, responses did not align with the issue. McCune will make the appropriate edits to correct and email the corrected version to the ACC.

Olson requested Fish First and other parties who had yet to give written input to respond in writing regarding the following items:

- What are the hydro project effects that AQ Funded projects should address?
- Should any priority be given to certain project types?
- What "value" should be given to those projects that include monitoring to assess the success of the project?

Jim Malinowski (Fish First) expressed that he was impressed with the comments provided by WDFW and at the very least he will respond that he completely supports WDFW comments.

Malinowski further communicated that he is uncomfortable with the approval of projects that he thinks did not provide real environmental benefits. He requested that all East Fork projects receive fair consideration going forward in the review of aquatic project proposal.

Malinowski also asked about how we will deal with those not present who modify decisions within the 7-day period after decisions are made. Olson replied that PacifiCorp will insert edits to the procedures to remove the option of a 7-day comment period and identify that the ACC representative or their proxy must participate at the project decision meeting.

Olson also requested the Yakama Nation review the aquatic fund matrix and provide written comment on the discussion points and questions.

Study Updates

Olson provided the following study updates:

Swift Constructed Channel Concept Design and Swift Upper Release Design – Permits submitted to county; county reviewing; not sure when to expect receipt of permits. Construction planned in 2009.

Hatchery Upgrades

Lewis River Pond 15 – Construction is still planned to begin January 2009; permits submitted to the county. PacifiCorp working on Request for Proposal to solicit construction bids.

Speelyai Burrows Pond – On schedule construction planned for 2009.

Hatchery and Supplementation (H&S) Plan – This item will be included on the ACC October 2008 meeting agenda; new HGMPs that have been prepared by WDFW.

Release Pond – Very close to completing land transaction with WDFW. Access has been given to PacifiCorp's engineer to review site in order to move forward with conceptual design, surveying, etc.

Yale BT Entrainment Reduction Study Plan – Explored idea of electric barrier; however upon review of velocities in the area PacifiCorp's engineering team discovered that the cost will be considerable. A barrier net now looks to be a better option.

Review and Discussion of Land Interests

Olson provided an update of interests in certain lands, however, this discussion is considered confidential and proprietary and not for public viewing.

New topics/issues

Diana Gritten-MacDonald (Cowlitz PUD) informed the ACC attendees that a PUD project engineer discovered an elk camp on PacifiCorp lands. The site is east of the powerhouse and the inhabitant was asked to leave. She indicated that PacifiCorp may want to consider contacting the WDFW law enforcement.

Lewis River License Issuance Celebration

Olson reminded the ACC attendees that the Lewis River License Issuance Celebration will take on Wednesday, September 17, 2008 and they are all invited.

Agenda items for October 9, 2008

- Review September 11, 2008 Meeting Notes
- Definition of ATE – ACC Decision

- Continued Review of Aquatic Fund – Strategic Plan and Administrative Procedures (September 2005) *Review suggested changes to the Strategic Plan*
- Hatchery & Supplementation Plan
- Study/Work Product Updates
- License Issuance Update

Next Scheduled Meetings

October 9, 2008	November 13, 2008
Merwin Hydro Facility	Merwin Hydro Facility
Ariel, WA	Ariel, WA
9:00am – 3:00pm	9:00am – 3:00pm

Meeting Adjourned at 9:55a.m.

Handouts

- Final Agenda
- Draft ACC Meeting Notes 8/14/08
- [Attachment A](#) – Definition of ATE Nordlund Memorandum, dated September 11, 2008
- [Attachment B](#) - Review of Aquatic Fund – Strategic Plan and Administrative Procedures (September 2005), with collective comments dated September 11, 2008

9/11/08

Draft – for ACC consideration

The ACC agrees that:

ATE is defined as the number of tagged active migrants that are passed upstream in a safe, timely and efficient manner, divided by the number of tagged active migrants entering the Merwin tailrace. Safe passage means that fish are re-captured and passed upstream with facility induced injury and mortality rates less than defined in Section 4.1.4 of the Lewis River Settlement Agreement (SA). Timely passage means that median delay is less than defined below. Efficient passage means that trapped fish are transported upstream within 24 hours of trap capture.

For ATE evaluation purposes, the following definitions apply:

- a) Active migrants are fish that are trapped and tagged at the Merwin facility, minus fish that are sport-caught, minus fish entering the hatchery, minus fallbacks, minus lost tags.
- b) Fallbacks are fish that leave and do not re-enter the Merwin tailrace.
- c) Merwin tailrace is the river between Merwin Dam and the project access bridge.

To achieve ATE,

- a) the median delay (time between Merwin tailrace entry and trap capture) for active migrants will be measured at less than or equal to 24 hours, with no more than 5% of the test fish taking longer than 1 week to pass. If study results show the median delay is less than 30 hours and all other upstream fish passage SA Performance Standards at Merwin dam are met, the 30-hour median delay may be acceptable based on consensus of the ACC.
- b) at least 98% of the active adult migrants are passed upstream.

After ATE, Upstream Passage Survival per SA 4.1.4a, and Injury Performance Objectives per SA 4.1.4b are achieved, no further adjustments or modifications to the Merwin upstream passage facility will be required.

Discussion Point and Questions	Fish First	LCFRB	Yakama Nation	USFS	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	USFWS	Utilities	NMFS	WDFW	Decision
Clarify East Fork Lewis language in the Settlement Agreement Q1 - Should projects in the EF be funded? Q2 - Should EF projects be funded after funding of NF projects?	Concerned about limiting funding to North Fork projects only which violates certain parts of the Settlement Agreement. The emphasis should be on the relative aquatic benefits of the project and not the location. If all things are equal in benefit, priority means you select a North Fork project first. If the benefits are greater on an East Fork project, that project should be selected.	It is clear that there is a strong priority given to the North Fork system for project implementation. We agree with this guidance, and feel that investment should be made in the East Fork only if there are no opportunities in the North Fork, including future opportunities. Any project proposed for the East Fork Lewis should make clear, direct connections to benefits to North Fork Lewis populations. We recognize the importance of the East Fork Lewis for salmon recovery efforts, but the purpose of the Aquatics Fund should remain focused on the North Fork Lewis system.	The Yakama Nation is not opposed to funding projects on the East Fork. Fish can not be programmed to react in the way we want. Changing the variable upsets the balance of the fish with scientific ideas. All streams should be included in the enhancement efforts. You cannot cut the arm (the tributaries) off which is why the East Fork is important to the reintroduction process. Different streams change with time. Placing a priority on the basin does not consider how the salmon (different species) are related and what they need to do. The North Fork and the East Fork are equal in importance.	Projects should be funded in the East Fork Lewis River with priority given to projects on the North Fork Lewis River. Projects proposed for the East Fork Lewis should have a clear nexus to benefits to North Fork Lewis populations. Projects downstream of Merwin Dam should also be funded with priority given first to projects above the reservoirs.	East Fork projects are to be determined on a case by case basis. The Tribe does not believe any "clarification" is needed. A project proponent introduces a project, the ACC discusses it and a decision will be made. The project should have a clear connection to the benefits to the North Fork Lewis.	East Fork projects should be considered for funding (but are a lower priority), and only if a clear link can be established (in the body of the proposal) that the project will benefit NF populations. FERC has made it clear that there has to be a nexus to project operations or to enhance populations affected by the project.	The SA specifically states that the Aquatic Fund should support resource protection measures that, "increase the probability for a successful reintroduction program" (SA 7.5) The SA goes on to state that for the purposes of Section 7.5, North Fork Lewis refers to the portion of the Lewis River from its confluence with the Columbia River upstream to the headwaters, including tributaries except the East Fork of the Lewis River (SA 7.5.3.1). However, the section above this says that one of the objectives is to "enhance fish habitat in the Lewis River Basin, with priority given to the North Fork Lewis River"(SA 7.5.3.1(3)). Since East Fork is really the only part of the North Fork Lewis River that is not included in the above definition, that is what 7.5.3.1(3) is referring to. All this really says is that we can fund East Fork projects but they fall behind any other proposed project that fits the North Fork definition.	According to the Settlement Agreement priority is given to the North Fork; however, this does not preclude funding projects in the East Fork. The ACC must provide clear connection of the East Fork projects to the reintroduction efforts.	Yes, aquatic enhancement projects in the East Fork Lewis should be funded without prejudice. The damage caused by hydropower development on the Lewis is so great and pervasive that artificial constraints or innovative or system-wide enhancement methodologies should not be imposed by attorneys, utilities or bureaucrats. Solutions to re-introduction problems should be judged in terms of efficacy of improving fish survival through the hydropower system (upstream and downstream) – throughout the fishes' life cycles. Habitat improvements should be made within an ecosystem framework that is focused on restoring properly functioning conditions that can support self-sustaining natural populations and sustainable fisheries. WDFW agrees with the comments of Fish First and the Yakama Nation.	East Fork projects may be funded, but priority of spending should go to North Fork as identified in the Settlement Agreement.
Project effects/nexus definition Q1 - What are the hydroproject effects that AQ Funded projects should address? Q2 - Should any priority be given to certain project types?				Priority should be given to instream habitat restoration projects, next to riparian related projects, and then to road related projects.			Priority should be given to instream projects that will provide a "home" for reintroduced salmon and steelhead.		All hydropower impacts should be mitigated – i.e., damage caused by initial construction plus its ongoing existence and operation. Priority should be given to projects that provide significant biological benefit to both target species population health and ecosystem functioning.	
Role of Project owner Q1 - What is the appropriate level of engagement in the funding process for an ACC entity that is also a project proponent?	The ACC is too small to exclude any members from discussion (whether a proponent or not). Consensus takes care of any advocating of projects. Agree with position of Cowlitz Indian Tribe.	In Section 3.2, under the Process Considerations, it states that ACC representatives may not champion their own projects. We agree with this guidance and feel that this guidance should be more closely followed. While a member of the sponsoring organization can participate in discussions to provide information, the ACC voting member should not advocate for their organization's project. It is the responsibility of the facilitator to determine when this line is being crossed.		The project proponents are most knowledgeable about the project and should be allowed to participate in discussions about the proposed project as needed. Proponents should not champion their project, just provide clear concise information as needed.	The Tribe agrees with Fish First. The ACC is too small to exclude members from discussion and/or voting. ACC members are educated, intelligent individuals with a good working knowledge of the watershed. They also have professional integrity. The Tribe is not concerned with any member's participation, regardless if their agency is a project proponent. Participation of all ACC members is critical if we are to make the best decisions for the Lewis River Watershed. Let the projects speak for themselves.	Agree with position of the LCFRB. Have the project manager leave the discussion if different from the ACC representative. Do not let project questions be asked at the decision meeting.	An ACC entity proposing a project may participate in ACC discussions on their project, but cannot champion their project nor participate in the consensus selection of their project. If requested, they must excuse themselves from the ACC meeting at the appropriate time.	Do not give ACC members more of an advantage or opportunity than ACC members. A project owner should step out when decision is being made or show that there is a clear division between ACC representative and project proponent.	All ACC members should be encouraged to be project sponsors as well as bringing in and supporting outside entities that could contribute to diverse solutions.	No questions should be asked of Project proponent at the Funding Selection meeting. If requested by any ACC representative, a project proponent/entity must remove themselves from the meeting during discussion on their project. Process should strive to give equal consideration to all projects.
Post-implementation monitoring Q1 - What "value" should be given to those projects that include monitoring to assess the success of the project?				A higher value of some sort should be given to projects that include monitoring.		Monitoring above and beyond what is already required may be appropriate in a more "experimental" project, i.e., where the ACC is interested in seeing it go forward, but on a pilot or trial basis.	Projects that include monitoring at the appropriate funding level should get a higher rating. ACC should have the right to eliminate funding of monitoring as needed. Project owners must continue to demonstrate that the project was built according to project plan and is functioning as expected (e.g. photos before and after the project).		Research, monitoring and evaluation components are essential for Adaptive Management of projects, and the development of sustainable, long-term solutions. Ideally, implementation projects should have integral RM&E components that enable the success of the project to be objectively judged and modifications to be made. The difficulty would be determining the level of RM&E that is feasible given the time-frame, scope and budget of the specific project.	
AQ Fund Spending Q1 - Should we stop funding projects until fish are reintroduced?	No, Only projects that are truly worthy and that really help fish should get funded. The Fund is not just for reintroduction of anadromous fish, but for the whole basin and mitigation for aquatic habitat inundated by the reservoirs. Fund announcement needs to stress what the ACC is looking for in habitat projects.	No, however, more weight should be given to projects that benefit re-introduction of anadromous fish.	No, the Settlement Agreement gives direction for the Aquatic Fund. The ACC should respond accordingly in a professional fashion and work through any funding response differences together.	No, if we wait until fish are reintroduced to do any work, we may be years behind habitat needs of reintroduced fish, and create an unsuccessful reintroduction effort. Some of the money, perhaps half, should be saved until fish are actually reintroduced. NOAA and USFWS need to play a major role in monitoring reintroduced populations so they can help determine locations for successful projects to be implemented. The ACC should consider how proposed projects address issues identified in the 2008 Habitat Synthesis.	No, look at each project on a case by case basis and ask the question does the project benefit anadromous fish reintroduction efforts?	We should continue funding projects now, and not wait until reintroduction takes place.	No, however projects that will directly enhance the habitat of reintroduced fish should be of priority. Selected projects should tie directly to items identified in the Settlement Agreement.	No, the ACC should spend the fund on the appropriate projects while looking to make the anadromous fish reintroduction a success.	No	The ACC should not withhold distribution of Aquatic Funds until anadromous fish are reintroduced upstream of Merwin dam. Future funding should only be spent on projects that justifiably benefit the anadromous fish reintroduction, recovery of listed species, and/or fish habitat (per Lewis River Settlement Agreement).

Review of Aquatic Fund - Strategic Plan and Administrative Procedures

Project review consistency (fairness) Q1 - What steps can be taken to assure fairness?				All projects from all proponents should be held to the same standard to be fair. Don't ask one proponent to provide information that other proponents aren't also required to provide i.e. detailed budgets.		I wonder if there is a stronger role for the facilitator--i.e., ensuring everyone has the chance to comment, but also not letting the group get bogged down.			Establish "Norms". More use of objective methods, e.g., the new Habitat tool.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Discussion Point	Fish First	LCFRB	Yakama Nation	USFS	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	USFWS	Utilities	NMFS	WDFW	Decision
Ranking of Projects Q1 - Should prioritization of projects be considered? Q1 - Is additional focus needed on the individual project long-term benefits?		Section 3.1 Aquatics Fund Goals – states in the first paragraph, final sentence, “The purpose of the Aquatic Fund is to fund projects that directly help achieve the Reintroduction Outcome Goal.” Can you clarify if this is an overarching goal of the Aquatic Fund, or if this is one of several goals, including those listed in section 1.0 Introduction in the language from the SA describing Resource Projects?		When projects are rated using established guidelines they should be ranked by priority. Long-term benefits should be addressed in the project proposal for all projects.	The Tribe believes it would not be a good use of time for the Utilities to prioritize projects based on scores. The current method of reviewing projects, which includes a ‘Selected by Utilities for Full-Proposal’ category in the pre-proposal evaluation and the ‘Total Score’ category in the final proposal matrix, is adequate.	It would be useful to make a distinction between long term benefits that restore ecological function (e.g., log jams or restoring riparian habitat), vs. one time action, (e.g., adding spawning gravel that would wash away).	If a request of information is made to a project proponent, that same request goes to all applicants. Discussion of projects by the ACC should be limited to the information on hand, unless all project applicants are participating.		Ranking should be based on biological benefits – for the target species and ecosystem health.	
Funding process Q1 - How can the process become more efficient to meet schedule?		We recommend strengthening the proposal instructions to encourage sponsors to better describe how their projects relate to the Aquatics Fund objectives and recovery plans. Sponsors should be asked to clearly describe biological benefits and expected outcomes of their projects. Sponsors should include metrics to help the reviewers quantify the scope of their project and relate it to their proposed cost. A more detailed budget form should be provided in the proposal.		Time should be set aside for each project proponent to present their projects to the ACC group at an ACC meeting. This could be at the draft proposal stage, but it may make more sense to do it when the final proposal is submitted. It appears that the ACC group expects to see projects begin a short time after final project approval. A shorter review time of projects would speed up the funding process and may allow this to occur under certain circumstances. However, the amount of time it takes for final project approval, collection agreements to be executed, and to get projects on the docket to be evaluated by our NEPA planning team, a start date of the following calendar year is more realistic. Representatives need to attend ACC meetings to participate and discuss potential projects. Representatives should not be allowed to object to projects without participating in the selection process. Rearrange the time line so that the final vote for project approval is the final vote. The 7 day comment period should be prior to the final vote, and Representatives can provide feedback during this 7 period if they are not able to attend the final vote. Either the Representatives should vote for final project approval. If a Representative is not available, Project proponents should be allowed to stay in the room when project	In the past, the ACC has made decisions in a timely fashion. A problem seems to have arisen when an objection was received after the ACC made a funding recommendation. Addressing the seven day objection period timeline should be adequate to address this problem. The Tribe does not want to see the ACC Aquatics Fund process become a huge, bureaucratic, paperwork nightmare for our project proponents. Most are not viewed as user friendly by applicants. The ACC spends a meeting or two a year discussing Aquatics Fund projects. To expect an ACC member to invest 8-16 hours of their time to attend these meetings is not unreasonable. Requiring more paperwork from Aquatics Fund proponents will not streamline the ACC decision making process.	From the language of the license, it sounds like FERC wants to approve the suite of projects prior to funds being released. If so, it really throws our schedule of review off. We should discuss, clarify, and decide how best to respond. The project proposals should include enough information to adequately describe the project and its context within the Lewis River basin.	Project funding should be prioritized based on evaluation score		Each entity needs to participate at all phases of the process, and not undermine the work of others by exercising a veto at the end.	
Funding Decision Meeting Q1 - Should it be a requirement that ACC members should attend or an alternate should be in attendance at the meeting or they lose their voting opportunity?			ACC members should attend or an alternate should be in attendance, since we (the ACC) operate on a consensus basis it doesn't mean a project will be approved. He further stated that our group is too small to exclude any members from discussion (whether a proponent or not).	YES. If they don't attend they cannot make an informed decision, and it wastes project proponent's time.	the Tribe agrees with Fish First. The ACC is too small to exclude members from discussion and/or voting. Our ACC members are educated, intelligent individuals with a good working knowledge of the watershed. They also have professional integrity. The Tribe is not concerned with any member's participation, regardless if their agency is a project proponent. Participation of all ACC members is critical if we are to make the best decisions for the Lewis River Watershed.	As a suggestion, voting members or their representative should attend when a decision needs to be made, or assign a proxy who can represent their needs at that meeting. The project proponents are most knowledgeable about the project and should be allowed to participate in discussions about the proposed project as needed. Proponents should not champion their project; just provide clear concise information as needed.	See USFS suggestions. They are good and we should discuss these as a group although there is no real way to assure certainty with timing especially given that FERC now says they need to approve each project.	Giving a proponent more time to argue their own projects is a concern for her; to remove appearance of conflict of interest and bias a project proponent should not champion their proposed project.	Yes, ACC entities should identify primary members and substitutes within their organization and/or have a proxy.	
FERC Comment in License - 6/26/08 Section 7.5.3.1 of the Agreement proposes the establishment of an Aquatic Fund. The Agreement explains that this fund may be used for projects that would benefit fish recovery throughout the North Fork Lewis River. In contrast to the In-lieu Fund, the Agreement notes some specific aquatic habitat enhancement objectives that would be implemented with the funds but provides no nexus to project purposes. The EIS emphasized, however, that the fund should be used only for measures that provide a demonstrated benefit to resources affected by project facilities and operation and that the strategic plan and annual report describing proposed resource measures be filed with the Commission for approval so that our approval can be made on a suite of measures. I concur and require that the annual report be filed for our approval in each of the Lewis River Project licenses.								Yes		