# Lewis River Hydroelectric Projects Settlement Agreement Aquatics Coordination Committee (ACC) Meeting Agenda

Date & Time: Thursday, December 13, 2012

9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.

**Place:** Merwin Hydro Control Center

105 Merwin Village Court

Ariel, WA 98603

**Contacts:** Frank Shrier: (503) 320-7423

Lore Boles (Merwin Desk): (360) 225-4412

Time	Discussion Item						
9:00 a.m.	Welcome						
	➤ Review Agenda & 11/8/12 Meeting Notes						
	Comment & accept Agenda & 11/8/12 Meeting Notes						
9:30 a.m.	Acclimation Pond/Crab Creek Subgroup Update						
10:00 a.m.	Lewis River Project Delay Schedule – FERC Approved Delays						
10:15 a.m.	Break						
10:30 a.m.	Aquatic Fund Pre-proposals						
	<ul><li>Decisions for Full Proposals Selection</li></ul>						
11:30 a.m.	Study/Work Product Updates						
	<ul> <li>Hatchery Upgrades</li> </ul>						
	<ul> <li>Hatchery and Supplementation Program</li> </ul>						
	<ul> <li>Woodland Release Ponds</li> </ul>						
	<ul> <li>M&amp;E Plan Implementation</li> </ul>						
	<ul> <li>Merwin Upstream Construction Status</li> </ul>						
	<ul> <li>Swift Downstream Collector Construction Status</li> </ul>						
	<ul> <li>Yale Spillway Barrier Net</li> </ul>						
	o Development of New Information to Inform Fish Passage						
11:45 a.m.	Next Meeting's Agenda						
	<ul><li>Public Comment Opportunity</li></ul>						
	Note: all meeting notes and the meeting schedule can be located at:						
	http://www.pacificorp.com/es/hydro.html						
12:00 p.m.	Adjourn						

# Join online meeting

https://meet.pacificorp.com/kimberly.mccune/7Z9FM73P

# Join by Phone

+1 (503) 813-5252 [Portland, Ore.]

+1 (855) 499-5252 [Toll Free]

Find a local number

Conference ID: 3999138

# FINAL Meeting Notes Lewis River License Implementation Aquatic Coordination Committee (ACC) Meeting December 13, 2012 Merwin Hydro Control Center

# **ACC Participants Present (17)**

Kimberly McCune, PacifiCorp Energy Frank Shrier, PacifiCorp Energy Peggy Miller, WDFW (via conference) Michelle Day, NMFS Adam Haspiel, US Forest Service Jeremiah Doyle, PacifiCorp Energy Jim Malinowski, Fish First Bob Rose, Yakama Nation (via conference) Eli Asher, Cowlitz Indian Tribe (via conference) David Hu, US Forest Service Dave Olson, US Forest Service Abi Groskopf, US Forest Service Ray Yurkenycz, US Forest Service Diana Gritten-MacDonald, Cowlitz PUD Eric Kinne, WDFW Aaron Roberts, WDFW Pat Frazier, LCFRB

#### Calendar:

January 10, 2013	ACC Meeting	Merwin Hydro
February 14, 2013	ACC Meeting	Merwin Hydro

Assignments from December 13, 2012 meeting	
McCune: Email USFWS and Cowlitz Tribe representatives and provide an additional 7-day comment period prior to finalizing these decisions for the Aquatic Fund Pre-proposals selections	Complete – 12/14/12

Assignments from November 8, 2012 meeting	
Al-Chokhachy: Provide description and photos of the PIT tag detection	In process as of
site to Haspiel (US Forest Service) as soon as possible for the required	12/13/12
Special Use Permit relative to the Development of New Information to	
Inform Fish Passage Decisions at the Yale and Merwin Hydro Projects.	

Assignments from September 13, 2012 meeting	
Kinne: H&S Supplementation Program – Determine location and installation method for screw trap placement in the lower river.	In process as of 12/13/12; potential location determined; Lesko working on getting permission from two landowners

Assignments from January 12, 2012 meeting	
Coordinate a summer tour of the Swift Downstream Collector Construction for the Cowlitz tribal council. (One month delay was recommended. Shannon Wills to confirm with Tribe leadership). <i>PacifiCorp working on a public rollout; April 2013 is possible.</i>	Pending as of 12/13/12— Shrier will update Wills on the best timing for the tour. Likely Spring 2013

Assignments from March 8, 2012 meeting	Status
Murdock - indicated that she will email literature to Shrier regarding Yakama Nation acclimation reports. <i>November 2012: Shrier is still</i>	Pending as of 12/13/12
awaiting information.	

# Opening, Review of Agenda and Meeting Notes

Frank Shrier (PacifiCorp) called the meeting to order @ 9:05 a.m. Shrier requested all attendees identify themselves for the benefit of attendees on the conference call. The ACC reviewed the agenda and no new topics were added. The pending assignments were reviewed and updated as reflected in these notes.

The November 8, 2012 meeting notes were reviewed and Adam Haspiel (US Forest Service) requested the following edit on page 3, first paragraph, second sentence of the Acclimation Pond Subgroup Update: modify "which requires excavation" to read, "may require excavation". The meeting notes were approved at 9:20am to include Haspiel's requested change.

Kim McCune (PacifiCorp) will finalize the November 8, 2012 meeting notes for posting to the Lewis River website.

#### **Lewis River Project Delay Schedule – FERC Approved Delays**

Kimberly McCune (PacifiCorp) advised the ACC that all projects affected by a delayed schedule have been approved by the ACC and the FERC (see **Attachment A**, *Lewis River Project Delay Schedule 2012/2014*, dated November 8, 2012 for further detail).

#### **Aquatic Fund Pre-proposals – Decisions Full Proposal Selection**

Shrier reviewed the comments of each aquatic fund pre-proposal (6 projects) contained in **Attachment B**, *Lewis River Aquatic Fund – Utilities and ACC Evaluation of 2012/2013 Project proposals*, dated November 27, 2012. The decisions to proceed to full proposals are as follows, although comments from USFWS and Cowlitz Indian Tribe are not reflected in this document.

McCune will email their representatives and provide an additional 7-day comment period prior to finalizing these decisions.

Decision	Proponent and Project Name
YES	USDA FS - Lewis River Side Channel Near Little Creek
YES	USDA – FS, Muddy River Tributary near Hoo Hoo Bridge
YES	USDA – FS, Little Creek Fish Habitat Restoration
YES	USDA – FS, Survey of Bull Trout stream habitat features to develop future habitat restoration projects
YES	LCFEG, Eagle island North Channel Restoration
YES	LCFEG, Cedar Creek Reach 1A Restoration

McCune provided next steps -

Meetine provided next steps					
Activity	Actual Date				
Pre-Proposal Report Comments due from	Late November – reviewed with ACC on				
ACC	11/8/12; comments due 11/28/12				
	As of 12/13/12 a 7-day comment period is				
	needed for USFWS & Cowlitz Tribe				
Finalize List of Selected Projects for	December – 12/21/12				
Additional Consideration					
Submit Request For Proposals to Selected	December – 12/21/12				
Applicants					
Proposals due	January – 1/31/13				
Proposal Evaluation Report Submitted to	February – 2/14/13				
ACC (30 day review)	-				

## **Acclimation Pond Subgroup Update - Crab Creek Site**

Bob Rose (Yakama Nation) expressed that his preference relating to the Crab Creek site is to use an adaptive management strategy for 2-3 years and let's see what the fish are doing. He does not see a high level of value in continuing with the present Crab Creek site. In response to a question from Michelle Day (NMFS) Rose said he thinks that the Lower Falls Campgroundr5 site is a reasonable place to go and could provide reasonable success but the complications are numerous and issues are expensive. An acclimation pond at the Crab Creek site may take longer but he thinks that the fish will find their way into the upper Lewis and make progress in that regard.

Eric Kinne (WDFW) expressed that he is struggling with the difference between the Lower Falls site and Crab Creek; they are only ½ mile apart. Rose said that he is concerned the Crab Creek fish will form a strong imprint on Crab Creek rather than the mainstem Lewis River well, maybe. Rose wondered if we are spending a bunch of money for a 'maybe'. We are currently working out of the realm of known science and into the realm of experiment.

Shrier said that we put Chinook up there years ago and they are maintaining some small population because we are seeing smolt and fry in the Swift Collector but we don't know where they are coming from. We do know, however, that adults have been observed spawning in the upper mainstem above Crab Creek.

Rose said the he believes in 3-5 years over the course of time; if we were to spend a couple years using direct release at the Crab Creek area and letting the salmon find their way and tell us what we need to know we could get to answers faster concerning Crab Creek.

Kinne communicated that we do not have any adults to put up there and might not over the next year or two. He further stated that the Yakama Nation always pushed to have fish sited on the mainstem. Shrier said he does not recall the Yakama Nation ever saying that.

Pat Frazier (LCFRB) said that there are acclimation sites all over the state. He does not understand why it would not be good to do acclimation in Crab Creek.

Rose stated that there is no logic that leads him to any solid direction either way.

Day requested clarification that if Rose does not approve with proceeding will he not stand in the way and let us move forward. Rose came to the conclusion that Crab Creek will not work very well and he prefers upstream of the waterfall but he will not stand in the way and is up for the experiment.

Shrier said that getting water was an issue. There are still numerous roadblocks and speed bumps; a never ending list. And, there is a potential of cultural disturbances

Adam Haspiel (US Forest Service) informed the ACC attendees that the Forest Service is ok with going forward even with the weir and intake. The lithic scatter is no longer a cultural resource issue with the Crab Creek site. They did not find any up by the intake. Shrier reiterated that there is no intent of cutting any old growth and there will be minimum disturbance.

The ACC consensus is to push forward with Crab Creek (3<sup>rd</sup> site) even though it will likely be delayed until 2014 for construction.

<Break 10:45am> <Reconvene 11:05am>

#### **Study Updates**

# **Hatchery & Supplementation (H&S) Program**

A draft 2013 Annual Operating Plan will be finalized by the end of this month based on comments received by the Hatchery and Supplementation subgroup. Concerns for 2013 include obtaining adequate numbers of returning Chinook and coho to meet transportation goals and pedigree genetic assignment of steelhead smolts captured in the collector this spring. PacifiCorp is working with Gary Winans and perhaps Scott Blankenship of Cramer Fish Sciences to develop a procedure, methodology and budget for this work. Surveys of the lower river for coho are ongoing through January 2013. Surveys have been negatively affected by high flows on the Lewis in the last month.

Hatchery Upgrades -

# Hatchery projects expected to be completed in 2013

The following four projects remain from Schedule 8.7 of the Lewis River Settlement Agreement and are planned for completion in 2013

- Lewis River Hatchery Modifications and structural support for the downstream intake.
- Merwin Hatchery Upgrades to the PLC, metering and alarming at the ozone facility
- > Speelyai Hatchery Modifications to the intake structure
- > Speelyai Hatchery Conversion of Pond 14 to raceways

#### **Woodland Release Ponds**

Waiting on completion of Eulachon consultation between NMFS and FERC. The FERC approved the requested extension to December 26, 2013. Response from Michelle Day (NMFS) relating to direct release is pending.

# **M&E Plan Implementation**

Survey crews have completed surveying their respective reaches in the upper basin. Due to the low numbers of transported coho (about 200) no carcasses were recovered but some redds and lives were observed. Meridian Environmental will estimate the total number of redds (and total number of spawners) based on redd counts. In addition, reach photos, barrier descriptions and locations (GPS waypoints) along with descriptions of access points will be provided in our annual report and aid in the selection of reaches for 2013 as some reaches will be eliminated due to inaccessibility or presence of barriers.

# **Merwin Upstream Construction Status**

Moving along; no major road blocks

#### **Swift Downstream Collector Construction Status**

Nearing completion; currently in the 7-day test process. PLC work progressing toward the substantial completion date of 12/26/12; NMFS walking through today to view various steps of operation. The Collector is all automated and will not require staff 24 hour a day. Debris issues are reduced if operating continuously; alarms and cameras installed and operating. The 24-hr test resulting in the following fish numbers:

- 200 to 300 sticklebacks in the fry tank (not salmon or trout)
- 24 Chinook smolts
- 52 coho smolts
- 2 cutthroat smolts
- 2 steelhead smolts
- 4 adult coho
- 1 adult cutthroat
- 2 adult resident rainbow trout (one of them was about 8 lbs.)

Shrier showed pictures of fish caught to include the Collector and fish truck photos. The ACC can tour the facility any time after construction is complete.

#### Yale Spillway Barrier Net

Construction expected to be complete by mid December 2012.

# **Development of New Information to Inform Fish Passage**

Working with appropriate agencies on permitting activity.

## **Other Topics**

David Hu (Forest Service) would like to schedule a bull trout subgroup meeting and will follow up with proposed dates.

<11:30 a.m. meeting adjourned >

# Agenda items for January 10, 2013

- ➤ Review December 13, 2012 Meeting Notes
- ➤ Aquatic Fund year end updates
- > Acclimation Pond/Crab Creek Update
- > Study/Work Product Updates
- ➤ Updates Dr. Robert Al-Chokhachy, Development of New Information to inform fish passage decisions at Yale and Merwin

#### **Public Comment**

None

## **Next Scheduled Meetings**

January 10, 2013	February 14, 2013
Merwin Hydro Control Center	Merwin Hydro Control Center
Ariel, WA	Ariel, WA
9:00 a.m. – 3:00pm	9:00 a.m. – 3:00pm

# **Meeting Handouts & Attachments**

- ➤ Notes from 11/8/12
- ➤ Agenda for 12/13/12
- ➤ 2012/2013 Aquatic Fund Pre-proposals and Comment Evaluation Matrix
- ➤ Attachment A Lewis River Project Delay Schedule 2012/2014, dated November 8, 2012
- ➤ Attachment B Lewis River Aquatic Fund Utilities and ACC Evaluation of 2012/2013 Project proposals, dated November 27, 2012

D	GA N		Former Completion	Permitting	Construction	Revised Completion Da	Date Requested FERC Extension	FERC Approved Extension
Project Title/Mgr. Merwin Upstream Trap Frank Shrier	4.3	Project Status and Justification for Extension Request  New construction schedule for the Merwin Upstream Trap - old trap closure would occur in 2013 from July 1 to December. I also stated that the trap would be substantially complete on 1/23/2014 (i.e. trapping but not necessarily sorting). That essentially means the trap would be closed July 1, 2013 to January 23, 2014.	7/1/2013 to 12/31/2013	In progress	7/1/13 to 1/23/14	1/23/2014	8/13/2012	√ - FERC issued 9/14/12
Speelyai Pond 14 Modification Erik Lesko	8.7 (A)	PacifiCorp has completed its Consultation with the ACC and finalized the new raceway designs. Permit applications will soon be submitted to the appropriate agencies. Achieving final designs was delayed due to substantive changes requested by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife during the final phases of the design development. These changes included reconfiguration of pond sizes, concerns related to available water flow to each raceway and piping configurations. These requests caused significant delays in redrawing final plans and required specific consultation with the department. In addition, the project has a narrow construction window given other rearing space at the hatchery is used to meet license production goals and is not available. The existing Speelyai Pond 14 provides adequate rearing space for this additional production and no adverse effects are anticipated to fish health or production obligations by delaying this project to 2013.	9/1/2012	6/8/2012	2/1/13 to 5/30/13	9/1/2013	6/4/2012	√ deferred to ACC; FERC issued 9/14/12
Speelyai Intake Modification Erik Lesko	8.7 (C)	On November 18, 2010, PacifiCorp informed the ACC that the project may be delayed for one year due to in-water permitting requirements. The ACC had no objections regarding the proposal to move this project to June 26, 2012. During the months to follow, PacifiCorp completed its Consultation with the ACC and prepared 90 percent project engineering designs and permit applications. The permit applications will soon be submitted to the appropriate state and local governments. From past experience with the permitting of other Lewis River projects, it is very likely that permits will not be issued in time to give a sufficient construction window that accommodates hatchery operations (this is the single water source for the Speelyai Hatchery).  PacifiCorp Energy requested extension of time to complete the permitting process and construction of the Water Intake Structure Repair project. The existing intake functions normally and provides the specified volume of water to support fish health at the hatchery. Thus, there is no additional risk of fish loss from prolonging the modifications to the existing intake. The Lewis River Aquatic Coordination Committee was advised on May 10, 2012 of this situation and does not take issue with a delay until 2013.	9/1/2012	Will submit June 2012	6/1/13 to 9/30/13	10/1/2013	6/4/2012	√ deferred to ACC; FERC issued 9/14/12
Merwin Ozone Reliability Upgrade Erik Lesko	8.7 (A)	On March 11, 2010, PacifiCorp Energy informed the ACC that upgrades to the Programmable Logic Control (PLC) at the Merwin Hatchery ozone plant may be delayed for one year. PacifiCorp Energy later confirmed the ACCs approval by submittal of the revised hatchery schedule to the Commission on May 6, 2010, a required by Section 8.2.3 of the Lewis River Settlement Agreement. PacifiCorp Energy continues its extensive Consultation with the ACC and annual submittal of the revised hatchery upgrade schedules to the Commission on April 15, 2011 and April 13, 2012.  Despite the delays to the PLC upgrades, PacifiCorp Energy completed hardware upgrades including new metering, alarming and computer systems according to Schedule 8.7(A) of the Lewis River Settlement Agreement.  On May 10, 2012, the ACC was informed that the PLC upgrade requires the use internal PacifiCorp Energy staff. Internal staff is required due to the integration of the PLC upgrade with the company's proprietary Process Integration (PI) software platform. This requirement was not known until April of 2012 Because internal staff is not immediately available for most of 2012, the ACC was informed that the project would be implemented in 2013. PacifiCorp staff will, however, begin planning and design consultations with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, contracted operator of the Merwin Hatchery, in 2012 to prepare for implementation in 2013. This will help ensure that the project is ready for implementation in 2013. The PLC upgrade is intended to meet the objectives contained in Section 8.7(A) to ensure reliability of the water treatment system. The ACC has no objections regarding the proposal to move completion of this Project to November 30, 2013.	6/26/2010	In progress	7/13/13 to 11/30/13	11/30/2013	6/8/2012	√ deferred to ACC; FERC issued 9/14/12
Lewis River Downstream Intake Modification Erik Lesko	8.7 (C)	In 2005, PacifiCorp Energy completed replacement of the common header and replacement of the submersible pumps with turbine motors. However, on March 12, 2008 PacifiCorp Energy informed the ACC that the replacement of the screen and stabilization phases of the Lewis River Hatchery downstream water intake project upgrades will be delayed until 2011 when pond 16 was scheduled to be rebuilt. PacifiCorp Energy later confirmed the ACCs approval by submittal of the revised hatchery schedule to the Commission on May 6, 2008, as required by Section 8.2.3 of the Lewis River Settlement Agreement. PacifiCorp Energy continues its extensive Consultation with the ACC and annual submittal of the revised hatchery upgrade schedules to the Commission.  In March 2010, NOAA Fisheries listed Eulachon (Pacific smelt) as threatened under the Endangered Species Act. This listing as well as subsequent critical habitat listings have delayed in-water work required for screen modifications and structure stabilization as PacifiCorp Energy seeks to complete necessary consultation with the federal agency. On May 10, 2012, the ACC was informed that the project has been delayed while PacifiCorp Energy drafts and submits their Biological Assessment to NOAA. PacifiCorp Energy now anticipates starting the project in the summer of 2013; however, if Eulachon coverage is not provided in a timely manner, the project could be delayed further. The ACC had no objections regarding the proposal to move completion of this project to September 1, 2013.	End of calendar year 2008	In progress	Summer 2013	9/1/2013	6/8/2012	√ deferred to ACC; FERC issued 9/14/12

	a		Former Completion	Permitting	Construction	Revised Completion Date FERC Extension	
Project Title/Mgr. Lewis River Juvenile Acclimation Sites Frank Shrier	SA No. 8.8.1	In accordance with Lewis River Settlement Agreement (SA) 8.8.1, Juvenile Acclimation - Sites Above Swift No. 1 Dam the SA requirement stipulates that Licensee shall, beginning upon completion of the Swift Downstream Facility, place juvenile salmonid acclimation sites in areas reasonably accessible to fish hauling trucks and in practical areas in the upper watershed above Swift No. 1 Dam, as determined by the Licensees in Consultation with the Yakama Nation and the ACC. PacifiCorp has completed several steps in the process including the following:  60% design to ACC for 30-day review, April 29, 2011  Design completion, June 24, 2011  Pond Plan to ACC, 30 day review, July 7, 2011  Pond Plan finalized on August 8, 2011  Action substantially changed on February 9, 2012 (letter to ACC dated 2/13/12, Attachment A)  Consulted with USFWS on bull trout critical habitat and received Letter of Concurrence on April 9, 2012  Developed NEPA document in cooperation with the US Forest Service and submitted for public review on April 10, 2012  Field tour of alternate sites on April 30, 2012 (conducted by Yakama Nation)  PacifiCorp has yet to receive a FONSI from US Forest Service (USFS) along with a Special Use Permit and has come to the realization that final permitting and construction will not occur this year primarily due to too little time to obtain a contractor and not enough time to complete inwater work within the July 15 to August 31 work window. So the work has been postponed until summer 2013. In addition, and as explained in the NEPA document, there is still work to be completed to locate an alternative site for the Crab Creek acclimation pond, obtain USFS approval of the site, complete designs for the new site, and complete a separate NEPA process for the new site.	Date	5 permits waiting for completion of NEPA; in progress for next year	Summer 2013	12/26/2013 7/13/2012	√ - FERC issued 11/7/12
Lewis River Release Ponds Frank Shrier	4.4.3	On June 9, 2011, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission issued an Order Modifying and Approving Stress Release Ponds Final Design Under Article 401(a)(4) for PacifiCorp Energy's Merwin, Yale and Swift No. 1 Hydroelectric Projects, FERC Nos. P-935, P-2071 and P-2111. Construction of the Release Pond is currently delayed to 2013 primarily to consult with National Marine Fisheries Services (NMFS) on the Eulachon smelt (Thaleichthys pacificus) listing and critical habitat designation. A biological assessment (BA) is prepared for submission to NOAA Fisheries (NMFS). Once submitted, estimated time for consultation is six months, which will push permitting and construction out to 2013. The in-water work window is August 15 to August 31st. Based on this information, Ponds 15 at the Lewis River Hatchery is being considered as a temporary release site until the Woodland Release Ponds are completed. PacifiCorp has acquired land and completed the design phase (100% design completed and submitted to the Commission on 3/31/2011). All building and environmental permits have been submitted but are on hold for the consultation.	12/26/2012	In progress	TBD	12/26/2013 7/13/2012	√ - FERC issued 10/19/12
Lewis River RRMP David Moore	11.2.2.9, 11.2.3.3, 11.2.3.8, 11.2.3.9	To complete Merwin Park improvements (SA 11.2.3.3, Marble Creek Trail, SA 11.2.3.8, Merwin Park Day Use Facilities and SA 11.2.3.9, Merwin Park Picnic Shelters) that are currently in construction but experiencing delays from wet weather, PacifiCorp Energy respectfully requests an extension of time until September 30, 2012 (see Attachment A).  PacifiCorp Energy also respectfully requests an extension of time until June 26, 2013, (see Attachment A) to create a barrier between boat launch parking and the wetland at Beaver Bay Campground (SA 11.2.2.9, Beaver Bay Day Use Parking). Project design and development of the state and county permit applications for these projects is more extensive than originally anticipated. Currently downed logs (30" diameter) have been placed to create an adequate separation until a permanent barrier is completed. With an extension granted, barrier construction could coincide with construction of the non-motorized multi-use trail being constructed between Cougar Campground and Beaver Bay Campground (Yale FERC License article 405, SA 11.2.2.5). This nexus will minimize any potential impacts to adjacent sensitive resources that arise from multiple construction mobilizations in the same location. Wetland barrier design and permit application information are complete. Trial design and permit applications, including the wetland barrier will be submitted to the responsible agencies by the end of June, 2012. The permitting process is expected to take at least six months.	6/26/2012	In progress	currently under construction	11.2.2.9 - 6/26/13 11.2.3.3 - 9/30/12 11.2.3.8 - 9/30/12 11.2.3.9 - 9/30/12	√ - FERC issued 7/17/12
Lewis River IP Road Phase One David Moore	11.2.2.2	PacifiCorp Energy has been using best reasonable efforts to secure non-motorized multi-use recreational access on the existing Yale/IP Road by way of consultation with roadway landowners including the Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and Weyerhaeuser, a privative land owner. On December 15, 2011, PacifiCorp Energy received a letter (Attachment A) from DNR and a letter from Weyerhaeuser, dated November 5, 2010, (Attachment B) disapproving any undertaking or easement modification that could prohibit either entity from exercising the ability to use the Yale/IP Road for forestry activities and stating PacifiCorp Energy could not establish a pedestrian trail on their land ownership portions of the Yale/IP Road.  Given responses, PacifiCorp Energy's concern is vehicle access on a road intended to be a non-motorized multi-use trail poses a public safety risk. In review of land ownership, it does look possible to adjust the scope of the trail and therefore reduce vehicle/pedestrian interactions. In addition to safety concerns, the overall conditions of the Yale/IP Road are substantially compromised from years of deterioration due to major weather events. Measures necessary to remediate road conditions are much greater than envisioned during development of the settlement agreement. There is also now the concern that certain actions could negatively impact designated critical habitat for bull trout, a federally listed species.		In progress	N/A	3/1/2013 5/24/2012	$\sqrt{\ }$ - FERC issued 6/28/12

				2012/2013 LR A	equatics Fund Evaluation Matrix	
ACC						
Decision		Applicant	Project Title	WDFW	Fish First	LCFRB
	1	USDA Forest Service	Lewis River Side Channel near Little Creek	Need better breakdown of budget. How will the structures be anchored. Need additional information on how fish will use area in high and low flows. Please explain the need for helicopter. <b>Proceed to full proposal</b>		Project is located on a Tier 1 reach (Lewis 22) and a Tier 2 reach (Lewis 21). It would benefit a primary population (Spring Chinook) and 2 contributing populations (Coho, Winter Steelhead). Off-channel/side channel habitat is a high priority in the reach. To fully evaluate this project is is important to know if the side channels are currently functional and are they accessible year round or seasonally? In addition to providing greater habitat diversity, would large wood structures also enhance or maintain flows in the side channels? A diagram showing approximate structure locations and elaborating on the type, location and scale of expected habitat outcomes (sort gravel, provide juvenile rearing, etc) should be included in a final proposal. A full description of existing habitat and the improvement resulting from this project would assist in evaluating this project. Project is dependent on LCFRB/SRFB funding (\$70,000 out of total value of \$164,000). While this project addresses primary populations and Tier 1 and Tier 2 reaches, further SRFB funding is not assured and depends upon the availability of funding and the benefits to fish, cost effectiveness, and certainty of success of a construction project relative to other project proposals under consideration. A decision by the LCFRB to recommend the project for funding would be made in August 2013 and a final SRFB funding decision would not be made until December 13. <b>Recommend this project move forward for final proposal.</b>
	2	USDA Forest Service	Muddy River Tributary near Hoo Hoo Bridge	Would like addional information on the success or failure of the stage one work that occurred in 2011. Need diagram of where structures will be placed. Need explaination on how structures will be anchored. <b>Proceed to full proposal</b>		This project is located on an untiered tributary stream to the Muddy River reach 2. Muddy River reach 2 is Tier 3 and has moderate value for Winter Steelhead and low value for Coho and Spring Chinook. The preproposal notes the presence of Coho. It may be reasonable to expect some usage by Coho and Winter Steelhead given the correction of a downstream passage barrier. The proposed project area appears to be upstream well above the tributary's confluence with the Muddy River, which makes the project's value in providing side-channel habitat for fish from the Muddy River somewhat questionable. Additionally, it appears from the pre-proposal that habitat may be functioning as is; therefore, there needs to be a full description of the current habitat conditions and the improvements in these conditions that will result from implementation of this project. A more complete description of existing stream in the project reach as well as watershed conditions is needed. The installation of 15 large wood structures (200 pieces of wood) over a mile of stream length is a fairly low density for wood placement. The final proposal should explain the rationale for the number of structures and provide a diagram showing approximate structure locations and elaborating on the type, location and scale of expected habitat outcomes. The project is not dependent on unsecured contributions from other sources. <b>Recommend this project move forward for final proposal.</b>
	3	USDA Forest Service	Little Creek Fish Habitat Restoration	Is helicopter service funded with this project or is it dependant on funding project #1 through aquatics funds or SRFB funding.  Need explanation of how structures will be anchored. Proceed to full proposal		Project is located on a Tier 3 reach (Little Creek) used principally by Coho and Winter Steelhead, both contributing populations. The project reach is adjacent to Lewis 22 (Tier 1) and Lewis 21 (Tier 2). In addition to Coho and Winter Steelhead the Lewis reaches are used by Spring Chinook, a primary population. Project would enhance 2,200 feet of Little Creek through the placement of approximately 20 large wood structures, each comprised of 8 to 10 pieces, thereby improving spawning and rearing habitat, particularly for Coho. The project would address stream channel habitat and bank stability, which are identified as high priority habitat needs in the LCFRB Habitat Strategy. A diagram showing approximate structure locations and elaborating on the type, location and scale of expected habitat outcomes should be included in a final proposal. The project cost seems reasonable. The project is not dependent on unsecured contributions from other sources. <b>Recommend this project move forward for final proposal.</b>
	4	USDA Forest Service	Survey of Bull Trout Stream habitat features to develop future habitat restoration projects	Final porposal needs to have a clear plan that identifies specific spawning and rearing habitats. What are the areas in Rush Cr. Pine Cr. and P-8 that BT accually use. What are the specifics attributes: depth, channel width, substrate, tree canopy, gradient, ect. WDFW supports this effort in having a more stretegic planning effort with multipal partneres that can provide information to the Bull Trout Technical Work Group. <b>Proceed to full proposal</b>	1	The LCFRB supports the development of a Bull Trout habitat strategy that assesses habitat needs and current conditions and identifies and prioritizes habitat restoration opportunities. A final proposal for this study needs to provide a clear plan to: 1) Identify and prioritize stream reaches; 2) Define Habitat Suitability Criteria; 3) Define the methodologies and protocols to be used in conducting the habitat surveys; and 4) Implement the survey and habitat strategy development, including identification of tasks, a schedule, management structure and partner responsibilities, needed skills and qualifications, and a detailed budget. The final proposal should provide additional information on which streams are being surveyed and what criteria was used to select these streams. Additionally, it will be important to describe how people conducting this work will be trained to collect the data necessary to guide future habitat restoration projects. Finally, we have concerns that the cost estimate may not be adequate to fully analyze the information resulting from this project. <b>Recommend this project move forward for final proposal.</b>

ACC				2012/2013 LR	Aquatics Fund Evaluation Matrix	
Decision		Applicant	Project Title	WDFW	Fish First	LCFRB
	5	Lower Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group	Eagle Island North Channel Restoration	Concerned over the timing of the request. The proposal is for construction costs with no current design completed until early next year and no certainty of construction funding in the future. WDFW has concerns on how this project may effect fall Chinook rearing habitat. Also concerned that project could cause highway erosion. Request that WDFW staff be envolved with disign of project.  Proceed to full proposal		Project is located on a Tier 1 reach and would benefit primary populations (Bright Fall Chinook, Spring Chinook, and Chum) and contributing populations (Coho, Winter and Summer Steelhead). Given its significance particularly to Fall Bright Chinook, maintenance of flows in the north channel is a high priority. Key limiting factors are flood plain function, channel migration processes and side channel habitat. Design work for this project has not been completed. The preliminary design report is scheduled to be completed in February 2013. Is this work on schedule and will the report be available in time to aid the ACC in evaluating the project proposal? The LCFRB/SFRB has provided design funding for this project, but no SRFB funding has been approved for construction at this time. Construction funds could be approved in December of 2013 at the earliest. While this project addresses primary populations and a Tier 1 reach, further SRFB funding is not assured and depends upon the availability of funding and the benefits to fish, cost effectiveness, and certainty of success of a construction project relative to other project proposals under consideration. Project designs will be needed to evaluate investing ACC grant funds in this project; therefore, unless a preliminary design is provided to the ACC as part of the final proposal this project should be deferred until the next funding cycle.
	6	Lower Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group	Cedar Creek Reach 1A Restoration	Tier 3 reach, what is the issue with this area currently. WDFW observes multipal species spawning in this area on a annual basis WDFW is very concerned with Lamprey inpacts. When will the amount of donated wood be known? Proceed to full proposal		Project objectives and description are consistent with the SRFB application. The SRFB grant is pending at this time. While there is a high likelihood that the project will be funded, the SRFB will not make a final decision until December 2012. SFRB application estimates wood cost at \$53,000, but \$60,000 are being requested in this proposal. Funding for wood is being requested in the event adequate donated wood from PacifiCorp is not available. When will it be known whether sufficient donated wood is available? Should the grant funds for wood be contingent on donated wood not being available? Concerns about impacts to lamprey were discussed as part of the SRFB grant process and conducting lamprey monitoring is a condition of the SRFB grant; therefore, funding of lamprey monitoring through this ACC grant appears to be questionable. Project would benefit primary populations (Bright Fall Chinook, Chum) and contributing populations (Coho, Winter Steelhead). Given their relatively short tributary residence time, the project will provide limited rearing habitat for juvenile Chinook and chum. Cedar Creek Reach 1A is a Tier 3 reach. The LCFRB believes that the value of restoration in this reach would be the enhancement of off-channel habitat for the mainstem North Fork Lewis Reach 7A, which is a Tier 1 reach. Recommend this project move forward for final proposal.

2

11/27/2012

		uation Matrix			
Yakama Nation	USFS	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	USFWS	Utilities	Next Step
	Please expand on project need and current fish usage; Please explain why helicopter needed (vs ground based/use of current abandoned road); Please clarify what scenario is if SRFB helicopter costs are not received; Please show map of proposed structure locations (eg zoomed aerial map with asterisks or symbols where log placement); Please describe more on "opportunity to treat invasives"; Recommend describing how fits into and contributes to Forest restoration plans; <b>Proceed to full proposal</b>				
	Please expand on project need and current fish usage; Please show map of proposed structure locations (eg zoomed aerial map with asterisks or symbols where log placement); Like the invasive plant treatment elements and consider as an appropriate riparian treatment; Recommend describing how fits into and contributes to Forest restoration plans; <b>Proceed to full proposal</b>				
	Please expand on project need and current fish usage; Like the invasive treatment as part of appropriate stewardship; Recommend describing how fits into and contributes to Forest restoration plans; <b>Proceed to full proposal</b>				
	Believe project is intended to inventory and characterize reference "bull trout used" reaches and develop quantitative inferences that can be applied to infer upon other streams that are not currently used by bull trout. This information would help transcend current Lewis ACC bull trout impasse; Not sure this will lead to prioritized restoration opportunities but will help steer ACC group towards target "bull trout habitat elements" beyond temperature that could be used to develop restoration opportunities upon; Like the integrated WDFW/USFWS/USFS effortseems like the appropriate bull trout experts; Please describe proposed inventory methodologyshould incorporate a methodology for all habitat parameters; <b>Proceed to full proposal</b>				

			2012/2013 LR Aquatics Fund Evalu	ation Matrix	
Valrama Nation	LICEC	Cowlitz Indian	USFWS		Next Step
Yakama Nation	Like project; Like and encourage the incorporation of and consideration for neglected Lamprey species; Proceed to full proposal	Tribe		Utilities	
	Please expand on project need and current fish usageesp for bed re-configuration; Please show map of more specific proposed structure/treatment locations (eg zoomed aerial map with asterisks or symbols where log placement); Remaining concern and caution over altering mainstem Lewis system; Proceed to full proposal				

11/27/2012

	Lewis River Aquatic	Fund - Utilities' Evaluation of 2	012/2013 Proj	ect Proposals							
	•							Cost	Consistency with	Utilities	
			Project		Bull Trout				Fund Objectives	selected for Full-	Comments - Utilities
No.	Applicant	Project Title	Schedule	Benefit		Project Partners	Funding	Share?		Proposal-Y or N	
	USDA Forest Service	Lewis River Side Channel near Little Creek	2013 - 2015	This project will place 25 large wood structures in two side channels in the LR near the Little Creek confluence to maximize summer and winter rearing habitat for coho and spring Chinook salmon, winter steelhead and bull trout.	Yes	Gifford Pinchot National Forest, Mt. St. Helens Institute, LCFRB, Cowlitz Indian Tribe	\$ 52,000.00	Yes	1 Benefit Recovery Y 2 Support reintro. Y 3 Enhance habitat Y		FS: Bull trout benefit uncertain. As far was we know there have been very few bull trout documented in the area of Little Creek. There were no signs of bull trout use when surveyed on October 11, 2012; however, there is prime spawning habitat in the lower reaches with plenty of braided channels and cover from LWD. Water temperatures are still uncertain for suitability. Coho should benefit. No ACC \$\$ for weed control. Only concern is channel movement in large flood plain.
2	USDA Forest Service	Muddy River Tributary near Hoo Hoo Bridge	2014/2015	Restore one mile of fish habitat on tributary of Muddy River that crosses the 8322 road at Hoo Hoo Bridge. Place 200 pieces of LWD with root wads to create 15 structures, creating rearing pools to enhance juvenile salmonid rearing habitat. Coho is the main species to benefit.	No	Gifford Pinchot National Forest, Mt. St. Helens Institute	\$ 38,000.00	Yes	Benefit Recovery Y     Support reintro. Y     Benhance habitat Y	? (more	Coho and steelhead may benefit. Coho would benefit so long as the structures do not wash out under high flow. Egg survival would be a much larger question during flood stage via sediment load. It may be beneficial to assess whether or not the tributary's confluence with the Muddy River is in stable/acceptable condition. If an alluvial fan is present or forming an elevation control structure (log jam/scour logs) could degrade the fan, promoting upstream travel during the low summer/early-fall flows. No ACC \$\$ for weed control. Is there any known spawning or rearing in this section? Benefits should be specified prior to selection for full proposal. More information is needed regarding documentation of anadromous fish.
3	USDA Forest Service	Little Creek Fish Habitat Restoration	2013 - 2015	Enhance 2,200 feet of Little Creek with instream LWD structures. Place 20 structures into stream bank by trench excavating and backfilling; provide excellent potential rearing and refugia habitats. FS will spot-treat noxious weeds; collect temperature readings to establish likelihood of bull trout use.	No	Gifford Pinchot National Forest, Mt. St Helens Institute	\$ 69,000.00	Yes	1 Benefit Recovery Y 2 Support reintro. Y 3 Enhance habitat Y	Y	If bull trout used Little Creek for spawning there might be some benefit to them. This will likely be most beneficial to coho. J. Samagaio recently surveyed Little Creek to the confluence and discovered that the lower reach already supports enough LWD and prime spawning habitat for salmon, steelhead, and bull trout. I would encourage LWD placement in the mid to upper watershed of Little Creek to reduce flow for easy fish passage and increase potential spawning habitat (see James for pictures). The lower portion of the proposed restoration reach displays a wide array of bedforms. This array of bedform types brings with it a high diversity of sediment "patches" and flow regimes. Many of the sediment "patches" differ from one another as they display unique particle size distributions. This promotes spawning potential for multiple species. Caution should be had when altering the channel of the lower portions of the restoration reach. There appears to be ample opportunity for side channel enhancement within Little Creek. Velocity breaks in the mid to upper reaches of the restoration reach would benefit. No ACC \$\$\$ for weed control. Agree that LWD should be placed in areas where it may be insufficient (e.g., upstream of proposed work area) as noted by James. Also, the lower end appears to move around and current maps are incorrect based on foot surveys (pers. comm. Jason Shappart).
		Survey of Bull Trout stream habitat features to develop future habitat restoration projects	2013/2014	Survey Rush Creek, Pine Creek, Little Creek and other cold NF Lewis tributaries to locate functional bull trout habitat features, identify degraded reaches and prioritize habitat restoration and improvement opportunities. Report will form the basis of a strategy for bull trout habitat restoration in the Lewis River.	Yes	Mt. St. Helens Institute, WDFW, Cowlitz Indian Tribe	\$ 50,000.00	Yes	1 Benefit Recovery Y 2 Support reintro. N 3 Enhance habitat N	N	It seems like these water bodies have been repeatedly surveyed by USFS and other entities. It is difficult to see the opportunity to extend the knowledge base. As in the past the Utilities do not favor funding projects that do not directly enhance fish habitat. Rush Creek would be a challenge as high flows and potential fish barriers limit fish access. In addition, large boulders and bed rock do not offer much in terms of spawning habitat. Pine Creek may be more suitable for potential spawning habitat among Coho salmon, but no information has been recorded thus far. With disregard to temperature data, the knowledge base of Bull Trout in these water systems seem to be largely qualitative. The qualitative data holds little value when implementing habitat requirements in a restoration project. There is opportunity to characterize known Bull Trout spawning and rearing grounds in a strictly quantitative manner. These known Bull Trout spawning and rearing grounds could then be defined as "reference reaches". If the quantitative data is made dimensionless (or relative) one could then extrapolate the reference reach to another location by matching the key parameters during construction of a restoration project. This is regular practice in the field of stream restoration and should benefit the upper Lewis restoration program. No ACC funding for studies. If there is a need for these data then it could be beneficial, but it seems there is a wealth of information on bull trout habitat preferences already that could be applied here.
5	Lower Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group	Eagle Island North Channel Restoration	2013 - 2015	This project involves construction funding to implement enhancement work to re-configure channel beds at the upstream end of Eagle Island and possibly within upper portion of the north channel. If primary flow continues to shift the north channel could become too low to support juvenile salmon rearing during certain times of year.	No	SRFB, WDFW, Clark County, Cowlitz Indian Tribe, USAC, LCFRB, DNR, USFWS, PacifiCorp and NOAA	\$ 150,000.00	Yes	Benefit Recovery Y     Support reintro. Y     Enhance habitat Y	Y	This project has the potential to support other species besides fall Chinook if successful. The nature of the bedrock foundation in the North Channel adds a lot of uncertainty to the success of this project but the benefits outweigh the risks. Restoration that works against historic channel migration may not be successful over the long term (MacDonald ok but with reservation)
6	Lower Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group	Cedar Creek Reach 1A Restoration	2013 - 2015	Acquire and install LWD in 1,525 feet of lower Cedar Creek to increase spawning and rearing habitat for ESA listed chum, Chinook, coho and steelhead. Also, monitoring component for impacts of restoration on the Pacific lamprey population in lower Cedar Creek.	No	WDFW, USFWS, Clark County Public Works	\$ 75,000.00	Yes	1 Benefit Recovery Y 2 Support reintro. Y 3 Enhance habitat Y	Y	Restoration in the lower reaches of Cedar Creek should be an item of priority to aid ESA listed fish. Low flows have deterred salmon from accessing the upper reaches in past years. Multiple species should benefit. No Lamprey studies (MacDonald ok but with reservation).
						Totals	\$ 434,000.00				
						Total non-bull trout Funds	\$ 263,000.00				
	Fund Objectives:	Benefit fish recovery throughout the North Fork Lewis River, priority to federal ESA-listed species				Bull Trout Funds	\$ 102,000.00				
		2. Support the re-introduction of ana				Possible BT Funds	\$ 69,000.00				
		∃. Enhance fish habitat in the Lewis	River Basin, wit	n priority given to North Fork Lewis River							
	<u> </u>	1	1		<u> </u>	1				1	