

| Lewis River Aquatic Fund - ACC & Utilities Final Comments of 2006/2007 Project Proposals | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| ACC Decision | Project Title | WDFW | LCFRB | USFS | Fish First | Cowlitz Indian Tribe | Utilities | Yakama Nation | NMFS | USFWS | TU/AR |
| Approve | 3 Dispersed Camping and Day Use Road Restoration (\$77,000) | Approve - secure lockable gates allowing access for biological and habitat monitoring are preferred | Approve - addresses important limiting factor for bull trout as well as reintroduced populations of Spring Chinook, coho and steelhead. | Approve - closing roads and associated campsites will have a positive effect on bull trout habitat and populations. | Approve | Approve - closing roads and limiting access to certain areas in the Lewis River Basin is a good idea. | Approve - PacificCorp views this as a good mechanism to reduce sediment input to streams. | Approve | Defer comment - but will not stand in the way of approval | Approve | Approve |
| Disapprove - additional research and data is needed; consider for next round of funding | 4 Muddy River Floodplain Nutrient Enhancement (\$88,000) | Approve - introduced nutrients will improve riparian vegetation contributing to improved bank stability, reduced air and water temperatures, and increased insect and aquatic life. | Approve - questions whether this project should be given priority for funding. | Approve - will create positive benefits to water quality in Muddy River by accelerating riparian tree growth and eventually lowering summer water temperatures in the system. | Disapprove | Disapprove - proposal does not directly benefit fish recovery and fish habitat enhancement. Until geomorphic processes in the Muddy River basin have stabilized, flooding and other infrequent, large-scale disturbances will continue to impede riparian zone growth. | Disapprove - PacificCorp would like to see the evaluation of the Pine Creek nutrient project before committing to this. We believe that the current HPP is providing as much, if not more, benefit to the habitat in Muddy River. | Disapprove | Defer comment - but will not stand in the way of disapproval | Approve - our concurrence with the decision of the ACC. The idea of considering this for the next round of funding has merit - that way we will have the evaluation of the Pine Creek | Initially approved, but we have significant reservation after the issues raised by the Cowlitz Tribe such that we will not stand in the way of the disapproval |
| Approve | 6 Pine Creek Nutrient Enhancement (\$43,150) | Approve - Pine Creek has become increasingly important to bull trout production. | Approve - project area is a critically important subbasin for bull trout, and is an important subbasin for reintroduction of steelhead, coho and Spring Chinook. | Approve - positive benefits to aquatic biota will continue in this watershed because this is a multiyear project. | Approve - will support only if there is no loss of marine derived nutrients below Merwin nutrient projects. | Approve - overall we agree this project is beneficial to fish recovery. | Approve - as a continuation of last year's project and a continued benefit to bull trout. | Approve | Defer comment - but will not stand in the way of approval | Approve | Approve |
| Disapprove - does not meet fund objectives | 7 PIT Tag Detectors for Bull Trout in Upper Lewis River (\$81,000) | Approve - Multiple PIT tag detectors on the mainstem and tributaries will provide a much better view of migration timing and habitat use in the upper Lewis. | Disapprove - not recommended for funding by Utilities. Lack of nexus to actual recovery efforts. | Approve - will provide us with a clear picture of streams used by bull trout for spawning and migration. | Disapprove | Disapprove - this project is an excellent research project and would be very useful if implemented, but we believe that on-the-ground restoration meets the Fund's objectives more closely. | Disapprove - Does not provide a direct benefit to bull trout in fact marking all the bull trout spawners may be a detriment and disturb the staging spawners. Fail to see any benefit. | Approve | Disapprove | Approve - this project would provide useful information that could help inform our restoration efforts. We can live with the decision of the ACC, based on the concern that on-the-ground restoration may more closely meet the fund's objectives. | Disapprove - We agree with the Cowlitz Tribe that this is a project that is worthy of funding, but this fund isn't the right place for it. |
| Disapprove | 8 9015 Culvert Replacement (\$120,000) | Disapprove - There is a barrier falls below the culvert and the area in close proximity has recently been clear-cut. If on ORM land, they should replace culvert under DNR regulations. | Disapprove - More information is needed to assess if this project is a reasonable investment, i.e., culverts are relatively high in the tributary watershed no information is given regarding fish usage below the culverts, not clear whether these culverts are partial or total barriers. | Approve - this road has two culverts that are undersized, improperly installed and prevent migration of resident fish species. | Disapprove | Disapprove - The Tribe is in agreement with the Utilities. | Disapprove - Why replace culverts if the road is to be given to ORM? They will have to do this under RMAP. How can this benefit anadromous fish and bull trout if there is a falls downstream? Not very much habitat benefit for the \$\$. | Disapprove | Defer comment - but will not stand in the way of disapproval | Disapprove | Approve - because we feel that all passage barriers should be remedied, however if the road is going to be transferred to ORM then we do not believe that monies from this fund should be used. Will not stand in the way of a disapproval. |
| Approve - investigate where the gravel is to be placed and solicit ACC input by conducting site visit | 9 Rush Creek Gravel Restoration (\$20,000) | Approve - Believe the lack of appropriate gravel is a limiting factor for bull trout in Rush Creek. Gravel additional is vital. | Disapprove - Given the lack of information and technical assessment demonstrating potential project effectiveness and benefits to target species | Approve - spawning gravel is in short supply in Rush Creek. Additional gravel will provide increased spawning opportunities and may lessen interspecific competition for spawning sites when anadromous fish are reintroduced into the system. | Approve - better to have more gravel than not enough. | Approve - We suggest the addition of boulders or the like to "capture" the gravel. We have concerns that the gravel will not remain in the stream. | Approve - Question whether gravel will remain. We would like to see some assurances for gravel retention. | Approve - with perhaps marking gravel | Defer comment - but will not stand in the way of approval | Approve - though would like to have some way of tracking how well that gravel is retained. | Disapprove - Agree with LCFRB concerns - why is gravel limited in this system and is this the right approach to address the problem. Will not stand in the way of approval. |
| Approve - work on combined budget and options for Beaver protection | 10 Martin Access Riparian Forest and Off-channel Habitat Enhancement (\$26,200); may increase to \$30K for Beaver protection | Approve - Vegetation and shade in the lower river are sorely needed. | Approve - provides for significant enhancement of off-channel habitat in the lower Lewis. | Approve - good riparian habitat is critical to maintain and restore healthy fish populations in the Lewis River system. | Approve - if at least 3 foot high metal mesh screening fixed with metal posts protect every planting and adequate long term monitoring, maintenance and repair program is included. | Approve - this project meets the Fund's objectives. | Approve - Letter of support from landowner is pending. Vehicle support from WDFW pending. How will beaver damage be prevented? Approve with beaver protection and a combined budget. | Approve - although no highest priority | Defer comment - but will not stand in the way of approval | Approve | Approve |
| Approve - work on combined budget and options for Beaver protection | 11 Plus Newydd Riparian Forest Enhancement (\$29,400); may increase to \$30K for Beaver protection | Approve - This project will help stabilize and anchor the riverbank and sandbars in the area. | Approve - provides for significant enhancement of off-channel habitat in the lower Lewis. | Approve - off channel habitat is rare in the Lewis River system, this project should help keep what is available intact | Approve - if at least 3 foot high metal mesh screening fixed with metal posts protect every planting and adequate long term monitoring, maintenance and repair program is included. | Approve - this project meets the Fund's objectives. | Approve - How will beaver damage be prevented? Approve with beaver protection and a combined budget. | Approve - although no highest priority | Defer comment - but will not stand in the way of approval | Approve | Approve |
| Approve - work on combined budget and options for Beaver protection | 12 Two Forks Access Riparian Forest Enhancement (\$26,400); may increase to \$30K for Beaver protection | Approve - Vegetation and shade in this lower river are sorely needed. | Approve - provides for significant enhancement of off-channel habitat in the lower Lewis. | Approve - good riparian habitat is critical to maintain and restore healthy fish populations in the Lewis River system. | Approve - if at least 3 foot high metal mesh screening fixed with metal posts protect every planting and adequate long term monitoring, maintenance and repair program is included. | Approve - this project meets the Fund's objectives. | Approve - How will beaver damage be prevented? Approve with beaver protection. With approval, would like to see adjusted budget for duplicative charges. | Approve - although no highest priority | Defer comment - but will not stand in the way of approval | Approve | Approve |