

PacifiCorp
North Umpqua Hydroelectric Project
FERC No. 1927-008



Settlement Agreement
Protection, Mitigation, and Enhancement Measures

2001-2002 Annual Report

North Umpqua Hydroelectric Project (FERC 1927-008)

Settlement Agreement

Protection, Mitigation, and Enhancement Measures

2001-2002 Annual Report

North Umpqua Hydroelectric Project
Protection, Mitigation, and Enhancement Measures
2001-2002 Annual Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1.0 Introduction.....	1
2.0 Resource Coordination Committee.....	2
2.1 Roles and Responsibilities.....	2
2.2 RCC Members.....	3
2.3 RCC Meetings.....	4
2.3.1 RCC Meetings Overview.....	4
2.3.2 Meeting Summaries.....	6
3.0 Protection, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures.....	7
3.1 Date Certain PM& E Implementation.....	7
3.2 Early Implementation Projects.....	13
3.2.1 Purpose of the Early Implementation Program.....	13
3.2.2 Establishment and Use of Funds.....	13
3.2.3 2002 Early Implementation Projects.....	13
3.3 License-dependent Implementation.....	14
3.4 Revisions to PM&E Due Dates.....	14
4.0 Conclusion.....	15

Tables

2.2-1 RCC Members.....	3
3.1-1 All Date Certain PM&E Implementation.....	8&9
3.1-2 Status of Date Certain PM&E measures from June 2001 - June 2002-06-12.....	10
3.1-3 License Dependent PM&E Implementation.....	11&12
3.2.3-1 2002 Early Implementation Projects.....	13
3.4-1 Revised PM&E Due Dates.....	14

- Appendix A RCC Members List including Alternates and Caucus Members
- Appendix B RCC Ground Rules
- Appendix C Approved RCC Meeting Summaries

1.0 Introduction

The annual report is prepared in accordance with section 21.4.2 of the Settlement Agreement, and provides information about activities of the Resource Coordination Committee (RCC), and on the status of the implementation of protection, mitigation, & enhancement (PM&E) measures contained in the Settlement Agreement.

On June 13, 2001, PacifiCorp filed a Settlement Agreement pursuant to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Rule 602, 18 C.F.R. § 385.602, to resolve issues concerning the relicensing of the North Umpqua Hydropower Project (P-1927-008). Parties to the Settlement Agreement include PacifiCorp, the USDA Forest Service (“USDA-FS”); the USDI Fish and Wildlife Service (“USFWS”); the USDI Bureau of Land Management (“BLM”); the National Marine Fisheries Service (“NMFS”); the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (“ODEQ”); the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (“ODFW”); and the Oregon Water Resources Department (“OWRD”), referred to collectively as the “Parties.” Copies of the Settlement Agreement are available from FERC upon request or on the PacifiCorp website at <http://newwww.pacificorp.com/Article/Article984.html>.

Section 21 of the Settlement Agreement establishes a process to facilitate coordination and decision making concerning implementation of Settlement Agreement measures. To accomplish this objective, section 21.1 of the Settlement Agreement provides for the formulation of the RCC consisting of representatives from the Parties. The purpose of the RCC, discussed in detail in section 3, is to (1) facilitate coordination and consultation on plans developed by PacifiCorp for the implementation of protection, mitigation and enhancement PM&E measures; (2) coordinate the implementation of PM&E measures and ongoing monitoring requirements by PacifiCorp; (3) establish appropriate procedures for conducting activities; and (4) establish subcommittees to accomplish these objectives.

Section 21.4 of the Settlement Agreement provides that PacifiCorp shall designate an Environmental Coordinator to oversee coordination and implementation of PM&E measures. Section 21.4.2 of the Settlement Agreement provides that the Environmental Coordinator shall prepare and file with FERC and the RCC a “detailed annual report on the activities of the RCC and on the implementation of the PM&E measures during the previous year.” The Environmental Coordinator must file this annual report by the first anniversary of the effective date of the Settlement Agreement (June 13, 2002) and annually each year thereafter during the term of the new license. Section 21.4.2 likewise provides that the Environmental Coordinator will prepare annual reports in consultation with members of the RCC and will provide such members with at least 30 days to comment on a draft report prior to filing a final version with FERC.

2.0 Resource Coordination Committee (RCC)

2.1 Roles and Responsibilities

The purpose and role of the RCC, as discussed in 21.1 of the Settlement Agreement, is to facilitate coordination and implementation of PM&E measures consistent with the Settlement Agreement. Specifically excluded from RCC responsibility and authority is the administration of the Tributary Enhancement Program and mitigation fund set forth in section 19 of the Settlement Agreement, though responsible parties may consult with the RCC concerning measures conducted pursuant to this Program and fund.

The structure and process of the RCC is intended to be value-added to its member organizations by providing a forum to address time sensitive matters, early warning of problems, and coordination of member organization actions, schedules, and decisions to save time and expense. The RCC must endeavor to conduct its business by consensus; however, in the event of disagreements, the Parties may refer such disagreements to appropriate policy-level decision-makers. Finally, decisions of the RCC may not usurp the authority of individual Parties or specific governmental agencies identified in the Settlement Agreement as having approval authority regarding specific PM&E measures.

The RCC is responsible for the following measures, pursuant to the Settlement Agreement:

- Prioritize early implementation projects (SA 19.5.1).
- Facilitate coordination of the implementation of the Resource Coordination Plan (RCP), including ongoing operations and maintenance (SA 21.1). As the RCP will not be finalized until 2005, this role may not take place until future years.
- Coordinate and monitor implementation of PM&E measures (SA 21.1), and coordinate ongoing monitoring requirements by PacifiCorp (SA 21.1).
- Coordinate responses and evaluations specifically assigned to the RCC in the Settlement Agreement (SA 8.2.2, 8.3.3, 12.2, 14.3.3, 14.5, 17.8, 19.2.1, 22.5.2).
- Facilitate coordination and consultation on plans developed by PacifiCorp (SA 21.1).
- Review and comment on the draft annual report of RCC activities and implementation of the PM&E measures (SA 21.4.2).
- Serve as a common point of contact for public information regarding Settlement Agreement implementation (SA 19.5.3).

The following measures are specifically excluded from RCC responsibility:

- Administration of Tributary Enhancement Program through Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife's Memorandum of Understanding (SA 21.1).
- Administration of the Mitigation Fund through the USDA Forest Service (SA 21.1).
- Approval of plans and actions regarding specific PM&E measures specifically assigned to individual organizations for resource protection in the SA (SA 21.2).

RCC Roles and Responsibilities:

The RCC has established the following functional roles in order to be more effective in its business:

- Interpret the Settlement Agreement: Apply provisions to on-the-ground planning and implementation.
- Monitor implementation of the Settlement Agreement as a whole: Provide a wider view than one agency's perspective.
- Avoid surprises and errors through effective communication.
- Track progress: Serve as the interface for the Parties to the Settlement Agreement as implementation takes place.
- Identify policy issues: As policy issues arise, work collectively to define and clarify the issues and options for transmittal to the executive members of the Parties.
- Provide public information: Serve as a point of information regarding Settlement Agreement implementation with a collective voice. (SA 19.5.3).
- Promote efficiency: Share information between organizations. Communicate changes in policy, procedure or regulation. Consult prior to decision-making. Share technical resources.
- Implement the Settlement Agreement collectively to ensure that all Parties interests are continued to be valued through out the new license term.
- Effectively communicate its progress through the development of a website. The website will be located on PacifiCorp's web page in September 2002.

2.2 RCC Members

The Parties have each appointed a member and an alternate to the RCC. The RCC members shown in Table 2.2-1 work with a designated caucus within their respective organization. Appendix A lists the members including alternates and caucus members.

Table 2.2-1: RCC Members

RCC Member	Organization
John Sloan	USDA Forest Service, Umpqua National Forest, Roseburg, Oregon
Craig Tuss	USDI Fish and Wildlife Service. Roseburg, Oregon
Jay Carlson	USDI Bureau of Land Management. Roseburg District
Keith Kirkendall	National Marine Fisheries Service. Portland, Oregon
Ken Homolka	Oregon Dept of Fish and Wildlife. Roseburg, Oregon
Dennis Belsky	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. Medford Oregon
Craig Kohanek	Oregon Dept. of Water Resources. Salem, Oregon
Diane Barr	PacifiCorp. Medford, Oregon

2.3 RCC Meetings

The RCC first convened in December of 2001 and has met on a monthly to bi-monthly basis. The RCC first established ground rules for its operation. The ground rules located in Appendix B were developed to clarify the collective nature of decision-making and to carry out the mutual purpose of the implementation measures. These ground rules make explicit the common expectations that RCC members possess. Such ground rules describe:

- How RCC representatives will work together for effective communication;
- The decision-making process that will be used;
- The role of public information and participation;
- Responsibilities of the committee members to one another and to their respective agencies;
- The spirit in which members will communicate with each other; and,
- The responsibilities of the facilitator.

2.3.1 RCC Meetings Overview

The RCC has held four (4) meetings from December 2001 to June 2002. Seven sub-committee meetings or conference calls have also been held. Following is a general summary of the issues covered and areas of consensus reached:

RCC Meeting #1 December 6, 2001

- Outlined Purpose and Scope of the RCC.
- Discussed and reached consensus on the role of the RCC.
- Determined criteria for 2002 Early Implementation Projects.
- Organized and assigned a 2002 Early Implementation Sub-committee and conference call.

Early Implementation Sub-committee Conference Call December 20th, 2001

- Drafted a 2002 Early Implementation priority project list for presentation to the RCC.

RCC Meeting #2 January 24, 2002

- Selected 7 highest priority Early Implementation Projects for 2002.
- Set date for a technical briefing by Stillwater Sciences concerning data collected at the Soda Springs Bypass Reach.

- Organized and selected a sub-committee to discuss public outreach and information issues.

Public Outreach Sub-committee Conference Calls February 19th, 22nd, and March 4th, 2002

- Developed recommendations for the RCC regarding public outreach, such as an open house, website, and press releases.
- Compiled a draft outreach list of media, non-government organizations, and public officials who should be kept informed of RCC activities and receive written material.

Soda Springs Enhancement Technical Sub-committee Briefing March 7th, 2002

- Reviewed and discussed a technical report by Stillwater Sciences concerning the Soda Springs enhancement reach.
- Developed preliminary questions concerning the Soda Springs enhancement reach for additional consideration.
- Scheduled a field assessment to confirm or modify technical findings, and to determine whether potential spawning microhabitat sites may exist.

RCC Meeting #3 March 22, 2002

- Discussed public outreach sub-committee recommendations and established a preliminary date for a Public Open House on July 24, 2002 at the Roseburg Public Library.
- Drafted preliminary procedures for referring issues to the executive policy group.
- Defined the purpose of the Soda Springs enhancement field assessment by the technical team, as well as a set of questions for technical team consideration.
- Organized 2003 Early Implementation Project sub-committee to develop criteria, process and project ideas for RCC consideration.

Soda Springs Technical Group Field Assessment April 8th, 2002

- Field work to confirm technical research by Stillwater Sciences.
- Anadromous spawning micro-habitat site research.
- Established criteria for evaluating potential micro-habitat sites.
- Determined additional information needed.
- Developed a collective response to technical questions posed by the RCC.

RCC Meeting #4

May 10th, 2002

- Approved Ground Rules.
- Approved Soda Springs enhancement technical team report and discussed next steps.
- Discussed PM&E Master Schedule.
- Considered sub-committee report on 2003 early implementation criteria and process, and agreed on next steps.
- Reviewed draft Annual Report.
- Developed recommendations for referring RCC issues to the Parties executive members, and authorized transmittal to executives.

2.3.2 Meeting Summaries

Meeting summaries are drafted for RCC meetings, sub-committee conference calls, and sub-committee meetings. These drafts are distributed to the RCC for review and comment. At a future meeting, after corrections have been made as appropriate and when work in progress is complete, the summaries are approved by consensus by the RCC. The summaries are made part of the public record and will be placed on the PacifiCorp web site in the near future beginning in September 2002. Completed and approved meeting summaries are included in this document (see Appendix C).

3.0 Protection Mitigation and Enhancement Measures

This annual report is intended to present the status of PM&E measures identified in the NU Settlement Agreement from the effective date to June 13, 2001. The schedule for implementing PM&E measures is established in Appendix A of the Settlement Agreement. PM&E measures fall into the following implementation categories:

- Date Certain (pre and post license)
- Early Implementation (pre-license)
- License-dependent (post-license)

These categories are defined as:

Date Certain: Measures specifically identified to be completed by a specified calendar date regardless of when the final license is issued. Measures begin as early as Settlement Agreement effective date of June 13th, 2001.

Early Implementation: Measures selected by the RCC to be conducted prior to issuance of the final license and funded by PacifiCorp through the Early Implementation Fund. Measures may be either Date Certain or License dependent.

License-dependent: Measures that will be implemented after the new Project license becomes final, as defined in the Settlement Agreement.

The PM&E schedule may be modified by the Parties under Section 22.6 of the Settlement Agreement. If necessary, the Parties may convene and modify Settlement Agreement implementation dates if all Parties are in agreement that such modifications are warranted. A meeting of the Parties occurred on May 22, 2002 to review PM&E progress and due dates. Further discussion on the PM&E measures and the modified implementation dates are presented below.

3.1 Date Certain PM&E Implementation

As discussed above, the Settlement Agreement identifies some PM&E measures as Date Certain by indicating a specific date for its completion or commencement. All the PM&E Date Certain measures are presented in Table 3.1-1. The status of the PM&E measures specific to the timeframe of this report (June 13, 2001 to June 13, 2002) are presented in Table 3.1-2. Actions during this first year primarily focused on preparing study, implementation, monitoring, and management plans. Funds were provided for deferred backlog of recreation capital and maintenance projects. These included improvements in the Lemolo Lake area such as a vault toilet, road resurfacing, picnic tables and new picnic tables at Toketee campground.

Table 3.1-1-Date Certain PM&E's

**NORTH UMPQUA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT (FERC 1927-008) SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT
PROTECTION MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENT MEASURES
DATE CERTAIN COMMITMENTS**-Measures to be completed irrespective of final license issuance date.

SA Sect.	PM&E	YEAR											2012+	
		2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011		
4.0	FISH PASSAGE MEASURES													
4.1.1(a)	Soda Springs Fish Ladder Design													
4.1.1(d)	Ladder Operations, Maintenance, and Evaluation Program													
4.1.2(a)	Soda downstream screen design													
4.1.2(f)	Soda Downstream Passage-Spillway Modifications Design													
4.3.1(a)	Lemolo 2 Fishway Design													
4.3.1(c/d)	Lem. Operations, Maintenance, and Evaluation Program													
4.3.2(a)	FC Proposed Design													
5.0	INSTREAM FLOWS													
5.1	SS Table 1 Flows													
5.3	Modifications to Instream Flows													
5.5	Instream Flow Monitoring-Gage installation													
5.7	ODFW holding ponds water supply													
6.0	RAMPING													
6.2.1	Slide Creek Ramping Monitoring Plan													
6.4	W&S Ramping Restrictions													
6.5	Bypass Reach Ramping Restrictions (0.2/ft/hr)													
6.8	Soda Emergency Bypass Valve Design													
7.0	RESTORATION OF FLUVIAL PROCESSES													
7.1-.2	Gravel Augmentation below Soda													
7.3	Passage of Woody Debris													
7.4	Passage of Sediment (if high flows present)													
8.0	MAIN STEM HABITAT ENHANCEMENT													
8.2	Slide Creek Alluvial Reach													
8.2.1	Study and Implement. Plan													
8.2.2	Monitoring Plan													
8.2.4	Test Boulder Placement													
8.3	SS Alluvial Reach Restoration													
8.3.2	Study and Implement. Plan													
8.3.3	Monitoring Plan													
8.3.4	Baseline Habitat Survey													
9.0	RESERVOIR AND FOREBAY MANAGEMENT													
9.1	Stocking of Rainbow Trout; Production Funding													
9.2	Rainbow Brood Stock Development													
9.3	Management of Lemolo Reservoir													
9.5	Salvage of Fish during shutdowns													
10.0	AQUATIC RESOURCES													
10.5	Riparian Restoration-White Mule Creek													
10.5	Riparian Restoration-Potter Creek Restoration													
11.0	TERRESTRIAL RESOURCES													
11.1	Big Game Bridges (29) Widening													
11.4	Wild Life Underpasses (9)													
12.0	VEGETATION MANAGEMENT													
12.1	Vegetation Management Plan Dev. and Implementation													
12.2	Noxious Weed Control													

Key	
	Due Date
●	Completed
○	In Progress

Table 3.1-1-Date Certain PM&E's

**NORTH UMPQUA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT (FERC 1927-008) SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT
PROTECTION MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENT MEASURES
DATE CERTAIN COMMITMENTS**-Measures to be completed irrespective of final license issuance date.

SA Sect.	PM&E	YEAR											2012+	
		2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011		
13.0	AVIAN PROTECTION													
13.4	Records and Database management system	●	○											→
14.0	EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL													
14.4.2	High Priority Erosion Sites (31)													→
14.5	Monitoring													→
14.7	Seismic and Geologic Hazard Evaluation													→
15.0	TRANSPIRATION													
15.1	TMP Plan and Program													→
15.2	PPL Roads to FS standards		○											→
15.3	Cost Sharing for joint roads and Maintenance													→
15.5	Bridges-Improvements													→
15.6	Culvert Maintenance on PPL use roads													→
16.0	AESTHETICS													
16.1	Visual Resources Management Plan and Program			○										→
16.2	Landscaping Clearwater Shop													→
16.2	Landscaping Clearwater Switchyard													→
16.4	Tline Evaluation (design)													→
17.0	RECREATION													
17.2	Operations and Maint. Funding to FS													→
17.7	Law Enforcement Funds to FS													→
17.8	Rec-Defferred Capital Improvement Funds to FS													→
17.9	Public Information Funding to FS													→
17.10	Annual Monitoring Funding to FS													→
17.11	Rec-NW FP Compliance Funds to FS													→
18.0	CULTURAL													
18.1	Cultural Resources Management Plan													→
18.3/18.6	Site Discovery/Monitoring	●	○											→
18.4	Protection, Restoration, and Recovery													→
19.0	MITIGATION													
19.1	State Mitigation Fund-MOU													→
19.2	Long-Term Monitoring and Predator Control													→
19.3	Federal Mitigation Fund													→
19.5	Early Implementation Fund		●											→
19.5.2	Early Implementation Fund Annual Reporting		●											→
21.0	COORDINATION AND DECISION MAKING													
21.1	Resource Coordination Committee	●	○											→
21.1	Resource Coordination Plan Developed and Implemented													→
21.4.2	Annual Report		●											→
21.5	Site Specific Plan Development		●											→

Key	
→	Due Date
●	Completed
○	In Progress

Table 3.1-2: Date Certain PM&E measures from June 2001-June 2002 Status

SA Section	Date Certain PM&E	Date Due	Status
5.5	Instream Flow Monitoring Plan	Dec 2002	Gaging plan under development with agencies.
6.1.1	Impact analysis of Pipe to Stinkhole	Dec. 2001	Draft work plan completed in April 2002. Final Impact analysis anticipated in July 2002.
6.4	Wild and Scenic Ramping Restrictions	June 2001	Ramp rate requirements have been followed implemented.
6.4.3	Wild and Scenic Ramping Study Plan	July 2001	Study Plan is under development. Final Study Plan estimated in September 2002.
6.5	Bypass reach ramping restrictions	June 2001	Ramp rate requirements have been implemented.
7.1	Gravel augmentation below Soda Springs dam	June 2001	Ongoing implementation, annual program.
7.3	Passage of woody debris	June 2001	Ongoing implementation, annual program.
8.2.1	Slide Creek Boulder Enhancement Study Implementation Plans	June 2001 ¹	September 2002
8.2.2	Slide Creek Boulder Enhancement Monitoring Plan	Sept. 2001 ¹	Under development.
8.3.1	Soda Springs Alluvial Reach Study Plan	June 2001 ²	Under development with agencies.
8.3.2	Soda Springs Alluvial Reach Implementation Plan	Oct. 2001 ²	Development will begin after completion of the Study Plan.
9.3	Lemolo Lake elevation limits	June 2001	Implemented. Ongoing.
12.1	Vegetation Management Plan	Dec. 2002	Under development with agencies.
14.1	Erosion Control Plan	Dec. 2001	Agency comment period completed. Response to comments underway. Final draft plan December 02.
15.1	Transportation Management Plan (TMP)	June 2002	Under development with agencies. Final TMP anticipated in fall of 2002.
16.1	Visual Resources Management Plan	Dec. 2002	Under development with agencies, on schedule.
17.1	Recreation Resources Management Plan	Sept. 2002	Under development with agencies, on schedule.
17.8	Recreation Funds (\$56k) for deferred capital projects to Forest Service	Jan. 2002	Implemented.
19.5.4	Early Implementation Account Deposit \$356K	Jan. 2002	Implemented.
20.2-.3	Alternative Measures Feasibility Report and Recommendations.	July. 2001	Implemented.
21.4.1	Resource Coordination Committee (RCC)	June 2002	Implemented. Ongoing.

¹ SA date for completion of these plans was stated in error. The revised date has been established as April 2003 by action of the Parties.

² SA date for completion of these plans was stated in error. The revised date has yet to be established by action of the Parties.

3.2 Early Implementation Projects

3.2.1 Purpose of the Early Implementation Program

Under section 19.5.1 of the Settlement Agreement, PacifiCorp established an Early Implementation Fund to be used during the period before the New License becomes final for highly visible measures not otherwise funded before the New License becomes final. These measures shall include but are not limited to, (1) high priority erosion sites, (2) riparian restoration at Potter Creek, (3) enhancement of up to two wetland areas, (4) road decommissioning, (5) tributary reconnections, and (6) culvert replacement.

3.2.2 Establishment and Use of Funds

On January 31, 2002 \$358,186.50 (\$350K adjusted for inflation) was wired into an interest bearing account for Early Implementation Projects. As of the date of this report, this account has not charged any costs as projects are still in the planning phase. The 2002/03 annual report will provide a detailed ledger sheet of costs against this account for the period of 2001-02.

3.2.3 2002 Early Implementation Projects

The RCC selected 7 projects for early implementation, which are described in Table 3.2.3-1 below. The projected cost of these projects slightly exceeds the amount of available funds. This was considered reasonable as they are based on estimates, and all efforts will be made to maximize efficiencies to complete all 7 projects within the available funds.

Table 3.2.3-1: 2002 Early Implementation Projects

PM&E	Description/Comment	Estimated Cost
High Priority Erosion Control Project <i>Fish Creek Side Cast Removal</i>	Remove as much sidecast material as possible for the amount allocated.	\$100,000
High Priority Erosion Control Project <i>LM2-27 Site</i>	This is a location of a previous flume failure. Significant improvements are designed for this location.	\$70,000
Potter Creek Restoration and Erosion Control Design	Funds are to go to 25% design package in order for NEPA to begin scoping.	\$25,000
Wildlife Bridges (3+)	Expand the width of 3 existing wildlife bridges in the Lemolo No. 2 reach	\$90,000
Tributary Connection Designs	Priority 1 Aquatic Connectivity Sites Preliminary Design (s).	\$10,000
Noxious Weed Inventory	Contribute \$17,000 towards completing a noxious weed inventory on Transmission Line ROW on BLM land.	\$17,000
Road Decommissioning	Decommission approximately 1.2 miles of road. Site selected is in the Fish Creek canal area.	\$50,000
	TOTAL	\$362,000

All of these projects are currently in the planning and permitting stages. As of the date of this report, we believe all projects will be completed on schedule unless pending permitting timelines or requirements preclude the timeliness of actions.

3.3 License-dependent Implementation

PM&E measures scheduled for postlicense implementation are presented in Table 3.1-3. At this time, all of these actions are believed to be on schedule.

3.4 Revisions to PM&E Due Dates

On May 22, 2002, the executive members of the Parties convened to review the specific Settlement Agreement due dates for accuracy. This meeting addressed the progress of the implementation and review of the draft annual report. In reviewing the Settlement Agreement due dates for actions over the last year, the Parties agreed that there were some inaccuracies along with unexpected delays. Therefore, the Parties unanimously agreed to revise the dates for certain PM&E measures. These are presented in Table 3.4-1 below. The need for revising the dates are primarily due to the Settlement Agreement originally stated a timeline that was inaccurate at the time of signature (June 13, 2001) for the Stinkhole pipeline study, Slide Creek and Soda Springs alluvial projects, and the Wild and Scenic ramping study. Delays have also occurred due to technical study and field survey timing and availability of the Parties staff to convene on a regimented basis to accommodate an aggressive schedule. The erosion, transportation, recreation, and visual management plan dates were extended so that they are synchronized with each other as they all have inner dependencies. These plans are expected to be at 90% draft by the end of 2002. This revised timeline does not account for necessary FERC review time.

Table 3.4-1: Revised PM&E Due Dates

S.A. Section	Protection, Mitigation, & Enhancement Measure	Current Date	Revised Date
6.1.1	Final Impact analysis of Pipe to Stinkhole	Dec. 2001	December 02
6.4.3	Wild and Scenic Ramping Study Plan	July 2001	September 02
8.2.1	Slide Creek Boulder Enhancement Study Implementation Plans	June 2001	September 02
8.2.2	Slide Creek Boulder Enhancement Monitoring Plan	Sept. 2001	September 02
8.2.4	Slide Creek Boulder Initial Placement	Dec. 2002	September 03
8.3.1	Soda Springs Alluvial Reach Study Plan	June 2001	TBD
8.3.2	Soda Springs Alluvial Reach Implementation Plan	Oct. 2001	TBD
12.1	Vegetation Management Plan	Dec. 2002	April 03*
14.1	Erosion Control Plan	Dec. 2001	April 03*
15.1	Transportation Management Plan	June 2002	April 03*
16.1	Visual Resources Management Plan	Dec. 2002	April 03*
17.1	Recreation Resources Management Plan	Sept. 2002	April 03*

* Synchronized because of inner dependencies.

4.0 Conclusion

This first Annual Report demonstrates that the Parties have established detailed collaborative procedures for monitoring and implementing the Settlement Agreement, and have commenced working with each other to achieve the management goals of the Settlement Agreement.

This report likewise illustrates that the Parties have committed substantial time and resources to establishing and formalizing working relationships and procedures. However, more time and effort than expected was required to achieve on-the-ground progress given the need to: (1) prioritize early implementation activities and respond to seasonal conditions; (2) respond to National Environmental Policy Act and other permitting requirements; and (3) permit adequate coordination with the Parties and environmental contractors. Nevertheless, the Parties are pleased with the progress made during this first year, and believe the investments made in developing these relationships and protocols will ensure the Parties achieve the management goals of the Settlement Agreement.

APPENDIX A
Caucus Membership
Resource Coordination Committee
North Umpqua Hydropower Project: FERC #1927-008

Organization	RCC Member	Caucus Members
USDA Forest Service	John Sloan	Pam Sichting (Alternate) Walt Dortch John Ouimet
USDI Fish and Wildlife Service	Craig Tuss	Rob Burns (Alternate) Scott Center Peter Lickwar Dave Peterson
USDI Bureau of Land Management	Jay Carlson	Bill O'Sullivan (Alternate) Dan Couch Jeanne Klein Fred LaRuew
National Marine Fisheries Service	Keith Kirkendall	
Oregon Dept of Fish and Wildlife	Ken Homolka	Dave Loomis (Alternate) Stephanie Burchfield Steve Denney Dan Edwards
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality	Dennis Belsky	Paul Heberling (Alternate) John Blanchard Greg McMurray
Oregon Dept. of Water Resources	Craig Kohanek	Dave Williams (Alternate)
PacifiCorp	Diane Barr	John Sample (Alternate) Terry Flores Jerry Roppe Charles Martin

APPENDIX B
Ground Rules
Resource Coordination Committee
North Umpqua Hydropower Project: FERC #1927-008

A. PURPOSE

These ground rules make explicit the common expectations with which the participants join the Resource Coordination Committee (RCC). They describe how government agencies and PacifiCorp will work together for effective communication, the decision-making process they will use, responsibilities of the committee members to one another and to their agencies, the spirit in which they will communicate, and the responsibilities of the facilitator.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE RCC

1. Role of the Resource Coordination Committee:

The Resource Coordination Committee (RCC) is created by Section 21 of the North Umpqua Hydroelectric Project (FERC #1927-008) Settlement Agreement, derives authority from that Settlement Agreement, and makes collective decisions while implementing the agreement. The structure and process of the RCC is intended to be value-added to its member organizations by providing a forum to address time sensitive matters, early warning of problems, and coordination of member organization actions, schedules, and decisions to save time and expense. The RCC shall not infringe on the authority of the agencies.

2. Responsibilities of the RCC according to the Settlement Agreement:

- Prioritize early implementation projects (SA 19.5.1).
- Facilitate coordination of the implementation of the Resource Coordination Plan (RCP), including ongoing operations and maintenance (SA 21.1). As the RCP will not be finalized until 2005, this role may not take place until future years.
- Coordinate and monitor implementation of Protection, Mitigation, and Enhancement (PM&E) Measures (SA 21.1), and coordinate ongoing monitoring requirements by PacifiCorp (SA 21.1)
- Coordinate responses and evaluations specifically assigned to the RCC in the Settlement Agreement (SA 8.2.2, 8.3.3, 12.2, 14.3.3, 14.5, 17.8, 19.2.1, 22.5.2)
- Facilitate coordination and consultation on plans developed by PacifiCorp (SA 21.1)
- Review and comment on the draft annual report of RCC activities and implementation of the PM&E Measures (SA 21.4.2).
- Serve as a common point of contact for public information regarding Settlement Agreement implementation (SA 19.5.3).

Settlement Agreement Actions specifically excluded from RCC responsibility include, but are not limited to:

- Administration of Tributary Enhancement Program through Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife's (ODFW) Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (SA 21.1)
- Administration of Mitigation Fund through the USDA Forest Service (SA 21.1)
- Approval of plans and actions regarding specific PM&E measures specifically assigned to individual organizations for resource protection in the Settlement Agreement (SA 21.2).

3. RCC Established Procedures (SA 21.1.c)

- **Interpret the Agreement:** Apply provisions to on-the-ground planning and implementation.
- **Monitor implementation of the Agreement as a whole:** Provide a wider view than one agency's perspective.
- **Avoid surprises and errors:** Through early warning and involvement, and through organization caucuses which transmit information to and from internal organization staff, head off conflicts early.
- **Track progress:** Serve as the interface for the parties to the Settlement Agreement as implementation takes place.
- **Identify policy issues:** As policy issues arise, work collectively to define and clarify issues and options, and recommendations for transmittal to the Executive Policy Group.
- **Provide public information:** Serve as a common point of contact for public information regarding Settlement Agreement implementation (SA 19.5.3).
- **Promote efficiency:** Share information between organizations. Communicate changes in policy, procedure or regulation. Consult prior to decision-making. Share technical resources.

C. STRUCTURE OF THE RCC

1. Composition

- The RCC consists of eight members with equal authority who represent each of the following eight organizations: USDA Forest Service; USDI Bureau of Land Management; USDI Fish and Wildlife Service; National Marine Fisheries Service; Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife; Oregon Water Resources Department; Oregon Department of Environmental Quality; PacifiCorp.

2. Representation

- Each organization represented will appoint a member and an alternate to represent the interests and concerns of that entity. The RCC will be informed when changes in a member or alternate are necessary.

3. Caucus Structure

- Each RCC member will form a caucus within the organization they represent. Each caucus will develop procedures for keeping its members informed of the progress of the RCC and procedures for development, ratification and implementation of RCC recommendations within the spirit of these ground rules. In the event a caucus fails to send either the member or alternate to any two consecutive RCC meetings, the RCC may request selection of replacements.

D. RCC MEETINGS

1. Schedule and Agendas

- The RCC will meet regularly as scheduled in advance. Meetings will be task-oriented with specific agendas.
- Members will receive agendas and other information prior to meetings. It is each member's responsibility to keep abreast of upcoming meeting dates and agenda issues.
- A review of proposed agenda items for the next meeting will be provided at the conclusion of each RCC session. Draft agendas will be distributed at least seven and preferably fourteen days prior to RCC meetings.

2. Record Keeping

- A record will be kept of every meeting which documents, at a minimum, members present and decisions made.
- Meeting notes from the prior meeting will be distributed for review with each draft agenda.
- At the beginning of each meeting, the prior meeting's notes will be amended as needed and approved.
- Draft meeting notes containing RCC decisions and directives will be distributed to members only. Meeting notes are working documents until approved by the RCC. After approval, meeting notes become part of the public record.

3. Meeting Participation

- Consistency at the table is critical. Only one person can represent each organization at the table, but RCC members may be accompanied to meetings by other persons from within their agency or organization that are necessary to provide technical and other support. Individuals from outside the member organizations may be invited when approved by the RCC. These invitees may sit at the table when the member so requests for a specific purpose, and when the RCC agrees.
- Invitees will be asked to confine comments to issues at hand, subject to time limits, so as not to dilute discussion.

- Invitees who are not RCC members and not on any caucus may address the RCC and/or participate in discussions at the request of a member and with RCC agreement.

4. Public Participation

- Members of the public may attend RCC meetings as observers.
- Notification of RCC meeting dates and location will be made.
- Notification of meeting dates and location will also be made for open houses and other public meetings the RCC may sponsor (See Section H: Public Information).
- Public comment will be limited to two comment periods scheduled on the agenda. A period will be designated near the beginning of the meeting for agenda-specific comments, and a period will be designated near the close of the meeting for more general comments about Settlement Agreement implementation. Public comments shall be limited to three minutes per person. The RCC may expand or decrease the comment period for individual speaking time.
- Written comments to the RCC are encouraged and will be accepted at any time. Only written comments will be incorporated in the record.
- The RCC shall endeavor to address public comment on agenda items during that meeting, or on a subsequent meeting agenda by the RCC.
- In order to assure that the RCC remains a working committee, the time periods reserved for public comment may be contained with the use of a sign up sheet for a pre-determined number of slots.
- The agenda and ground rules will be available to members of the public attending the meeting.
- The RCC may hold a closed work session before, during or after an RCC meeting. In such a case, the RCC will report out any results of that work session at the subsequent public meeting. The RCC will not make final decisions during a closed work session.

E. RCC MEMBER PARTICIPATION

- Statements, positions, and offers made during the RCC process are voluntary and are made only for purposes of the planning process. They are not to be considered findings for any other purpose, including litigation and administrative procedures, except when duly recorded in the meeting notes.
- Members agree to work cooperatively to fulfill the responsibilities assigned to the RCC as established by the Settlement Agreement. No policies, approaches or decisions will be adopted unless there is agreement among the RCC members.

- The purpose of RCC discussions is to find agreement among members. Members will respect the interests of all participants and will try to incorporate the goals of all members into its recommendations.
- Members will act in good faith at all times. This includes the “No Surprises” rule: members will not act or speak in a place, time or manner that may surprise or put off-guard other members. Good faith also includes making the effort to resolve disagreements in person rather than using email, early disclosure of issues or problems, following through on commitments, sharing information on related matters, and characterizing individual or caucus viewpoints fully and accurately. Good faith efforts include working directly with the RCC representative rather than seeking resolution with other members of an organization.
- Discussions of substance and development of solutions will focus on interests and concerns rather than positions and demands. Members will respect the concerns and interests of others, whether or not they are in agreement with them. Members will work in the spirit of giving the same priority to solving the problems of others as their own.
- Members will seek commonalities in their respective views and will seek to identify convergences of mission, opinion and values.
- Members will state their own concerns and interests clearly, listen carefully to others, and explore issues from all points of view before forming conclusions.

F. COMMUNICATION DURING PROCESS

- Committee and caucus members agree that successful collaboration depends upon individuals who refrain from speaking independently or characterizing the process.
- Participants agree to work collaboratively. To the extent that is practical, committee members will interact at the table or between meetings in person. If contacted by members of the public or the media, participants agree to speak only for his or her organization on specific elements of implementation, and to forward to the facilitator and the other parties inquiries that affect other members of the RCC.
- With regard to those portions of the Settlement Agreement relating to the RCC, participants will not attempt to influence the public, lobbyists or the media unless requested to do so by the RCC. Participants agree not to reach out as individuals or individual agencies to the public or the media in an effort to influence the RCC process, but to approach the public and media as a collective, collaborative entity.

- Public products related to RCC activities will be adopted by the RCC as a whole.
- With regard to internal written material, members agree not to characterize the motivations or positions of any other participant or caucus. Members agree to only represent positions of the RCC that have been agreed upon and to present those positions fully and accurately, including any formal dissent. This is not meant to restrict members from briefing their managers and appropriate public officials on the viewpoints and perspectives of other RCC members.
- The first avenue for resolving differences is through the RCC. If this is not successful, the Settlement Agreement provisions for dispute resolution in Section 22 will be used.

The RCC does not intend to restrict the free flow of discussion or information, written or verbal, between the members, caucuses, or technical staff as they work to implement the Settlement Agreement. The RCC is a problem-solving group available as needed to assist efficient Settlement Agreement implementation.

ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE FACILITATOR

- The facilitator is an impartial individual who guides the process. The facilitator chairs the RCC meetings, prepares agendas and meeting summaries, and coordinates logistics.
- The facilitator will keep the RCC focused on the mission, agenda, and agreed-upon tasks. S/he may suggest alternative procedures, and will encourage participation by all members.
- The facilitator shall be the designated contact point and spokesperson for the process and its progress unless otherwise agreed by the RCC. She will contact members of the RCC as needed to assist with public information needs.
- The facilitator may communicate between meetings with individual members and caucuses, and assist the free movement of ideas between members and caucuses.
- The members by consensus may change the facilitator's duties, replace the facilitator, or may choose to operate without a facilitator.

H. PUBLIC INFORMATION

- The RCC will provide public information as often as possible within the context of its responsibilities to speak as a group with consensus. The RCC will seek public involvement through public meetings, open houses, and/or other means of communication as agreed upon. At these times it will consult with the public about matters under discussion and receive suggestions.
- Public information through the RCC is separate from and in addition to public information through the site-specific National Environmental Policy Act process undertaken by public agencies.
- If the RCC wishes to make a public statement, a joint statement suitable for discussion with the media will be agreed to by the RCC in advance. When responding to the media, the members shall respond within the spirit of the media statement agreed to.

I. DECISION-MAKING

1. Consensus

- The principle which underlies RCC decision-making is that the RCC will do everything it can to carry out the Settlement Agreement, and will assist all members to identify mutually acceptable and appropriate means to do so.
- Approval of a *substantive decision* by the RCC shall be by consensus among its members through a formal polling process. Each member will register his or her degree of agreement with the decision according to the language in the chart below. The facilitator will record the polling results as noted below.
- A *substantive decision* is defined as establishing priorities of early implementation projects, recommendations to the Executive Policy Group for amendments (SA 22.6) to the PM&E Measures implementation schedule, approval of any written product of the RCC for general circulation such as annual reports (SA 21.4.2), evaluations and monitoring assigned to the RCC in the Settlement Agreement, public information material, or other actions of the RCC required to carry out its roles and responsibilities described in Section B.
- A substantive decision will be made by the RCC in a manner that allows time to communicate within caucuses.
- Consensus is defined in terms of agreement along a continuum. Committee members will communicate the degree of their agreement with language from the first six columns:

Endorse	Endorse with a minor point of contention	Agree with reservations	Abstain	Stand aside	Formal disagreement but will go with the majority	Block
"I like it"	"Basically I like it"	"I can live with it"	"I have no opinion"	"I don't like this but I don't want to hold up the group"	"I want my disagreement to be noted in writing but I'll support the decision"	"I veto this proposal"

- The shaded column to the far right of the continuum is not acceptable for consensus.
- Any of the six columns to the left are considered "agreement by consensus".
- The purpose of the position statements in the first five columns to the left side of the chart is to share information with other RCC about degree of support. However, the facilitator will record each of these five positions as "Support". The facilitator will separately record "Formal Disagreement" and "Block" in the meeting notes.

- “Formal Disagreement but Support” is a position intended to note a member organization’s dissent with the decision, yet allow it to concede that the decision is the best way to proceed to implement the Settlement Agreement. The rationale for the formal disagreement will be put into writing by the member and facilitator, agreed to by the RCC, and included in the description of the RCC decision. In this manner the RCC will support the rationale for the dissent, yet proceed with what it determines to be the best course of action.
- Registering a “Block”, a “Formal Disagreement” or a “Stand Aside” by a member requires that the RCC revisit the language of the proposed decision to attempt to meet the interests of the party so registering. A second polling of the members will then take place. After the second poll, any register of a “Block” moves the decision into the dispute resolution process as described in Section 22 of the Settlement Agreement.
- If an RCC member is not present for a substantive decision and does not respond to three inquiries on that decision within two weeks after the pertinent RCC meeting, the organization’s position shall be registered as support for the decision.
- Non-substantive decisions may be made by voice (aye/nay), or by the facilitator’s request that any dissenting member disclose his or her dissent. In the absence of such objection, the facilitator may declare consensus.

2. Quorum

- *A quorum of members must be present to conduct official business on behalf of the RCC. A quorum is four of the eight members. For substantive decisions, all eight members of the RCC must register a position at the RCC meeting, by written correspondence, or by recorded communications to the facilitator. In the event of support by default due to non-response, the facilitator will so note for the record (see two paragraphs above).*

J. WORKING GROUPS & COMMITTEES

- Sub-committees and working groups will be formed by consensus of the RCC to undertake a specific task. These groups and sub-committees may include persons who are not members of a caucus.
- The RCC will define or ratify the scope of work and timeline for work groups and sub-committees. (Only activities outside of PM&Es can be modified by the RCC)
- Requests for technical information and research by participants of a work group or sub-committee of the RCC must come through the RCC. New

research and data collection involving significant cost or time must be authorized by the RCC.

K. PRODUCTS

- The annual report shall be transmitted to the members 30 days before the scheduled date for consideration and approved by the RCC, as provided for in the Settlement Agreement.
- If additional written products and reports are agreed upon, there will not be minority reports. A single report encompassing both issues on which there is agreement and issues on which there are differing perspectives will be reviewed and approved by the RCC.

L. AMENDMENTS TO GROUND RULES

- Participating in RCC meetings signals an understanding and acceptance of the ground rules. The RCC may amend these ground rules by consensus. Modification of the ground rules will be considered a substantive decision.

END

APPENDIX C.1
Meeting Notes for 12/06/01, approved on 1/24/02
Resource Coordination Committee
North Umpqua Hydropower Project: FERC #1927-008

Attendance:

RCC Members or alternates present

Diane Robb-Barr	Env.Coordinator/ PacifiCorp	diane@camasconsulting.com	(541) 488-7585
Bill O'Sullivan	Group Supervisor, BLM	billosulliv@or.blm.gov	(541) 464-3216
Dennis Belsky	Or. Dept. Environmental Quality	belsky.dennis@deq.state.or.us	(541) 776-6010
John Sloan	Staff Officer/USForest Service	jsloan@fs.fed.us	(541) 498-2531
Dave Williams	OR Water Resources Dept.	dave.s.williams@wrд.state.or.us	(541) 440-4255
Ken Homolka	Or. Dept of Fish and Wildlife	ken.homolka@state.or.us	(541) 440-3353
Craig Tuss	USFWS-Roseburg	craigtuss@fws.gov	(541) 957-3470
Keith Kirkendall	National Marine Fisheries Service	keith.kirkendall@noaa.gov	(503) 230-5431

Caucus Members Present

John Sample	N. Umpqua Licensing Project Man.	John.sample@pacificcorp.com	(503) 813-6688
Charles Martin	Manager/PacifiCorp NW	charles.martin@PacifiCorp.com	(541) 498-2604
Steve Brown	Plant Supervisor/ PacifiCorp	stephen.brown@PacifiCorp.com	(541) 498-2635
Pam Sighting	Forest Hydro Coord/ USFS	psighting@fs.fed.us	(541) 957-3208
Dave Loomis	District Fish Biologist/ODFW	david.w.loomis@state.or.us	(541) 440-3353

Points of consensus that emerged from the RCC discussion

Purpose and Scope of RCC:

- The RCC is designed to facilitate and coordinate the decision making process
- RCC can coordinate actions in the field to avoid conflicts between parties
- RCC should focus on efficiency and try to predict and avoid constraints
- Common goals will be the focus despite individual agency agendas

Role of RCC

- RCC is an implementing body and may act as a nexus for the RCP
- RCC members have responsibility to inform each other of new regulations, resource protection needs, power generation issues, and schedules/processes of O&M. However, no infringement upon authority or agency decisions regarding O&M. The RCC will review and comment on these decisions.
- The RCC is an information/communication opportunity with the intent of promoting efficiency and inter-agency working relationships. The RCC can also provide resources such as technical assistance and consultation.
- Parties should consult with the RCC about implementation of PM&Es
- The RCC shall ensure that implementation actions are consistent with the Settlement Agreement specifications and intent.
- The RCC should be value added for all parties involved.
- Focal point for communication with external parties. Public information needs to be further discussed (January agenda). Some issues involved are: agency representation vs RCC representation, open house, press releases, facilitator as public contact, need for technical knowledge, avoiding surprises.
- The RCC is excluded from implementation of the Tributary Enhancement Program (ODFW) and Mitigation Fund (FS, BLM)

- RCC does not have approval authority over management plans, site plans, and designs. The RCC only plays a facilitation/coordination/early notification role and should function to solve problems such as coordinating schedules or addressing delays.
- The RCC is not involved in site specific project NEPA decisions.
- PacifiCorp retains the responsibility of contractor selection, however, the RCC has the responsibility to assure compliance with SA standards and PacifiCorp will pass decisions through the required agencies for approval.

Ground Rules

- Attached are revisions to the ground rules made during RCC discussion. This draft will be reviewed and revised by the members prior to the next meeting 1-24-01.

Early Implementation Fund

- Sub-committee consisting of PacifiCorp (co-organizer), FS (co-organizer), BLM, and ODFW was formed to prioritize a list of possible projects for the \$350,000 fund, based upon consideration of the following criteria:
 - Ability of the project to be on the ground and substantially completed in 2002
 - Highly visible
 - Important resource value
 - Additive or synergistic to each other
 - Out-year continued investment impacts
 - NEPA- easy
 - Consideration of the six policy categories, and others
 - Reliable cost estimates exist
- The Early Implementation Project List will contain budget information, NEPA status/cost, design logistics, and other materials that may assist the RCC in making final decisions (e.g. pictures). The sub-committee should also include recommendations for percentage of funds spent on continued programs (e.g. noxious weeds).
- The Early Implementation Project List will be distributed to the RCC members 7 to 14 days prior to the January 24 meeting.

Preparation for Next Meeting 1-24-02

- Sub-Committee will develop an Early Implementation Project List for RCC consideration
- Facilitator will circulate revised ground rules and draft meeting notes from 12/6/01. Please return your comments on these documents asap for final changes
- RCC Members will develop his or her Caucus procedures and member list to share with the other members on January 24.

Proposed Agenda for Next Meeting

- Approve Meeting Notes of 12/6/01
- Adopt Ground Rules, Roles, Responsibilities
- Receive sub-committee proposal for early implementation expenditures and make decisions
- Develop criteria for 2003 Implementation Fund Projects

- Discuss Public Information issues

Status of Early Implementation Measures:

- **Conference Call December 20th, 2001, 10am – 11:30 am**
Watch your email for call-in number

Next Meeting:

- **January 24, 2002 8:00 am – 4:00 pm USFS, Roseburg**

APPENDIX C.2
Meeting Notes for 1/24/02, approved on 3/22/02
Resource Coordination Committee
North Umpqua Hydropower Project: FERC #1927-008

Attendance:

RCC Members present

Diane Barr	PacifiCorp	diane@camasconsulting.com	(541) 488-7585
Jay Carlson	Bureau of Land Management	Jay_Carlson@or.blm.gov	(541) 464-3224
Dennis Belsky	Or. Dept. Environmental Quality	belsky.dennis@deq.state.or.us	(541) 776-6010 e226
John Sloan	US Forest Service	jsloan@fs.fed.us	(541) 957-3208
Craig Kohanek	Or. Water Resources Dept.	ron.c.kohanek@wrđ.state.or.us	(503) 378-8455 e289
Ken Homolka	Or. Dept. Fish and Wildlife	ken.homolka@state.or.us	(541) 440-3353
Craig Tuss	US Fish and Wildlife Service	craigtuss@fws.gov	(541) 957-3470

Member Absent: Keith Kirkendall, NMFS keith.Kirkendall@noaa.gov (503) 230-5431

Caucus Members Present:

John Sample	PacifiCorp	John.sample@pacificorp.com	(503) 813-6688
Charles Martin	PacifiCorp	charles.martin@Pacifcorp.com	(541) 498-2604
Dave Loomis	Or. Dept. Fish and Wildlife	david.w.loomis@state.or.us	(541) 440-3353
Dave Williams	Or. Dept. of Water Resources	dave.s.williams@wrđ.state.or.us	(541) 440-4255
Dan Couch	Bureau of Land Management	dcouch@blm.gov	(541) 440-4931 e3283
Pam Sighting	US Forest Service	psighting@fs.fed.gov	(541) 957-3342
John Ouimet	US Forest Service, Diamond Lake	jouimet@fs.fed.gov	(541) 498-2531

Old Business:

- 12/6/02 Meeting Notes and 12/20/01 Conference Call Notes were approved.
- Ground Rules were discussed, revised and distributed in final draft form. Any additional comments and proposed changes should be forwarded to Lois Schwennesen for incorporation into the groundrules scheduled for adoption by consensus on 3-22-02.
- A January '02 status report on PM&E Measures was reviewed and approved as meeting notes for the January 3 Early Implementation Sub-committee, along with the chart summarizing 23 projects proposed for early implementation funding.

Early Implementation Projects Selected:

- The Early Implementation Sub-Committee met on January 3. They presented a list of 23 proposed projects based upon the criteria defined in 12/6/01 meeting notes.
- After consideration of the 23 projects, the following 7 projects received highest priority ranking for 2002 early implementation by consensus of 7 RCC members. The eighth member, Keith Kirkendall representing NMFS, concurred on 1-29-02.

<u>Reference #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Est. Cost (\$)</u>	<u>Build</u>	<u>Design</u>
2 & 3	L2-27 High Priority Site and fish creek sidecast removal	170,000	B	D
20	Wildlife bridge expansion at fish creek (preferred) or L2	90,000	B	D
7	Decommission approx. 1.12 miles of road specified by FS	50,000	B	

4	Potter Creek erosion and riparian restoration	25,000	D
10	Tributary connections	10,000	D
15	Noxious weed inventory	17,000	D
Total:		\$ 362,000	

- Approval of these projects as 2002 early implementation measures commits the RCC to designating enough funds in future years for their completion before licensing.
- The ratio between build only and design only projects in 2002, and the criteria used to select 2002 projects, will likely be modified in determining criteria for future year projects.
- The RCC, by consensus, agreed that funding the 2002 projects above occurs with the understanding that the following projects will receive 2003 priority:
 - Additional work on L2 sidecast removal
 - Fish Creek sidecast removal
 - Potter Creek Restoration and Erosion Control
- 2003 Early Implementation Sub-committee will be formed in March, meet in April, and RCC decisions will be made in May/June.

Soda Springs Alluvial Reach:

- The baseline study of Soda Springs' alluvial reach conducted by Stillwater Sciences produced results inconsistent with previous findings. PacifiCorp requested the parties' assistance in forming a peer review group to assess this information.
- RCC Members set target dates of **Feb. 14** and/or **March 7, 2002** in Eugene (to be confirmed) for a technical briefing by Stillwater for RCC members and technical staff.
- By consensus, the RCC agreed to recommend postponing activity relating to the Soda Springs Alluvial Enhancement study plan until this new information can be shared, assessed, discussed within the RCC, and decisions made on next steps.
- The RCC agreed to collectively decide next steps following the technical briefing. It was acknowledged that the RCC may request the Executive Policy Group to reconvene and consider RCC-generated options and recommendations should policy decisions be required.
- PacifiCorp will request that Stillwater Sciences distribute information to the RCC members and briefing participants prior to the Eugene briefing.

Public Information and Outreach:

- A sub-committee will be formed before the next RCC meeting. It will discuss public information issues and alternatives. ODFW, USFWS, ODEQ, PacifiCorp, and USFS will have media representatives or RCC members/caucus members present. Sub-committee proposals or products will be presented to the RCC at its March 22 meeting.

RCC Member Preparation for Next Meeting

- Soda Springs technical briefing: Please call or email Lois Schwennesen Swen@rmi.net; (206) 605-9529 to let her know who will represent your

organization so that attendees may receive briefing material and meeting location.

- Public Information Sub-committee: Contact Lois (above) with the name and phone number for your representative on this group.
- Meeting notes and final draft of ground rules will be circulated. Please respond ASAP with comments so that an action agenda can be prepared for March 22.

Agenda Items for Next Meeting:

- Approve Ground Rules and 1/24 Meeting Notes
- Discuss Soda Springs enhancement report and make decisions on next steps
- Consider public information recommendations from sub-committee
- Consider master schedule of PM&E measures and status report from PacifiCorp
- Create 2003 Early Implementation Measures Sub-committee
- Each RCC member will give a brief update on current events within their organization

Next Meeting: March 22, 2002. 8:00 am – 4:30 pm. USFS, Roseburg

APPENDIX C.3
Meeting Notes for 3/22/02, approved on 5/10/22
Resource Coordination Committee
North Umpqua Hydroelectric Project, FERC# 1927-008

RCC Members Present

Diane Barr	Env. Coordinator/ PacifiCorp	diane@camasconsulting.com	(541) 855-5301
Craig Kohanek	Or. Dept. of Water Resources	ron.c.kohanek@wrđ.state.or.us	(503) 378-8455
Dennis Belsky	Or. Dept. of Environmental Quality	belsky.dennis@deq.state.or.us	(541) 776-6010
John Sloan	Staff Officer/U.S. Forest Service	jsloan@fs.fed.us	(541) 498-2531
Ken Homolka	Or. Dept of Fish and Wildlife	ken.homolka@state.or.us	(541) 440-3353
Craig Tuss	USFWS-Roseburg	craig_tuss@r1.fws.gov	(541) 957-3470
Keith Kirkendall	National Marine Fisheries Service	keith.kirkendall@noaa.gov	(503) 230-5431
Jay Carlson	Bureau of Land Management	Jay_Carlson@or.blm.gov	(541) 464-3224

Caucus Members Present

Charles Martin	Manager/PacifiCorp N Umpqua	charles.martin@Pacifcorp.com	(541) 498-2604
Pam Sichtung	Forest Hydro Coord./ USFS	psichtung@fs.fed.us	(541) 957-3208
John Ouimet	US Forest Service	jouimet@fs.fed.us	(541) 498-2531

Old Business:

- RCC meeting notes for January 24, '02 were adopted by consensus as amended.
- Public Information Meeting Notes reflect work in progress and will not be adopted.
- The April 1 Memo from the RCC to the Technical Group was approved.

Public Information:

Open House:

- A tentative date for the public open house was set for July 24 to coincide with the annual report. A public field trip, and maybe a prior RCC field trip also will be scheduled.
- The open house will be held in Roseburg during evening hours and will include a sign up sheet for the field trip.
- The agenda for the open house will include explanations of the Settlement Agreement, the Resource Coordination Committee, and the annual report.

NGO Briefings by RCC Members:

- Interest in RCC briefings will be determined before further action is taken.
- The purpose and conditions of such briefings will be shared in advance with each participating organization.

News Releases and Quick Response:

- "Quick response" public outreach was agreed to be PacifiCorp's responsibility. PacifiCorp will keep RCC members informed.
- NGO's will be included on the News Release contact list, but will be limited to one individual per organization.
- A News Release form will be drafted for RCC review.

Website:

- PacifiCorp will construct and maintain an informational RCC website as part of the North Umpqua relicensing website.

- RCC Members will be listed, with links to their respective agency websites.
- Documents posted will be those previously approved by the RCC. The website will be reviewed by the RCC before it is open to the public.

Ground Rules:

- Revisions were agreed to regarding public information and various clarifications were made. Adoption by the RCC is expected May 10.

Soda Springs Technical Group:

- Assistance and direction to the Technical Group about the purpose of the April 8th field trip were discussed.

Master Schedule of PM&E Measures:

- RCC members should expect a draft Master Schedule by May 3.
- The RCC agreed that most, if not all, changes in dates within the Master Schedule will be referred to the Executive Policy Group for final action after RCC review. Diane Barr will consult with Stoel Rives about what types of schedule change require SA amendment.

Annual Report:

- The Annual Report will be reviewed by the RCC, but is a PacifiCorp product. The RCC will receive a draft Annual Report by May 3rd to allow for a 30-day comment period. The RCC will walk through the draft collectively on May 10. Individual agency comments can be made through June 3, and the report will be released about July 13th.

2002 Early Implementation Projects Update:

- The NEPA process is currently underway for 2002 projects
- Lemolo 2-27 erosion control, Potter Creek design, noxious weed inventory, and some wildlife bridges should be in progress during the Public Open House in July.
- The RCC agreed that wildlife bridge construction can be scheduled to allow NEPA- easy bridge construction to begin ahead of bridges in spotted owl habitat, which may be under noise restrictions through July.

2003 Early Implementation Projects:

- A sub-committee of Diane Barr, John Sloan, Pam Sichting, John Ouimet, Jay Carlson, Ken Homolka, Dennis Belsky, and Dan Couch agreed to meet before the May 10th RCC meeting. This group will develop criteria, process, and project ideas.
- Criteria for 2003, and 2002 continued projects, will be in the annual report but new 2003 projects will not likely be finalized.

Referring Policy Issues to Executive Group:

- The RCC discussed this topic and will complete the discussion May 10.

Work Before next meeting May 10:

- Soda Springs - Goals for Technical Field Trip (Lois Schwennesen)
- 2003 Early Implementation Criteria sub-committee (Sloan/Barr to lead)
- Annual Report Drafted; Includes Master Schedule (Diane Barr)
- Referral of Issues to Executives: Summary of 3/22 RCC discussion (Lois Schwennesen)
- Website up with either PowerPoint snaps or password access for RCC member review.

Topics for Next Meeting May 10th 2002, 8:30 am-4:00 pm at ODFW in Roseburg, OR

- 2003 Early Implementation criteria, process, projects (Sub-Committee)
- Soda Springs Enhancement update from technical group's April 8 field trip
- Review of Draft Annual Report including the PM&E Schedule Update
- Public Open House Decisions and Talking Points for briefing NGOs

Future dates for your calendars:

- July 10th, 2002 RCC Meeting at ODFW in Roseburg, OR
- July 24th, 2002 Tentative date for Public Info Open House at the Roseburg, Library

Meeting Adjourned**RCC DRAFT 3/22/02
REFERRING ISSUES TO THE EXECUTIVE POLICY GROUP**

On March 22 the Resource Coordination Committee (RCC) discussed its role in defining and forwarding issues to the Executive Group. On May 10, the RCC will continue discussion of the preliminary concepts below, and seek to develop a collective recommendation to the Executive Policy Group.

The RCC meets regularly and represents all parties to the settlement agreement. It is responsible for implementation of the agreement. Any executive from one of the eight parties to the settlement agreement may request an executive policy group discussion among the signatories to the agreement. In addition to an individual RCC member assisting his or her individual executive, the RCC could:

Staff the Executive Policy Group

- Develop collective, distilled information where appropriate and possible,
- Define Problems – Agree collectively on definition of an issue to assist Executives'
- Narrow issues and options through information sharing and RCC discussion and prepare a range of options or alternative solutions for Executive Group consideration,
- Offer collective advice in the form of a consensus recommendation when possible,

- Fulfill the “no surprises” goal between the parties by bringing to the RCC an issue or a “heads up” about an issue about to be raised by one or more of the executive group members. This allows the other parties to prepare and staff their respective executives.
- Inform executives of date changes as agreed to by the RCC.

Screen Issues to Forward to Policy Group

- The RCC can filter, key up in a logical order, and/or determine when a matter is “ripe” for executive action. This could include referring work to a technical group first.
- There appear to be three levels of issues: a) implementation changes that don’t affect the substance of the agreement, b) significant policy issues, such a situation wherein a PM&E measure cannot be implemented as envisioned, c) significant public information events.

Process to schedule issues for the Executive Policy Group

Keep it as simple as possible. Suggestion: Any RCC member or Executive may contact the facilitator who will inform all parties as soon as possible. The topic would be placed on the next RCC agenda for definition, recommendation, or whatever staffing, if any, is requested.

Topics RCC intends to refer to Executive Policy Group, known to date

- Housekeeping Issues – Settlement Agreement Date Changes
- PM&E, and Pre-licensing Issues - such as Soda Springs
- Public Information - Plans and recommendations to executives for consideration