

Meeting Notes¹
Proposed Study Plan Meeting
May 26, 2005

For attendance, please see attached list. The purpose of the meeting was to briefly describe the proposed study plan, including deviations from the study plan requests, receive initial comments/concerns from agencies, tribes, and other stakeholders; and determine whether to meet again on the proposed study plan to resolve concerns.

Cultural Resources

Gail Thompson, Historical Research Associates, provided the overview.

There was a discussion on whether the study plan was as submitted and reviewed by Rick McClure, the Archaeologist/Heritage Program Manager for the Gifford Pinchot National Forest. Gail, Frank Winchell and Ruth Tracy indicated that they thought everything was in order, and that the proposed study plan included Rick's comments on the draft presented to the committee. Rick is on vacation. Mike Iyall stated that he would defer to Rick as to whether the plan meets the needs for a cultural resources study. It was decided to wait until Rick returns to proceed with field work. Field work was scheduled to begin the week of June 13; however, George Lee asked if Energy Northwest could postpone the work so that it would not coincide with the study plan meetings also scheduled for the week of June 13. Gail will check the schedule and let Laura Schinnell know when field work will begin; Laura will let the Cultural Resources Committee members know the dates.

Mike expressed concern that the access road and Lake Creek were not included in the study plan area. Mike is also concerned that the road provides access to Packwood Lake, and that especially during drawdown there is a greater risk of looting. Mike would like to see more areas field surveyed because there could be more sites, such as the site in Packwood.

Brian Peck asked if his comments on section 6.2.9 were addressed. Laura responded that although natural erosion can occur, the study plan addresses the entire drawdown zone.

Robert Whitlam asked whether the study plan took into account OAHP's comments regarding development of a management plan. He also asked if there were any wildlife mitigation lands that would need to be included in the work or the management plan. He noted that other plans may require consultation.

At this time, the group decided that an additional meeting is not needed, unless Rick has a problem with the study plan. Rick has approved the sensitivity criteria and map

¹ These meeting notes are not verbatim. The summary discussions presented below are a work in progress and do not reflect formal decisions by Energy Northwest, any agency, tribe, non-governmental organization, or interested stakeholder.

for the field survey; a copy of his email will be distributed to the Cultural Resources Committee members. If there is no need to meet further on the study plan, the next Cultural Resources Committee meeting will be held after field work is completed in the fall.

Recreation Resources

Debby Howe, Howe Consulting, provided the overview.

Mike asked if the area is currently legal for motorized vehicles, and if there is any enforcement on keeping vehicles away from Packwood Lake. The answer was that motorized vehicles do have access, up to a parking area at the Lake, where there are postings. There is little, if any enforcement. It was suggested that when the lake is drawn-down, there should be some investigation as to whether the motorized vehicles are proceeding beyond the posted signs.

Lauri Vigue asked if the needs analysis will include requirements for enforcement. Debby responded that we have not looked that far ahead; the need for enforcement may be included when the details are developed.

Ken Wieman asked if creel survey information would be collected; if there will be a determination on success of fishery. The answer was no specific information will be collected on success. Ken Wieman asked about whether economic information such as where the visitor is from, how long they'd be in the area, etc. will be collected. The answer was that information will be collected on the survey form. Debby indicated that she will develop a draft survey form and distribute it for review by the Recreation committee members. The form will also generally address visitors' likes and dislikes about their experience.

Jack Thorne stated that the Forest Service is generally satisfied with the proposed study plan; however they had asked for two years of study versus the one proposed by Energy Northwest because of the possible variation in data from year to year. However, it may be possible to use one year if additional survey dates are added to the calendar.

It was agreed to meet on June 16 to continue the discussion on additional dates to add to the calendar and to review the draft survey form.

Rare Plants

Katy Beck, Beck Botanical Services, provided the overview.

Lauri indicated that she believes that Lake Creek should be included in the study area because project flows could change the vegetation.

The proposed methodology is not the same as Lauri proposed. Katy explained that the Baker protocol WDFW proposed was a sampling because of the large area involved. The proposed study plan would be more thorough.

It was agreed to meet again to discuss the proposed study area and protocol.

Noxious Weeds

Katy Beck, Beck Botanical Services, provided the overview.

Lauri had the same concern about the proposed study area. It was decided to meet again to discuss this.

Vegetation Cover Type Mapping

Stephen Nyman, Devine Tarbell & Associates, provided the overview.

Lauri had the same concern about the proposed study area. She asked if the mapping would include the wetlands around the powerhouse. The answer was that we believe that because the study proposes to survey 100 meters outside the project boundary, that this should include the wetlands.

It was decided to meet again to discuss the proposed study plan area.

Amphibian Survey

Stephen Nyman, Devine Tarbell & Associates, provided the overview.

Lauri stated that Marc Hayes had a number of comments and that we'd need a couple of hours for further discussion. It was decided to meet again to discuss in further detail. To help us address the comments, it was suggested that we talk off-line with Lauri.

Water Quality

Kent Doughty, EES Consulting, provided the overview.

Paul Pickett indicated that he had comments on deviations from the study request, mostly on turbidity and toxics in the soil. Normally, licensees would do a toxics sweep. He'll defer to someone in Ecology with more expertise on toxics. Paul will email Kent Doughty his concerns. It was decided to meet again on the proposed water quality study plan on July 12 at Ecology's office.

Bald Eagle/Osprey Nest Survey

Kent Doughty, EES Consulting, provided the overview. Kent noted that he is not the expert.

WDFW had requested two years of survey; Lauri stated that if there is only one year of survey proposed, they would rather see an aerial survey. The question was asked if an aerial survey is allowed over the wilderness area. Ruth will check. Kent asked if one year of aerial equated to two years of a ground survey. Lauri stated that Regional WDFW staff believe that one year of aerial survey should address WDFW concerns. It was decided to meet again to discuss the proposed study plan.

Packwood Lake Drawdown (and General Discussion)

Kent Doughty, EES Consulting, provided the overview.

Lauri wondered if the drought conditions forecast for this year would make a difference. There was no discussion on potential drought conditions. Carolyn Holsopple wondered if the recreation field survey would cover this period. The answer was that the recreation surveys would be conducted in 2006, and would include survey during the drawdown period.

Paul indicated that we needed to look at how all studies are inter-related, otherwise things may fall through the cracks. For example drawdown could increase turbidity because of bank erosion. To try and show how all the studies are linked, Kent will create a matrix.

Paul indicated that Ecology is working internally to try to put a statement together as to what compliance with water quality standards will mean for the project. Mike indicated that there had been agency and tribal coordination on the study plans; and expressed concern related to the scope of the proposed study plans. Paul indicated that there may be a water quality versus fish issue, i.e., temperature versus flow. Ecology has flexibility and can examine scenarios that would achieve the greater benefit for the resource.

George asked if Lake Creek is in the project boundary. Laura stated that Lake Creek is not in the legal boundary as provided in the FERC license; however it could be included in the area of project effects.

It was agreed to meet on June 14 to continue the discussion on the proposed study plan.

Large Wood

Kathy Dubé, Watershed Geodynamics, provided the overview.

Ken Wieman asked about the differences in size class. Kathy indicated that her research indicated that a slightly different size class would provide good data. Ruth indicated that there may be a problem with big pieces, that plant staff will not be getting these over the drop structure. Kathy indicated that plant staff could only move pieces that two people could carry. Ken asked about the tracking of movement. Kathy stated that the inventory would include all the large wood in lower Lake Creek; however

movement of pieces would only be tracked from four sites. If possible, tagging would occur this fall, rather than next spring, if the plan is approved in time. It was decided to meet again on June 14 to continue the discussion.

Geomorphology and Habitat of the Tailrace Slough

Kathy Dubé, Watershed Geodynamics, provided the overview.

Blane Bellerud noted that there had been changes to his study plan request, and that additional discussion is needed. Brian Peck pointed out that this study was also requested by U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, but that that had not been noted in the proposed study plan. It was agreed to continue discussion on June 14.

Gravel Transport

Kathy Dubé, Watershed Geodynamics, provided the overview.

Ruth stated that it was important to know whether gravel could get to Reach 4 and then move to Reach 1. Ruth said they recognize that the project is not the only influence on Reach 1. Hal Beecher asked if source areas were being documented. Kathy indicated that they were not part of the proposed study. Hal indicated that if sources are not included, the study plan should better document that the project does not affect source areas. Ruth asked about study sites. Kathy stated that all sites would be inventoried; however, the study plan proposes to track movement from four sites. Ruth asked about the flows indicated in the proposed study plan, were they natural flows? Ruth stated that the flows requested by the Forest Service were flows that the project can provide. Kathy answered that some were natural flows. The idea is to check after the first flow, and keep checking at higher flows. It was agreed to continue the discussion on June 14.

Engineering Needs for Access Routes

Kathy Dubé, Watershed Geodynamics, provided the overview.

Danna Hadley agreed with Laura that the Forest Service had met with the FERC regional engineer and Energy Northwest to review the possible locations where the pipeline may be leaking. Information indicated that at least part of the flow is ground water, and that there may be three sites instead of two. Ruth asked about temperature. Danna stated that the temperature information indicated that the water was ground water. Ruth stated that when they took temperature data it looked like surface water. Kent indicated that EES Consulting will be taking temperature data monthly. Danna indicated that in the fall when the project is shut down, she will return to the area to determine if the areas contain water. Lauri asked how rainfall would be considered. It was agreed that there is no need to meet further on this proposed study plan.

Stream Connectivity in Packwood Lake Tributaries

Kathy Dubé, Watershed Geodynamics, provided the overview.

Ken Wieman indicated that Table 3-1 may be misleading in that the elevation of the Lake is largely driven by upper Lake Creek, which has glacial inflow. The other tributaries are mainly rainfall and snow melt. Therefore, it may be necessary to survey these tributaries further than proposed in the study plan. It was agreed to continue discussion on this proposed study plan in June.

Fish Population Characterization Near the Drop Structure

John Blum, EES Consulting, provided the overview.

Brian asked how EES Consulting could know that there is a barrier 1200 feet downstream from the drop structure. John indicated that although they believe this to be the case, EES Consulting will do the analysis as provided in the study request to determine that this is indeed a barrier.

Ken Wieman asked about methods to determine cut throat, temporal and/or spatial separation over the course of the year.

It was agreed to meet again on this proposed study plan.

Fish Passage Barrier

John Blum, EES Consulting, provided the overview.

John stated that a draft report related to the potential barrier at R.M. 1.03 was distributed. He will be revising the draft based on comments received.

Laura indicated that she had asked EES Consulting to prepare reports on all the studies conducted to date, so that they may be submitted to FERC with the final study plans. She has asked that EES Consulting get these to her by the end of June, so they may be sent to the agencies and tribes for review.

Lauri stated that Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife would like to see oversight with Pat Powers in the field. John said he would welcome input from Pat.

John stated that he'd like the group to take one day in the field to view some of the sites, perhaps using one of the meeting dates set for the last week in June.

Brian indicated that there seems to be some formatting errors in the analysis chart. Brian also indicated that another deviation not mentioned was that the study request was for use of laser level, but the proposed study plan stated laser level or clinometer.

It was agreed that Energy Northwest would go back through the study requests to more fully capture any deviations between the study requests and the proposed study plans.

Ruth stated that all life stages “that are appropriate” is vague, and that the study plan should not be vague. Ken Wieman asked if fish will be looked at in the tributaries. Ruth stated that the criteria all sounded about the same, and should be reviewed, and is it “or” or “and.”

Ken Wieman stated that the criteria did not include the USFS mapping criteria, and that this should be included.

It was agreed to meet again on this proposed study plan.

Lake Creek Instream Flow and Habitat Assessment

John Blum, EES Consulting, provided the overview.

Brian stated that on page 4 there is a description of natural waterfalls that contradicts the study at RM 1.03. He has additional comments on the study. Ruth asked where RM 1.03 study falls in the proposed study plans. The answer was in Fish Passage Barrier.

Hal stated that the model leaves a gap in that there is a big difference between the 100 cfs that can be modeled and the possible diversion of up to 260 cfs by the project, which is the project’s water right. Several options were discussed; Hal would ideally like to see some edge measured and then try to figure out how much water went down. There is a need to address how often and how much water went down the creek beyond the 100 cfs the model can handle, including the depths and widths at higher flows, and how often and when these flows occurred. Laura asked if this is part of the hydrology report, which is in draft and will be finalized. Hal said it is both.

It was agreed to meet again to discuss this proposed study plan.

Packwood Lake Entrainment

John Blum, EES Consulting, provided the overview.

John indicated that EES Consulting would use this year to trouble-shoot and determine where best to set up equipment and what equipment could provide the best results.

Ruth asked about the ability to check and see what was near the screens. Ken Wieman asked about the traveling screens. John stated that the screens did not travel continuously, but rather were operated when there was a pressure differential between the front and behind the screen, indicating debris piling up on the front of the screen. The screens could also be operated manually. Kent stated that he believed that the

project reduced the amount the screens travel to reduce impingement on the screens. Brian commented on the methodology related to use of the gill net.

It was agreed to meet again to discuss this proposed study plan.

Tailrace Slough Use by Anadromous Salmonids

John Blum, EES Consulting, provided the overview.

Blane stated that additional discussion is needed to determine how to accurately describe the habitat and population. It was agreed to meet again to discuss this proposed study plan.

Tailrace Slough Instream Flow

John Blum, EES Consulting, provided the overview.

Blane agreed that there is a problem with the potential for the tailrace to change with higher Cowlitz River flows. It was agreed to meet again to discuss this proposed study plan.

Engineering Study Related to Barrier Replacement on the Tailrace

John Blum, EES Consulting, provided the overview.

Blane and Brian agreed that this is an acceptable alternative to the study request. Brian stated that we need to meet to discuss options for a temporary barrier to prevent stranding fish until the permanent barrier is in place. Ken Hogan asked if the project would really need 10 years to have sufficient funds to replace the barrier. Laura indicated that it may be necessary. It was agreed to meet again to discuss options for a temporary barrier or way to prevent stranding fish in the interim.

Anadromous Salmonid Habitat and Spawning Survey

John Blum, EES Consulting, provided the overview.

Lauri asked about the change from weekly intervals as indicated in the study requests versus the proposed bi-monthly. John stated that this is the frequency we had been performing since last year, and that research suggests at least 10 days between surveys to ensure that the same fish aren't observed. Lauri will check with John Serl. It was agreed to meet again to discuss this proposed study plan.

As a result of the number and length of discussions on aquatic-related study plans, discussions on terrestrial study plans were moved to June 16, and the meeting will be held in Lacey.

Laura stated that she expected the agencies and tribes to provide comments on the proposed study plans, and to also note their understandings on any changes that will be proposed in the final submitted to FERC. Ken Hogan reminded the group about the ILP process and study criteria. These meetings are set up to try and reach consensus, an “informal dispute resolution.” The agencies, tribes, and stakeholders will comment in July. Energy Northwest will determine what will be in the revised study plans submitted in August. The Commission will make the final determination. Ken Hogan asked the agencies and tribes to think about where they had major sticking points with the proposed study plans.

Fish Distribution and Species Composition

John Blum, EES Consulting, provided the overview.

It was agreed to meet on June 15 to discuss this proposed study plan.

Proposed Study Plans Meeting Attendance Sheet

Study Plan Meeting 5/26/05			
Name	Organization	Phone	Email
Laura Schinnell	Energy Northwest	509-377-5223	lschinnell@energy.northwest.com
John Clements	FERC	202-502-8070	john.clements@ferc.gov
Dorothy Howe	Howe Consulting	206-542-6146	howeconsult@comcast.net
Katy Beck	Beck Botanical Services	360-691-6513	calypso@openaccess.org
Danna Hadley	USDA Forest Service	(360)497-1160	DLHADLEY@FS.Fed.US
George Lee	YN	509 865 5121	glee@yubone.com
Ruth Tracy	Gifted Pinchot	360-891-5112	rtracy@fs.fed.us
Bernice Kistb	Energy Northwest	509 377-4473	bkistb@energy-northwest.com
Dan Ross	Energy Northwest	509-377-8581	dross@energy-northwest.com
Ken Wieman	USFS	360 497 1141	kwieman@fs.fed.us
Brian Peck	USFWS	360-753-9560	brian_peck@fws.gov
Lauri Vigue	WDFW	360-902-2425	lvigue@dfw.wa.gov
Mike Iyall	Cowlitz Tribe	360-456-8720	mikenjean@comcast.net
Stephen Nyman	Devine Tanbell + Associates	360-671-1150	stephen.nyman@devinetanbell.com
Kent Doughty	EES Consulting	360 734-5915	doughty@eesconsulting.com
John Blum	EES Consulting	360. 734-5915	blum@eesconsulting.com
Paul Pickett	WDFW	360-907-6882	ppickett@dfw.wa.gov
Deb Coevert	"	360-407-7269	deort46@dfw.wa.gov
Hal Beecher	WDFW	360-902-2421	beechhal@dfw.wa.gov
Kathy Dulbe	Watershed Dynamics	425-823-7918	kdulbe@watershed.net.com
Gail Thompson	HRA	206-343-0226	thompson@hrassoc.com
Phone - Rob Whittam, Ken Hogan, Ann-Lise Vecchio			
Carolyn Hoffmeyer, Jack Thomas, Diane Bell			
Blaine Bellerud, Frank Knickell			