



FINAL MEETING MINUTES

PRCC Habitat Subcommittee

November 18, 2010

Chelan County PUD

1:00-4:00 pm

PRCC Habitat Subcommittee Members

Dale Bambrick, NMFS	David Morgan, USFWS
Chris Fisher, CCT	Dave Duvall, GCPUD
Bob Rose, Lee Carlson, YN	Carl Merkle, CTUIR
Dennis Beich, Casey Baldwin, WDFW	Denny Rohr, Facilitator

Meeting Attendees:

Chris Fisher, CCT	Dale Bambrick, NMFS
Lee Carlson, YN	David Morgan, USFWS
David Duvall, GCPUD	Casey Baldwin, WDFW
Richelle Beck, DRohr & Assoc (by phone)	D. Rohr, Facilitator

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Morgan or Fisher to modify language in contract for Pioneer Irrigation project to include funding use timeline and to make final edits.
2. Rohr to contact Aaron Penvose of Trout Unlimited regarding the Pioneer Irrigation project and the discuss the details of the HSC decision regarding this proposal.
3. Duvall to look into whether the HSC approved \$50K funding has yet been provided to the Nason Creek LFP Reconnection project.
4. Rohr to update the CDLT proposal with new language and contact Bugert for further discussion.
5. Duvall to check with Grant PUD regarding the addition of monitoring language with the UCSRB into the contracts. Once that step is complete, Rohr agreed to send a letter letting the UCSRB know of the HSC decision to support their request as a recommendation.
6. Rohr to send a letter to the UCSRB regarding the HSC decision to not support their request for a monetary loan.

COMMITTEE DECISIONS:

1. The HSC agreed to include language in their contract agreements when it's appropriate recommending coordination with the UCSRB for monitoring the projects.

- I. **Approval of Meeting Minutes:** Rohr noted he had made an edit to the Oct. 14 meeting minutes regarding the CDLT compromise. The HSC members approved the edit (after a later discussion on this subject) and made no further comments.

- II. **Habitat/NNI Fund Review:** Rohr had sent out a breakdown of the funding status prior to this meeting. The numbers were quickly reviewed. The NNI fund contains \$3.2 million, the Supplemental fund contains \$3.9 million and the Habitat fund contains \$880K.

- III. **Trinidad Creek:** Duvall stated phase II of this project is moving ahead. Tetrattech was scheduled to conduct a review and soil sample testing on Monday, Nov. 15. Their report is expected to be submitted to WDFW around Dec. 6 or 7. Once they have had time to review the report, it will be made available to the HSC sometime in mid-December. Duvall stated his intention to provide Tetrattech with the photos and write-up put together by the Yakama rep who investigated the property in October with Duvall. Duvall also noted the land owner was able to find out who dumped the material (rubbish) on the property, and the landowner is making arrangements to help with clean-up. If Tetrattech concludes the property to be contaminated to the point where WDFW is no longer interested in the property, the HSC will have to revisit this proposal. It is likely that if WDFW is not interested, the HSC will follow suit. If the property is approved, however, there will be an intermediate step before the next phase to include a discussion with the land owner to reach agreement on clean-up.

- IV. **Pioneer Irrigation Diversion, Lower Wenatchee River:** Rohr stated Morgan had written up some language on the HSC decision and Fisher modified it. That information was sent to the HSC, and an e-mail polling confirmed its approval. Since the offer states a two-year time frame, the HSC discussed what the actual start and end dates would be. They agreed on a start date of Nov. 1, 2010 and an end date of Dec. 31, 2012. The language in the contract will be revised to reflect those dates, stating, "Balance available through Dec. 31, 2012." along with a few typo edits. Rohr was provided with the phone number of Aaron Penvose, Trout Unlimited, the project sponsor, and Rohr agreed to call him with the information discussed by the HSC.

- V. **Review and Update of Nason Creek LWP Floodplain Reconnection Assessment:** Since the last HSC meeting, the Design Team for this project has met. Bambrick stated the Team was supposed to have conducted a survey and provide a report at that meeting but they did not. That report is more likely to be available in late January or early February. The Design Team did discuss two alternatives at their last meeting, and they agreed the most feasible option was for an upstream connection with a limited capacity entrance. To date, the Design Team has conducted some surveys and received direction on a 2-D model. No designs have been completed yet but some preliminary designs are expected in February. The 30% design will be completed with the \$50K awarded by the HSC for this portion of the project possibly by March. Since the 2011 implementation timeline is no longer an issue, progress has slowed down and that is why there is not much to report at this time. There are several HSC members participating in the discussions and they agreed to keep this HSC members apprised of any new information. Duvall noted the \$50K was not included on the

expenditures list for this year and agreed to look into whether this money has been paid out yet.

- VI. **Update Regarding Proposal from Chelan-Douglas Land Trust:** Rohr stated he reviewed past minutes and the CDLT funding proposals to determine where everything stands at this time. He provided the following write-up of his conclusions:

INITIAL CDLT PROPOSAL JULY 8th:

- Administrative Costs: \$10K for Fee-Simple Projects
 \$14K for projects related to conservation easements

Committee members had favorable response to this portion of the request

- Stewardship Funding: \$10K for all approved projects.

Committee members had favorable response up to \$10K for stewardship costs for land acquisition projects only. Conservation easement projects should be the responsibility of the land owner.

- Bugert also agreed he would expect no funding at all until the project proposals are approved by the Habitat SC for further investigation.

MODIFIED CDLT PROPOSAL AUGUST 9th:

CHELAN DOUGLAS LAND TRUST (CDLT) PROPOSAL

InRe: Request for Two Areas of Financial Support

- **Project Development Funding**
- **Stewardship Contribution Funding**

I. **Project Development Funding:**

- A. CDLT brings a proposal to PRHSC for possible development.
- B. If proposal approved by PRHSC:
 1. If Fee Acquisition: PRHSC provides \$5,000 (HSC agrees)
 2. If Conservation Easement: PRHSC provides \$7,000 (HSC agrees)
- C. If proposed project is completed:
 1. If Fee Acquisition: PRHSC provides additional \$5,000 (HSC agrees)
 2. If Conservation Easement: PRHSC provides additional \$7,000 (HSC agrees)
- D. If project not completed, no additional funding required

II. **Stewardship Contribution Funding:**

- A. CDLT Board Policy now requires that CDLT not accept fee or easement property unless CDLT obtains an adequate stewardship contribution.
- B. The average stewardship funding for salmon recovery project properties is \$23,000
- C. If Fee Acquisition: PRHSC provides \$10,000 (HSC Agrees)
- D. If Conservation Easement: PRHSC provides \$10,000 (HSC Disagrees and will provide no funding; landowner responsibility to fund)
- E. CDLT requests the balance of the contribution from the landowner.

The HSC reviewed the write-up and suggested that all of the number figures start with the caveat "up to." They also discussed their flexibility with providing stewardship funds, stating that if the conservation easement property had public access, they would be more willing to spend some money toward stewardship funding. It would have to be on a case-by-case basis though because if there wasn't public access in place already, it may not always be environmentally feasible to install public access. If the HSC does not approve stewardship funding, the responsibility would lie with CDLT and their negotiations with the land owners. Rohr will make the discussed HSC changes and contact Bugert with the updated comments to the proposal.

- VII. **Monitoring Language:** The UCSRB has made a request to include language in project proposals regarding coordination with the UCSRB. The HSC agreed they were supportive as long as it was a recommendation and not a requirement because while they encourage the idea of monitoring, they do not want to compromise the potential funding for land owners. Duvall stated he needed to make sure it wouldn't be a problem within the Grant contract to include this language. This decision is contingent upon Grant PUD's approval. Once approved, Rohr will send a letter of support to the UCSRB.
- VIII. **Loan Request of UCSRB:** Rohr stated his understanding that a vote was taken at the HCP Tributary Committee a couple of months ago wherein they voted to not provide the monetary loan that had been requested by the UCSRB several months ago. The HCP Tributary Committee agreed to send a letter notifying the UCSRB of their decision. Rohr asked if the HSC wanted him to send a letter as well since the HSC had also received a request for a similar monetary loan. The committee agreed that the loan request was also denied by the HSC and Rohr was requested to send a letter stating the HSC's decision to not provide this funding.
- IX. **WEBX Discussion:** Rohr mentioned the idea of holding these HSC meetings by WEB-EX in an effort to be more efficient with travel time. The HSC felt that it wouldn't help much in cost savings since they are already present for their morning HCP Tributary meeting. However, on days when the HCP morning meeting is cancelled, this might be a good alternative if the HSC has things needing to be discussed. No one was opposed to having it available as an option.
- X. **Project Updates:**
- A. **McIntyre Dam:** The \$45K contract extension was awarded but it seems they may not need an extension after all since there is no end date listed in the contract. The HSC agreed that April 1st is the deadline to use the money. Any further funding provided beyond that point will need additional HSC review and approval. There is still approximately \$155K remaining from the original amount.
 - B. **ORRI:** There was no update for this project.
 - C. **Tyee Project:** Project implementers (CCD, USBR), with the help of Julie Morgan (UCSRB), have been working to find an alternative to the channel migration barrier (CMB) in response to RTT concerns that the CMB would impose unacceptable environmental impact. Morgan would like to offer the land owners the option of a conservation easement, in lieu of the CMB, but before she approached them, she wanted to gauge HSC support for funding an easement. Bambrick had informed her that he would likely be willing to sponsor an

easement, as long as the project did not include a CMB. A major hurdle to implementing a project that has a meaningful change to the levees is the downstream landowner. Morgan indicated that she and CCD are working with the downstream landowners on a land swap or purchase to ease that issue. This opens up the options. Fisher asked if the HSC approved the necessary funding for the conservation easement if BPA would provide some financial support for this project as well. Bambrick stated that both BPA and the Bureau are more than on board with the restoration aspects of this project. However, the HSC is likely the only funding entity that can react quickly enough with the protection dollars to make the project happen in the desired timeline of the Entiat IMW. Although an official vote was not held, no one present at the HSC was opposed to the possibility of funding a conservation easement at the Tyee ranch. Of course, the final approval and dollar amount would be subject to an appraisal. Bambrick will contact Morgan regarding the HSC discussion.

- D. **Other:** Duvall inquired about Libby Creek. He stated he had spoken with WDFW about the property and evidently the WDFW commission is going to vote on that project at their December meeting in Olympia. If they approve, it is a done deal and a check will be cut. Duvall stated that WDFW had mentioned it would be a great place for an acclimation pond but the HSC was not supportive. Not being a participant during the original interactions, Duvall asked for clarification on the issue of HSC acquisition and hatchery acclimation. The HSC informed Duvall that the property was purchased for protection and if any entity wanted to put an acclimation facility on the property they would have to reimburse the habitat funds for the land that was taken up by the facility, or buy the whole property outright. This would be necessary because the activities and structures that it takes to have a hatchery acclimation facility would generally violate the restrictions and requirements for stewardship of a protected property.
- XI. **Next HSC meeting:** The December meeting was cancelled. If anyone feels there is an issue that needs discussed prior to the January meeting, a conference call will be scheduled. The January meeting is scheduled for January 13, 2011.
 - XII. **Other:** It was noted with regret that this is the last meeting for David Morgan who will be leaving the USFWS. All committee members wished David well in his new endeavors. All commented that he has been a valuable member of the HSC from its inception, and he will be missed. Everyone thanked David for his valuable contribution to the committee and the process. It was noted that Kate Terrell of the USFWS will be taking David's place and be in attendance at the next meeting.