

**Clark Fork Settlement Agreement  
Final Management Committee Meeting Minutes  
Edgewater Resort–Sandpoint, ID  
March 14, 2017**

**Management Committee Representatives in Attendance**

Avista Corporation: Tim Swant  
Cabinet Resource Group: Jim Nash (arrived at 9:35)  
Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes: Les Evarts (arrived at 9:11)  
Green Mountain Conservation District: Howard Bakke  
Idaho Dept. of Environmental Quality (Idaho DEQ): Tom Herron  
Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game (IDFG): Chip Corsi  
Kalispel Tribe: Ray Entz (alternate)  
Kootenai Tribe of Idaho: Norm Merz (alternate)  
Lake Pend Oreille Idaho Club: Ryan Roslak  
Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks (MFWP): Mark Deleray (alternate)  
Noxon-Cabinet Shoreline Coalition: Rick Robinson  
Panhandle Chapter Trout Unlimited: Loren Albright  
Sanders County Commissioners: Tony Cox (arrived at 9:10 am)  
U.S. Forest Service (USFS): John Gubel  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS): Ben Conard

**Interested Parties**

Avista: Shana Bernall, Heide Evans, Nate Hall, Bruce Howard, Catherine Kenney, Paul Kusnierz, Sean Moran, Eric Oldenburg, Guy Paul, Jason Pignanelli, Patty Shea, Bruce Sorensen, and Lisa Vollertsen; Avista Grant Writer: Susan Drumheller; Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game: Ken Bouwens, Matt Corsi, and Andy Dux; Kaniksu Land Trust: Regan Plumb (left at 11:32); Lower Clark Fork Watershed Group: Brita Olson; Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks: Lee Anderson, Jason Blakney, and Ryan Kreiner; Noxon-Cabinet Shoreline Coalition: Alan Stohle; Panhandle Chapter Trout Unlimited: Don Childress; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: Wade Fredenberg; USFS: Robert Brassfield and Brad Steele (arrived at 9:05 am, left at 11:05 am)

**Welcome and Introductions**

Swant welcomed everyone to the 47<sup>th</sup> MC meeting at 9:00 am, the first of two required in 2017. Swant invited everyone to introduce themselves and a quorum was recognized. Heide Evans informed Management Committee (MC) members to fulfill (in part) requirements of Paragraph 33 of the Clark Fork Settlement Agreement (CFSA) requires parties to designate representatives to the Water and Terrestrial Resource Technical Advisory committees (WRTAC and TRTAC) in writing on an annual basis. The sign-in sheet is used to verify attendance and to accomplish these tasks, please locate your name, make any necessary corrections, and initial. If your contact information changes between meetings, please notify Avista as quickly as possible.

**Meeting Etiquette**

Swant explained the meeting etiquette, formal decision-making process, and the 30 minute rule. The MC will be approving a number of Annual Implementation Plans (AIPs) and the group strives to seek consensus approval. If a vote is needed the procedures will be reviewed at the time.

## **Agenda Review and Approval**

Swant reviewed the meeting agenda and reminded members that several informational packets were sent out prior to this meeting. There were no additions or changes to the meeting agenda.

## **FERC Action Summary**

Evans explained that Paragraph 30 of the CFSA requires Avista to keep the MC informed of license compliance items. Avista received two orders since the September MC meeting, the first on October 26, 2016 approving the 2015 Annual Report and the 2016 AIPs. The Annual Threatened and Endangered Species reports required by license articles 432 and 433, which are included in the Annual Report, were also approved. The second order was received on November 18, 2016, approving revised Exhibit F drawings.

## **Consent Mail Package Update**

Swant stated there were no consent mail requests since the September MC meeting.

## **Draft 2016 Clark Fork Annual Report**

Evans noted the draft 2016 Annual Report was mailed to the MC on February 15, 2016. Management Committee members have until March 17, 2017 comment on the draft Annual Report. Keep in mind when submitting formal comments that they will be shared with others and will be included in the FERC filing. The Annual Report is placed on the agenda to allow MC members the opportunity to discuss the report and approve the budget sheet. The MC members reviewed the budget sheet (page 94 of the Annual Report). The final page of the Draft 2016 Annual Report (page 95) had a carryover error, which will not be included in the final version.

Paragraph 22 of the CFSA requires MC approval of the dollars spent on implementation during the previous year, and the amount proposed for expenditure in the current year. The current year requests are handled individually through the AIPs and associated budgets.

Swant requested consensus approval of the revised Annual Report budget sheet showing the amounts spent on implementation in 2016, with the understanding that slight modifications may be made to update the figures as necessary. Any modifications will be included in the final 2016 Annual Report.

***Consensus approval of the budget sheet showing amounts spent on implementation in 2016, with the understanding that slight modifications might be made to update the figure and any modifications will be incorporated into the final annual report.***

## **Grant Writer Report**

Swant described the history behind the creation of the grant writer position and turned the floor to Susan Drumheller for the grant writer report. Drumheller referenced the grant writer handout that was sent to the MC and noted the Watershed Restoration Grant was recently approved for a revised total of \$35,500 in grants received already in 2017.

### **Kaniksu Land Trust Update**

Swant provided a brief history of the relationship between the CFSA and Kaniksu Land Trust (KLT). Regan Plumb provided an update on current CFSA related conservation easements. The Pack River conservation easement, which will provide over 350 acres of protection along the Pack River. KLT finalized a restatement of the Twin Creek conservation easement, adding 100 acres of protection to the area. KLT also closed an acquisition near Heron, Montana utilizing dollars from the CFSA, North American Wetland Conservation Act and a donation by the seller. In addition to protecting important wetland habitat, the property will include a public access/education component. KLT received a 400-acre parcel donation near Grouse Creek. Other community outreach programs that KLT is involved in include the Pine Street Woods Project, BioBlitz, Prescription Park Pilot Project, and the Education Legacy Program.

### **CRMG Update**

#### Appendix R – Clark Fork Heritage Resource Program

Swant explained the CRMG was formed as a result of Appendix R of the CFSA. The CRMG consists of representatives from five tribes, representatives from State Historic Preservation Offices from Idaho and Montana, USFS, and Avista. Lisa Vollertsen provided an update on the CRMG and noted that the annual meeting was canceled due to weather and schedule conflicts and will be rescheduled for this spring. The CRMG members reviewed and approved the Appendix R 2017 Annual Implementation Plan, budget, and project plan for Management Committee review and approval.

*The AIP for Appendix R was approved by consensus.*

### **Water Resources Technical Advisory Committee Update**

Oldenburg provided an update on the WRTAC meetings since the September MC meeting.

#### Other WRTAC Business:

Oldenburg informed the MC that the WRTAC unanimously recommends that the ranking process and criteria are reviewed and updated. Some of the aspects of concern include better defining the types of projects that need to be ranked, updating criteria, developing new criteria for certain types of projects, and making the process retroactive. The request is to form a working group (subgroup of the WRTAC) to review the ranking process for aquatic project plans and provide a revised ranking criteria proposal for MC review.

*The request to form a working group (subgroup of the WRTAC) to review and develop a revised ranking criteria proposal for MC review was approved by consensus.*

Oldenburg explained that there will be an earlier deadline for submitting 2018 project plans (November 1). He described the issues with timing related to project plans and Annual Work Summaries all being due on the same date in December. No concerns were raised regarding the new deadline for submitting project plans.

Oldenburg reminded the MC that the draft Clark Fork River Native Salmonid Restoration Plan Five-Year Plan was updated last year and was tabled until after the CFSA amendment is

finalized. In light of this, and with a potential shift in direction from the management agencies, the 5-year plan will remain tabled.

Oldenburg informed the group that there would be a review of all research and monitoring efforts during 2017. The goals are to ensure monitoring is performed to answer relevant questions and to ensure that research and monitoring is applied and appropriate to the CFSA. In addition, future project plans require a description of what decisions or actions will be informed by research and monitoring activities.

Oldenburg mentioned that because many of the project plans are for continuing and carryover projects, and due to the large number of aquatic project plans, he would only describe new projects, projects that did not receive a consensus recommendation from the WRTAC, and those with post-WRTAC meeting updates. However, he encouraged MC members to ask questions and provide comments on any of the project plans prior to the request for approval within each appendix.

#### Appendix A: Idaho Tributary Habitat Acquisition and Fishery Enhancement Program

Oldenburg explained there are two funds within Appendix A: the Tributary Habitat Acquisition and Enhancement Fund and the Fishery Resource Monitoring, Enhancement, and Management Fund. For this year, Ken Bouwens requested to approximately \$8,000 from the habitat fund for fishery monitoring, enhancement, and management activities. This request is the result of more accurately accounting for funds than has been done in the past. Avista will work with IDFG to develop a long-term solution for MC review at a later date.

Oldenburg provided brief summaries of new project plans and project plans with post-WRTAC meeting updates. Those projects for which there was additional significant discussion are described below.

Oldenburg apologized that the Lightning Creek Large Woody Debris and Recruitment Project was accidentally omitted from the original MC mailing and explained that it was reviewed by the WRTAC and is recommended for approval.

Oldenburg explained that there is sufficient budget remaining with the project proponent to cover the Pack River Temperature Monitoring Project. Thus, the plan is to remove the \$2,500 budget request for 2017 and we will look more closely in future years to ensure only needed dollars are requested. Albright asked if the data is available publicly. Bouwens replied that the data is planned to be public but currently is not. However, it can be made available by request. Tom Herron described an issue with shared databases and questioned the reliability of the data. Bouwens and Herron will continue these discussions following the MC meeting.

Oldenburg explained that there is a post-WRTAC meeting update for the Spring and Mosquito Creeks Pathogen Survey Project. All of the sampling was completed and this year's proposal was to write the associated report. However, after consultation with the pathologist, Bouwens is not convinced the data collected so far tells the entire story related to temperature and sampling, and the inability to detect infectious pancreatic necrosis if it is not actively replicating. The revised proposal for 2017 is to perform another round of sampling to better characterize presence

and absence of infectious pancreatic necrosis relative to temperature. There is sufficient budget remaining to cover this activity so the request of the MC is to increase the scope and possibly extend the due date for completion of the report.

The Idaho Field Station Proposal is a new proposal and was under development in early January and was not reviewed during the WRTAC meeting. This project is phase II of developing a new field station for IDFG to support CFSA activities. Phase I determined that remodeling or rebuilding at the existing site is not a desirable option. Phase II is to conduct an alternatives analysis with regard to new facility locations.

***The AIP for Appendix A including the one-time reallocation of funds, updated budget for the Pack River temperature monitoring project, and increased scope and report timeline for the Spring and Mosquito Creeks Pathogen Survey Project was approved by consensus.***

#### Appendix B: Montana Tributary Habitat Acquisition and Recreational Fishery Enhancement Program

Oldenburg provided brief summaries of new project plans and project plans with post-WRTAC meeting updates. Those projects for which there was additional discussion are described below.

The WRTAC were unable to reach a consensus recommendation for the Managing Aquatic Invasive Plants on Noxon and Cabinet Gorge Reservoirs project. During the WRTAC meeting, MFWP requested and subsequently agreed to clarifying language that treatment would not occur until the alternatives analysis is complete and a course of action agreed to. The language was subsequently clarified and the proposal now has the full recommendation of the WRTAC. The version that was sent out includes the revised language.

Wade Fredenberg asked about the strategy to address invasive species. Hall explained that the alternatives analysis will look at the full spectrum of control options. The Sanders County Aquatic Invasive Species Task Force (Task Force) signed a contract with a consultant and a report should be available in early June. Ryan Roslak asked about biological control of EWM, and if the universities have been brought in for this effort. Hall briefly explained that the current bio-control is done with a native weevil. Unfortunately, the ability to achieve long-term control has not been proven. Mark Deleray stated the MFWP perspective on the issue and the difficulty of applying treatments in moving water, and the need to treat an area numerous times. Hall mentioned that Paul Kusnierz and Jason Blakney are reviewing data from the Task Force to get a better idea of the efficacy of past treatments. Rick Robinson asked if treatment could be done earlier in the year. Hall said he would discuss that with the contractor. The treatment is limited to when flows and turbidity have subsided after run-off. Roslak asked about utilizing low water levels for treatment. Hall stated that he would pass that information along to the contractor as well.

***The AIP for Appendix B was approved by consensus.***

#### Appendix C: Fish Passage/Native Salmonid Restoration Program

Oldenburg provided brief summaries of new project plans and project plans with post-WRTAC meeting updates. Those projects for which there was additional discussion are described below.

Regarding the Tributary Trapping and Downstream Juvenile Bull Trout Transport Program, Oldenburg explained that in the lead-up to the MC meeting, MFWP expressed concern about, and at this time did not support, the transport of what are believed to be stream-resident juvenile Bull Trout from Montana streams to Lake Pend Oreille. Specifically, they were not comfortable with trapping operations in Rock Creek (Task 5), Cooper Gulch (Task 6), and Prospect Creek (Task 8). Thus, there was not a consensus WRTAC recommendation regarding these three tasks. However, the WRTAC did indicate consensus support for all components of this project plan other than tasks 5, 6, and 8.

Following the WRTAC meeting, MFWP met with USFWS regarding these three tasks. The two agencies reached agreement on a management strategy for these three streams during 2017. They agreed that fish should not be transported from Cooper Gulch or Prospect Creek to Lake Pend Oreille. For Cooper Gulch, we will not electrofish and transport juvenile bull trout; and that USFWS will inform FERC of the rationale for departing from the July 21, 2011 FERC Order). For Prospect Creek, the AIT will consider and make recommendation to WRTAC/MC (as needed) on whether or not to salvage fish from dewatered reaches and if so which of four locations will the fish be relocated; LPO, upstream, downstream or Crow Creek. For Rock Creek, in 2017 we plan to continue transporting fish captured in late spring and fall trapping and will make an attempt to move traps to lower reaches of the stream as flows allow to maximize opportunity to capture migrant fish. Oldenburg stated that Avista, USFWS, and MFWP request removal of tasks 6 and 8 from the project plan.

Delaray asked about the potential for installing a passive integrated transponder-tag array in the East Fork Bull River during 2017. Oldenburg said the plan was to evaluate that option, and potentially implement, but that he thought he did not believe there are enough tagged fish in the system to warrant installation during 2017. Fredenberg discussed the program and the changes that will need to happen to more effectively manage resources. Oldenburg added that there will most likely be more suggested changes in these projects in the coming years. Swant noted the data that has been collected over the years is now robust enough to do in depth analysis. And we are utilizing the results of those analyses to make major changes in the programs moving forward.

Oldenburg again mentioned that there is a standing FERC order stating that fish are to be transported from Cooper Gulch to Lake Pend Oreille. Conard will prepare a letter on behalf of the USFWS to FERC addressing the Order, which was at the behest of the USFWS.

***The project plan for the Tributary Trapping and Downstream Juvenile Bull Trout Transport Program with tasks 6 and 8 removed was approved by consensus.***

Swant provided an update on the Cabinet Gorge Dam permanent fish passage facility (CGFPF). The modified design includes a change from pumps in the tailrace to a siphon water supply originating in the forebay and to a two-chamber design to replace the 16-step pool ladder. Swant discussed the bidding and value engineering process. When the alternatives were discussed, Swant ensured that the Design Review Team (DRT) approved basis of design criteria were followed. Currently, a 30% alternative design is close to completion and 100% design is expected to be completed in July 2017.

CFSA amendment (amendment) update: Swant explained the November 2, 2016 MC meeting stakeholders were in agreement on the majority of the amendment language with the exception of Section 2.4. The November 2 meeting minutes were sent out for review and a number of comments were conflicting with others' views of the meeting. Swant proposed packaging all of the comments and edits from stakeholders into a PDF and using that as the meeting minute summary to get past the issues that arose from the review of the meeting minutes. Roslak asked who determines if the CGFPF is working. Swant described the monitoring and evaluation plan was created in 2014 to evaluate the success of the CGFPF, and noted a subgroup of the MC would be convened to ensure the appropriate numbers of fish are captured and transported. The plan contains a contingency to address if the number of fish captured does not match expectations, current methods may be used to increase the number of fish available for transport.

Swant stated the only unresolved portion of the CFSA amendment is Section 2.4 and there have been a number of changes made to that section over the years.

Based on discussion with the USFWS Swant proposed tabling the amendment and reconvening the DRT to review the alternative design. Afterwards, the MC will recommence the amendment process. Ben Conard noted the USFWS concerns and the desire for ensuring that the CGFPF is effective and watching the uses of fishways like this in other systems. At issue is adaptive management and finding a balance between an open-ended requirement of Avista for future CGFPF modifications, versus no commitment for future modifications. Right now, no one knows what future modifications could feasibly be or what they might cost. The USFWS is seeking expertise from a FWS engineer in FWS Region 5. The engineer has reviewed fishways that have worked with similar fish species. Fredenberg suggested asking who would like to be a part of the DRT moving forward in this process. Swant asked if other parties would like to be involved. Ray Entz asked about the type of meetings, length, and location. Swant described prior DRT meetings and thought one full day meeting should be sufficient, with the possibility of an additional follow-up meetings if necessary. Roslak, Corsi, Herron, and Deleray were interested in being part of the DRT. John Gubel, Norm Merz, and Entz noted that a member from their organizations would be involved.

Nash asked how the design could be retrofitted if the fishway doesn't work as expected. Swant said and it depends what is causing the trap not to function as intended and discussed how the design already includes a fair amount of flexibility to minimize the need for modification. Roslak asked when the amendment could be ready MC review. Swant said he hopes that the amendment will be in front of the MC for approval this year. Swant reminded the group that after the CFSA amendment is approved by the MC there is still a FERC License amendment, numerous permits, and other actives that need to take place prior to commencing construction. Chip Corsi reiterated that all MC parties were invited to join the DRT, and if a member/agency opts to not participate of the subcommittee, they must be okay with the decisions made and that the DRT members participate throughout the entire process.

When the USFWS engineer is available, a DRT meeting will be scheduled.

Fredenberg asked about wording on page 2 of the Fish Capture Facilities Operation, Development, and Testing project plan related to when the DRT approved moving forward with the alternative CGFPF design. Swant and Oldenburg will check that language and make the appropriate change.

***The AIP for Appendix C with one minor modification to the Fish Capture Facilities Operation, Development, and Testing Project Plan was approved by consensus. (Note: the project plan for the Tributary Trapping and Downstream Juvenile Bull Trout Transport Program was separately approved.)***

Appendix D: Bull Trout Protection and Public Education Project

Oldenburg provided brief summaries of the Appendix D project plans. Those projects for which there was additional discussion are described below.

Roslak expressed concern with Bull Trout take and the lack of Bull Trout awareness signage at marinas located on the east end of LPO (i.e., Whiskey Rock). Corsi noted the concern and will speak with his team regarding the issue. IDFG discussed the concept of a catch and release tournament for Bull Trout in LPO however noted this was just a concept and a lot more discussion, and as well as approval of the USFWS, would be needed prior such an event.

Albright raised a question regarding the budget language to ensure it was correct. Oldenburg explained the budget and answered Albright's question. The cost-share of a new patrol boat for the Montana warden was mentioned as an addition to the project plan.

***The AIP for Appendix D, as written, was approved by consensus.***

Appendix E: Watershed Councils Program

Oldenburg noted that a lot of good work is being conducted under the watershed council programs.

***The AIP for Appendix E, as written, was approved by consensus.***

Appendix F1: Clark Fork River water Quality Monitoring Program

Kusnierz noted the project proposal funding request was \$35,931; however, only \$30,355 are currently available. He explained that this budget shortfall has occurred numerous times in the past and the difference has been funded by other appendices. Kusnierz proposed modifying the 2017 funding request to reflect what is actually available. Following the MC meeting, he will work with the appropriate stakeholders to determine the course of action for 2017 to reduce costs and operate within the available budget, grant funding opportunities, or consent mail request to request funding from Appendix F5.

***The AIP for Appendix F1 with the modified budget was approved by consensus.***

Appendix F2: Monitoring of Noxon Reservoir Stratification and Mobilization of Sediment Nutrients/Metals

Kusnierz explained that this PM&E calls for three sampling events to evaluate whether



sediments and associated metals and nutrients are being remobilized into the water column during periods of reservoir stratification. The first two sampling events were conducted in 2000 and 2001. Following the second event, Montana DEQ requested we hold off for a number of years prior to conducting the third and final round of sampling. Now that 16 years have passed, Avista would like to be prepared so that if we experience the right conditions, we can conduct the final round of sampling. During the WRTAC meeting, some parties expressed interest in making sure the final round of sampling is conducted during a year in which conditions are extreme in terms of expecting a strong stratification and low dissolved oxygen concentrations at depth (as opposed to sampling when the minimum conditions are met). Thus, the WRTAC would like to form a working group to determine if a refined criteria is needed to trigger the final sampling event, and, if so, define those criteria. Kusnierz requested that if any members would like to be part of that working group, they let him know by March 30. The working group will develop a plan by June 15 and submit the draft plan for MC review through a consent mail request if the recommendation is to change the criteria.

***The AIP for Appendix F2, as written, was approved by consensus.***

Appendix F3: Aquatic Organism Tissue Analysis

Kusnierz explained that no work is scheduled to be conducted during 2017 and the 2015 mercury report is expected to be finalized by May.

***The AIP for Appendix F3, as written, was approved by consensus.***

Appendix F4: Water Quality Protection and Monitoring Plan for Maintenance, Construction, and Emergency Activities and Appendix T: Project Operations Package

Oldenburg described appendices F4 and T and noted the AIPs are similar to previous years and all costs incurred are borne by Avista.

***The AIPs for appendices F4 and T, as written, were approved by consensus.***

Other:

Swant informed the MC of a five-day outage at Cabinet Gorge Dam is planned for September to preform required maintenance and upgrades. The outage may require variances from the general operating conditions defined in the CFSA, however, it is too early in the process to make that determination. If a variance in general operating conditions is required, Avista will follow the procedures of the Water Quality Protection and Monitoring Plan. This event may provide a good opportunity to conduct projects along the reservoir that require low flow and/or reservoir drawdowns (e.g., boat ramp improvements).

Appendix F5: Dissolved Gas Supersaturation Control, Mitigation, and Monitoring

Oldenburg provided brief summaries of the new Appendix F5 project plans and project plans with post-WRTAC meeting updates. Those projects for which there was additional discussion are described below.

Oldenburg informed the MC that the WRTAC did not reach a consensus recommendation regarding the Y-maze study. He explained that Avista believes this is interesting research with a

sound study design; however, it is not applied research with regard to the CFSA and should not be funded through the CFSA. Oldenburg explained that the proposal includes addressing passage primarily at two facilities: Albeni Falls and Cabinet Gorge. However, this research is not consistent with the current plan for CGFPF. The CGFPF has not been built and we do not know if there will be passage problems after construction. The plan for Cabinet Gorge is to build the facility, test the facility, and if problems are identified, targeted research and development will be used to address the problems. Regarding improving passage at Albeni Falls is a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers project and it would not be appropriate for Avista customers to fund work specific to a public project.

Entz noted that this is proposed as a cost-share project and the Kalispel Tribe see this as an effort to help improve fish passage in general. Swant described previous projects that have taken place researching pheromones (which were inconclusive), and noted that results based on lab-scale flows may not be applicable to a real-world application. If any problems are identified with the CGFPF, they will be addressed in a targeted and site-specific manner. Fredenberg asked what stage they were at with Bull Trout testing. Andy Dux described that IDFG originally requested starting with Brook Trout and then move on to Bull Trout after the Brook Trout study was complete. Dux explained that the project would continue with or without CFSA funding; however, the project scope would likely decrease without CFSA funding. Corsi stated that IDFG agrees with Avista that this research project is not appropriate for CFSA funding.

Swant called for a vote regarding this project plan. There was a long pause when the vote got to Roslak and Oldenburg asked the MC members if they felt like they had enough information to vote on this issue. Roslak indicated that he would like more information prior to voting. Oldenburg stated that Avista had a few additional concerns with the project proposal. Oldenburg explained concerns regarding the lab-to-field application and that numerous aspects of the research cannot be applied in the field even if the lab study demonstrated successful attraction. Oldenburg also stated that even with the cost share, cost for the project proposal was a concern. Avista has personnel and the fish handling and holding facility, similar research could be conducted specific to Cabinet Gorge site conditions and at a reduced cost.

Swant explained the MC voting process and requested MC members vote to approve the Y-maze project proposal.

Ben Conard: No  
Norm Merz: Yes  
Les Evarts: No  
Tony Cox: Yes  
Howard Bakke: Yes  
Ryan Roslak: No  
Jim Nash: No  
Rick Robinson: No  
Loren Albright: No  
Chip Corsi: No  
Ray Entz: Yes  
Mark Deleray: No

John Gubel: No  
Tom Herron: No  
Tim Swant: No

***The Y-maze project proposal was not supported by the MC and will be removed from the 2017 AIP and associated budget.***

Entz requested that Avista get in touch with the Y-maze project proponents to explain why the proposal was not approved and to provide suggested guidelines for future project proposals. Oldenburg agreed to follow-up with the project proponents.

Regarding the Bull Trout demography study, Oldenburg explained that the project proponent (IDFG) submitted a proposal in November but then removed the proposal from the packet at the WRTAC meeting because they had recently hired a biometrician and wanted time to evaluate whether he could play a role in this study. Subsequently, IDFG identified a role for the biometrician and resubmitted the proposal for MC review. Fredenberg pointed out that the project plan was not discussed at the WRTAC meeting and that we should be careful inserting projects for MC approval that have not been vetted by the WRTAC. Oldenburg acknowledged this concern; however, the WRTAC reviewed and ranked. The proposal was removed by the proponent after the WRTAC meeting. No additional concerns were raised regarding the project plan and the AIP summary and associated budget will be revised accordingly.

Bouwens pointed out that the project plan for the adfluvial Westslope Cutthroat Trout potential study was withdrawn at the WRTAC meeting, but there is a work summary that is noted in the work product section of this AIP summary that needs to be removed.

Guy Paul provided an update on the Gas Supersaturation Control Program and total dissolved gas (TDG) abatement project. Paul testing done on spillway bays 4 and 5 at Cabinet Gorge Dam and were successful in mitigating TDG. Paul described the work that will be performed on spillway bays 1 and, which would raise the design capacity from 20,000 cfs to 34,000 cfs. The work is expected to be completed in May or June. Swant explained the reason for moving forward with TDG abatement at Cabinet Gorge Dam to ensure that this is done in case of an 80,000 cfs flow event, which is needed to properly test the abatement structures. This information is key to defining the long-term mitigation in 2018 as called for in the Gas Supersaturation Control Plan addendum.

***The AIP for Appendix F5, with minor corrections to the work products in the AIP summary and Bull Trout demography study and excluding the Y-maze study was approved by consensus.***

#### **Terrestrial Resources Technical Advisory Committee Update**

Hall provided an overview of the terrestrial AIPs and introduced Jason Pignanelli as Avista's new Recreation and Land Use Specialist.

#### **Appendix G: Implementation of Land Use Management Plan (LUMP)**

Hall described this appendix and that he is looking forward to having Pignanelli on staff to help with implementation. Hall gave a high-level description of the Appendix, including approving

funding for Sanders County Aquatic Invasive Species Task Force. Hall noted that the budget is estimated and provided explanation that if legal issues arise throughout the year that Avista is obligated to pay the cost.

***The AIP for Appendix G, as written, was approved by consensus.***

Appendix H: Implementation of the Recreation Resource Management Plan (RRMP)

Hall described this overall goals of this appendix and the various components. Hall noted that the recreation resource facility development plan contains more projects than most likely can be accomplished in the construction season. This is set up to help ensure that if a project is delayed, another project can be implemented.

Operation and Maintenance of Recreation Facilities

Noted an increase in the budget to reflect an increase in the cost for MFWP personnel to manage Flat Iron Ridge and Thompson Falls State Park recreation sites.

***The AIP for Appendix H, as written, was approved by consensus.***

Appendix I: Implementation of the Aesthetics Management Plan

Hall described this appendix and components. There may be some opportunity during the year to conduct vegetation management at certain viewpoints to enhance the view.

***The AIP for Appendix I, as written, was approved by consensus.***

Appendix J: Implementation of the Wildlife, Botanical and Wetland Management Plan

Hall described this appendix and components, noting the changes in the Annual Report. With the removal of the appendices N1-N3 (bald eagle, peregrine falcon, and common loon). These observations will be included in the annual work summary associated with this PM&E.

***The AIP for Appendix J, as written, was approved by consensus.***

Appendix K: Wildlife Habitat Acquisition, Enhancement and Management Program

Albright asked about the management plan for the Twin Creek acquisition. Hall said that the plan is in the works and there is discussion with IDFG regarding the public access, and noted that help from Trout Unlimited will be needed to ensure sustainable public use of the area, and ensuring that the area is safely managed. Hall described the process of how committees are formed, stakeholders who wish to be involved with the process are welcome. The draft plan will be sent to the MC for review and approval through a consent mail request.

Wood Duck Re-vegetation and Maintenance

Brita Olson described the re-vegetation work being conducted and the desire to complete the job and provide for ongoing maintenance at the Wood Duck site.

Pack River Conservation Easement

Hall reminded the MC that this project has been reported on for the past couple years, and recently finalized the acquisition cost-share for the conservation easement. The Natural

Resource and Conservation Service grant program is providing ½ of the acquisition cost, the private landowner is donating ¼ of the value, and the request is for the CFSA to provide the remaining ¼.

*The AIP for Appendix K, as written, was approved by consensus.*

Appendix L: Black Cottonwood Habitat Protection and Enhancement

Hall described this project and the background on the Appendix. Albright asked if there has been growth outside of the fence. Hall said there has been very little growth outside of the enclosures. The 2017 proposal includes construction of two new enclosures at the Hereford Slough site and is based on the success of the enclosure that was built in 2014.

*The AIP for Appendix L, as written, was approved by consensus.*

Appendix M: Wetland Protection and Enhancement Program

Hall described this project and the background of the appendix. Based on concerns of potential negative impacts to the springs that feed into the mainstem Bull River, the proposed enhancement project on the Bull River Wildlife Management Area will no longer be pursued. Two potential projects, a wetland habitat acquisition and potential wetland enhancement on the newly acquired Twin Creek parcel will be investigated.

Cox asked about the work on the Clark Fork Delta. Hall replied that the work approved by consent mail through Appendix K last fall, will be completed this spring. The work entails placing larger rip-rap on the outer breakwater area to provide added protection to the site. Albright asked about addressing the rest of the Clark Fork Delta. Hall responded that future work is contingent upon receiving Bonneville Power Administration funding.

*The AIP for Appendix M, as written, was approved by consensus.*

Appendix P: Timber Habitat Protection and Enhancement

Hall explained the goal of this appendix is to provide for protection and enhancement of specific forest habitat parcels along the reservoirs. Work efforts for 2017 will be similar to past years and include: continuing the block management program on Tuscor, Genesis, and Wood Duck properties, continuing incorporation of CRMG interests into the Copper Flats Management Plan and administering the controlled access of Stevens Creek Point, and one potential timber stand improvement project located along the shoreline near Trout Creek. Hall reminded the MC that all proceeds from timber activities will be reinvested into this PM&E.

Robinson asked about the budget discrepancy budgets portrayed in the text vs. the budget sheet. Hall replied the budget sheet is correct and the text will be revised accordingly.

*The AIP for Appendix P, noting the minor revision, was approved by consensus.*

#### Appendix Q: Reservoir Island Protection

Hall stated that the purpose of this PM&E is to protect Avista-owned islands through the implementation of the Land Use Management Plan. There is no budget associated with this PM&E for 2017, as all activities will be covered by Appendix G.

*The AIP for Appendix Q, as written, was approved by consensus.*

#### Appendix S: Erosion Fund and Shoreline Stabilization Guidelines Program

Hall described the purpose of this program and noted the backlog of projects that have been in the queue. As such the focus will be on completing these projects with no new projects proposed for 2017.

*The AIP for Appendix S, as written, was approved by consensus.*

#### **Other Business**

The fall WRTAC and TRTAC meetings are scheduled for September 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup>. The fall MC meeting will occur on September 26-27, 2017.

Swant reminded the group that they have until March 17, 2017 to submit comments on the Annual Report and the final report is due to FERC by April 15, 2017.

Rolask asked about the recent discovery of invasive mussels in Montana. Deleray and discussed issues with boats moving throughout the state and country, and described the work going on in Montana. Deleray described the push for inspections and the budget increasing from one million to five million dollars to help stop the spread of aquatic invasive species; including mandatory decontamination of boats. Additional boat check stations, longer operation hours, and increased enforcement personnel will be implemented to help ensure all boats are inspected.

Swant thanked everyone for participating and adjourned the meeting at 2:55 pm.