

Sign Sheet

INTERNAL
CO150018
ENV. ASSES.

	Name	Agency	phone	email
1.	Luci Malin	DOG M	801 538 5323	luciamalin@utah.gov
2	Pam Jewkes	USFS-Manti	435-636-3510	pjewkes@fs.fed.us
3	Katherine Foster	USFS	435-636-3503	kfoster01@fs.fed.us
4	LEROY MEAD	UDWR	435-636-0274	LEROYMEAD@UTAH.GOV
5	Jerrann Ernstsen	DOG M	801 538 5214	Jerrannernstsen@utah.gov Jason.a.gipson@
6	Jason Gipson	Corps of Engineers	801-295-8380 x22	usace.army.mil
7	Terry Nelson	USFS-Manti	435-636-3578	tnelson@fs.fed.us diane.whittington@
8	Diana Whittington	USFWS	801-975-3330 x129	fw.gov
9	Michael Hudson	UDWR	435-259-3781	michaelhudson@utah.gov
10	Daron Haddock	DOG M	801 538-5325	daron.haddock@utah.gov
11	Bill Bates	UDWR	435-636-0262	billbates@utah.gov
12	Susan White	DOG M	801 184-4217	susanwhite@utah.gov
13	PATRICK D. COLLINS	MT. NEBO SCIENTIFIC	801 489 6437	mt.nebo@xmission.com
14	Guy Davis	ENvest Mining	435-687-4711	guy.davis@pacificcorp.com
15	CHUCK SENBORSKI	ENERGY WEST	435-687-4720	CHUCK.SENBORSKI@PACIFICCORP.COM
16	Carter Reed	USFS, Price	435-636-3547	creed01@fs.fed.us
17	Jim Smith	UDOG M	801-538-5262	jimsmith@utah.gov
18	Priscilla Burton	UDOG M SLC	801 538-5288	priscilla.burton@utah.gov
19.	Daren Rasmussen	State Engineers Office - Stream Alt	801-538-7377	darenrasmussen@utah.gov
20	Wayne Western	DOG M	801-538-5263	WayneWestern@utah.gov

Rilda Stream Restoration Meeting
Springville DWR
May 11, 2004
12:30 to 2:30

1. Introductions ...Luci.....5 minutes
2. Overview of planned Stream Relocation15 minutes
 - Power Point presentation
 - What is the plan?
3. Stream Alteration10 minutes
 - 404 permit by Army Corp. of Engineers
 - What is involved?
4. Stream Morphology.....20 minutes
 - Entrenchment
 - Width/Depth Ratio
 - Sinuosity
 - Channel Materials
 - Slope
5. Stream Restoration.....30 minutes
 - Morphology
 - Hydrologic flow regime
 - Stability
 - Soils
 - Vegetation
 - Biota
 - Mechanics
6. Enhancement/Mitigation.....30 minutes
7. Summary.....10 minutes

**Rilda Biology Meeting
Springville DWR
May 11, 2004
9:30 to 11:30**

1. Introductions ...Luci.....15 minutes
2. Define and Quantify Biological Impacts45 minutes
 - Mammals
 - Large mammals
 - Small mammals
 - Fish
 - Amphibians
 - Birds
 - Raptors
 - Song
 - Migratory
 - Reptiles
 - Mollusks
 - Insects
 - Macroinvertebrates
 - Vegetation
 - Upland
 - Riparian
3. Potential Mitigation Measures60 minutes
 - Mammals
 - Large mammals
 - Small mammals
 - Fish
 - Amphibians
 - Birds
 - Raptors
 - Song
 - Migratory
 - Reptiles
 - Mollusks
 - Insects
 - Macroinvertebrates
 - Vegetation
 - Upland
 - Riparian
4. Summary.....10 minutes

Rilda Meetings, Meeting 1 - Biological Issues; Meeting 2 Hydrologic and Stream Issues
 May 11, 2004
 Springville DWR Conference Center

Attending:

Meeting 1, Biological Issues:	
Bill Bates, DWR Patrick Collins, Mt. Nebo Scientific Guy Davis, Energy West Jerriann Ernsten DOGM Katherine Foster, Forest Service Jason Gipson, Army Corps of Engin Daron Haddock, DOGM Mike Hudson, DWR	Pam Jewkes, Forest Service Luci Malin, DOGM Leroy Mead, DWR Terry Nelson, Forest Service Carter Reed, Forest Service Chuck Semborski, Energy West Susan White, DOGM Diana Whittington, US Fish & Wildlife Ser
Meeting 2, Hydrologic Issues and Stream Restoration	
Priscilla Burton Patrick Collins, Mt. Nebo Scientific Guy Davis, Energy West Jerriann Ernsten DOGM Katherine Foster, Forest Service Jason Gipson, Army Corps of Engin Daron Haddock, DOGM Mike Hudson, DWR Pam Jewkes, Forest Service Luci Malin, DOGM	Leroy Mead, DWR Terry Nelson, Forest Service Daren Rasmussen, Div Water Rights Carter Reed, Forest Service Chuck Semborski, Energy West Jim Smith, DOGM Susan White, DOGM Diana Whittington, US Fish & Wildlife Ser Wayne Western, DOGM

Opened with short PowerPoint
 Introductions - round table

Biological issues

1. Ungulates

Elk - the main concern - need ½ mile buffer
 water is the main issue, then space, then forage
 1 cow AUM = 1.9 elk
 telemetry studies could be worth while

Mitigation ideas

- 1) finding a willing seller and buy grazing permit – then hold it open for wildlife or grass bank
- 2) private land in Millfork - could be bought and then turn it over for management by DWR, or USFS and closing Millfork off to other uses

- 3) SITLA timber harvest on East Mountain – if that could be purchased then that area could be stopped from road building and logging and that area could be dedicated to the elk
- 4) Prescribed burns to regenerate Aspen
More study needed: Ungulate Mitigation Committee created:
USFS – Kelly Reynolds
DWR – Leroy
DOGM - Jerriann and Susan – DOGM
- 5) Previous mitigation promised by mine in 1995 needs to be remitigated if lost because of this project

Cumulative impacts are defined as past, present and future and for all resources
All other mineral activity that could take place there – oil and gas leases, must be analysed

2. Small mammals

spotted bats and Townsend's big eared bats, there is a bat study in the MRP
red, gray squirrels, wood rats

3. Impacts to fish - likely no fish in Rilda, macro survey to confirm

Mitigations could be construction of barriers to protect cut throat, stream enhancement, riparian enhancement. Effects downstream on other natives – problem is the native fish are getting caught in native habitats between diversions, maybe removal of diversions down stream blue head sucker

Biggest concern: spills during operation, runoff, protect water quality

Need to suggest to County that road be designed to eliminate runoff

Any fish habitat mitigation needs to be part of a larger comprehensive plan

4. Macroinvertebrates

DWR will do macroinvertebrate survey. No additional surveys needed.

5. Herpes

1. Amphibians – DWR is surveying whole San Rafael drainage. Boreal toad and boreal chorus frog. Increased traffic will be an impact. Noise is the main problem, need to work on it. DWR and USFS. Mitigation would be production of stream, wetland, riparian acres.

2. Reptiles - Aquatics Section at DWR responsible. Bill Bates said all they will do is a road kill survey and that should suffice.

3. Mollusks and insects will be done with amphibian survey

4. Insects will be done with amphibian survey

6. Birds

1. Raptors –

Golden eagle is biggest concern, plus Coopers hawk as well as goshawk, flammulated owl, coopers, red tails, sharp chins. Terry will do surveys in June.

2. Mexican Spotted Owl not a concern according to Terry.

3. Migratory birds

Terry said potential for a variety, warblers, sparrows, hummingbirds – Utah Partners in Flight. Look at Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC) list. May need point counts and nest searches with in project area. Contact Jimmy Parrish for consultant list

7. Riparian Impacts

Improve the riparian area in the lower part of the canyon that would be an offsite mitigation. DWR- look at linear feet of stream. 3 to 1 for riparian mitigation. Probably would be 1500 feet of stream, plus 3 to 4 acres. Would need to raise the water table to get cottonwoods to come back.

Army Corps stated: need to maintain or increase the function value – downstream first, look elsewhere next. Creation, enhancement and/or preservation in that order.

BREAK

After Lunch - Meeting # 2 Hydrology

Bill Bates left; 4 people arrived: Darrin Rasmussen Division of Water Rights, Priscilla Burton DOGM, Jim Smith DOGM, Wayne Western DOGM

Army Corps will issue 404 permit, State Water Rights will review the Corps' application and sign off on it.

Division of Water Quality should be included in the whole process. Kent Montague, Price Div of Water Quality.

Army Corps process– this will be treated as permanent impact because there aren't 25 year permits. In 15 or 20 years there would be another permit. If requested to be a cooperating agency Army would be – then permit would be done at same time as NEPA – if not Army will do their own decision document. Appeal process on both wetland delineation and permit. From the date of application – 120 days (includes 30 day comment period). All comments then need to be addressed.

1. Stream Morphology

Move 1500 feet of stream for 15 years, and then move back into pre-existing channel. Baseline data collection should include photo documentation of the stream with current flow data. Patrick Collins will document all and have it go hand and hand with the wetland delineation.

Westridge experimental practice will be evaluated this summer

2. Enhancement

Control sediment – put culvert in, then transfer water and reverse the process to take it out

3. Return to Mitigation Discussion

purchase private land, no trailing, buy up grazing permits, create a preserve

Army Corps uses a in lieu fee program – calculate what it costs to recreate that use in that area - its about \$90,000 an acre. Check UDOT, NRCS, Ducks Unlimited for data

Ratios

Preservation – 10 to 1

Creation 2 to 1

Enhancement 5 to 1

In Lieu fee – 2 to 1

Revegetation enhancement would be separate species mix for hydrics, then one for riparian, then containerized