



**NORTHWEST POWER AND CONSERVATION  
 COUNCIL**  
**April 15-16, 2008**

While there were no reported bass or bear sightings, fish and wildlife dominated the Council’s agenda in Whitefish, Montana. The region now has an official resource adequacy standard, adopted unanimously by the Council, and reps from Flathead Electric Cooperative described their pursuit of conservation and renewable resources to meet a growing load. The Council began laying a plan to deal with the enormous volume of proposed amendments to its fish and wildlife program and sketched out a series of work sessions over the next several months. Next meeting: May 13-15 in Walla Walla, WA.

**IN THIS ISSUE**

---

Flathead Puts Priority on Efficiency .....	1
Resource Adequacy Standard: Our New “Smoke Alarm” .....	3
F&W Amendments: The 3,700-Page Crunch.....	4
Proposals for F&W Run Deep and Wide.....	6
Project Review Starts with a Walk on the Wild(life) Side .....	10

---

**THE AGENDA**



**Flathead Puts  
 Priority on  
 Efficiency**

Ross Holter, Flathead Electric Cooperative’s (FEC’s) director of energy services, briefed the Council on the co-op’s renewable energy and conservation program. While technically exempt from Montana’s renewable portfolio standard (RPS) law, FEC has launched a substantial effort to pursue and implement the legislature’s intent with Senate Bill 415, he said.

FEC started as a co-op in 1937 and purchased PacifiCorp’s local territory in 1999, adding about 35,000 customers to its existing 10,000, Holter explained. Melding a rural co-op and an investor-owned utility is an interesting story in itself, he noted. Today, FEC has 47,000 members, serves 63,000 meters, and is growing at a rate of about 2,000 meters per year, Holter said.

FEC is a full requirements customer of BPA, and 2 megawatts of its BPA purchase is Environmentally Preferred Power (EPP), the cost of which is included in the rates for all co-op customers, he said. According to a handout, FEC also offers a voluntary renewable energy program for \$5.00 per month, in which about 400 members participate.

For FEC, the benchmarks under the RPS law are 5 percent or 8.7 average megawatts (MWa) by 2008; 10 percent or 18.4 MWa by 2010; and 15 percent or 30.6 MWa by 2015, Holter explained. It's difficult to achieve those milestones given transmission and cost issues, he acknowledged.

The crux of FEC's program, according to Holter, is a mandate adopted by the co-op's board to "pursue and implement Montana's renewable portfolio standard in a responsible manner" and to "maintain existing, and pursue and implement additional energy conservation programs in a responsible manner." For conservation, that means offering a number of options, from programs to promote Energy Star appliances, energy-efficient electric water heaters, and compact fluorescent lights to commercial lighting programs, Energy Smart Grocer, and customized measures with industrial customers, he explained. We look at anything legitimate that companies want to pursue in energy efficiency, Holter added.

In its strategic planning for 2008, FEC's board supported a more proactive approach for conservation in the future, he said. We are considering additional staff to conduct home energy audits, to promote weatherization incentives and site-built efficient construction, and to be overall more aggressive with existing programs, Holter indicated.

Along with the EPP purchase from BPA and the voluntary renewables option, he said. FEC has a member-friendly net metering policy for solar energy and a solar demonstration project installed at the co-op so customers can see firsthand what is entailed. Holter acknowledged that FEC does not see much potential for wind or solar on its system and has more research to do on

geothermal and micro hydro. But there is promise for cogeneration with two large wood-products firms, and a landfill gas project is well along in the planning, he said. We are actively working on developing those projects, Holter added.

Overall, conservation and energy efficiency have to be our top priority, he said. When it comes to renewables, we are looking at things that are readily available, reliable, and cost-effective, and "we keep the ratepayer in mind" when we consider the options, Holter stated.

"We're about to pull the trigger" on our landfill gas project, he continued. The co-op hired an engineering firm experienced in such projects and is working with the Flathead County Solid Waste District to bring a generator online, Holter explained. We applied for funding through a sale of Clean Renewable Energy Bonds (CREBs) and received an award in January 2008, he reported. Repayment starts in December 2008, and we're on a fast track for design, development, and construction of the project, Holter said.

#### Landfill Offers Fuel

Steve Hamilton of SCS Energy described the feasibility study his company conducted for a generating project at the Flathead County landfill. He explained that as landfill waste decomposes, it generates gas that is about 50 percent methane. Methane can be used as a fuel source to generate power, Hamilton said.

The landfill currently has a partial extraction system for gas and a blower/flare station, he explained. FEC has secured \$3.5 million in CREBs financing for the power project, and the county is interested in working with the co-op to develop a project at the site, Hamilton said.

SCS came in to estimate the amount of recoverable landfill gas, recommend a project capacity and configuration, estimate the project cost and cost of power, develop a preliminary schedule, and estimate greenhouse gas reductions, he continued. The current capacity is 233 cubic feet per minute (cfm) at the landfill, and the current potential is 366 cfm, Hamilton reported. It takes 270 cfm for an 800-kilowatt generator and 540 cfm for two 800-kW units or one 1.6-MW unit, he said. By 2016, when more solid waste has been deposited at the site, the potential will be 539 cfm, Hamilton added.

He laid out two equipment options considered for the landfill, noting that Clean Air Act standards affected the choices available. As for capital costs, Hamilton said it will take \$450,000 to develop the well field at the site; for the power facility, costs vary from \$3.2 million to \$3.6 million, depending on the option. The power costs for either option are “within noise” of each other, he reported: 5.14 cents per kilowatt-hour (kWh) and 5.3 cents per kWh.

FEC expects to get a notice from the county to proceed with the project by April 30, to be followed by conceptual design and permit applications by July 1, Hamilton continued. If the permits are issued and the generating equipment is delivered by September 1, the project could be producing power by the end of February 2009, he said.

SCS also calculated the greenhouse gas reductions and potential for revenue from selling voluntary emission reduction (VER) credits, Hamilton explained. Methane is a greenhouse gas that is 21 times more potent than carbon dioxide because it has higher infrared absorption capacity, he said. The FEC project has the potential to reduce emissions by 485,000 VERs, and those could potentially be sold, Hamilton said.

Depending on the price, VERs could generate \$1.6 million in revenue over 16 years, he stated.

Council chairman Bill Booth asked what percent of FEC’s load the landfill project would meet. Holter said it is a very small amount – about 1 MW of FEC’s 180-MW load. Our current cost of power from BPA is about 3.5 cents per kWh, and our retail rate at FEC is 5.7 cents, he said. But in the renewable world, this project pencils out well, Holter added.

FEC’s general manager Ken Sugden pointed out that no new transmission will need to be built. The project can feed directly into our distribution system, he said.



### **Resource Adequacy Standard: Our New “Smoke Alarm”**

Tom Karier said the Council, BPA, and others have worked for over two years to devise a resource adequacy standard that can serve as an early warning system to alert the region when resource development drops to dangerously low levels relative to demand. Staffer John Fazio explained how the Pacific Northwest Resource Adequacy Forum was created, how it developed the standard, and modifications made to the draft proposal as a result of comments received. The biggest change, he said, was changing the word “target” to “threshold.”

The standard addresses both energy and capacity and has three appendices, according to Fazio. One deals with current assumptions, the second explains implementation, and the third summarizes the standard and process used to develop it “in clear English,” he noted.

Mary Johannes of BPA said it is a “dynamic” standard in that its assumptions will be revisited periodically. Paul Norman of BPA explained the genesis of the standard in connection with power sales contracts and BPA’s changing role in meeting public utility loads. We thought we needed a standard and a metric to assess the adequacy of the Northwest’s power supply, he said. The process to develop this has been good, and we hope you will approve it, Norman told the Council.

Karier said what the region has come up with is a level of minimum adequacy, and “if we fall below it, we know we have a problem.” He said he thinks of the standard as “a smoke alarm – when it goes off, you want a loud alarm that gets people’s attention right away.” In the next power plan, we will be looking at other measures of reliability beyond this, Karier pointed out.

Melinda Eden thanked all who worked to develop the standard and noted that the Power Committee voted unanimously to approve it. She cited as a key message this language in Appendix C to the standard: “The Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee and BPA amass utility planning information and produce regional assessments of loads and resources. These tabulations have a different purpose than the resource adequacy standard – they address utilities’ need to acquire prudent amounts of new resources not the bare minimum necessary to keep the lights on. It would be a misapplication of the adequacy standard to infer that utilities should slow down their resource acquisition activity because the adequacy standard is already being met.”

Karier moved to approve the resource adequacy standard. Eden seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.



### **F&W Amendments: The 3,700-Page Crunch**

The Council kicked off its first work session on proposals to amend the Columbia River Basin fish and wildlife (F&W) program with encouragement from staffer Tony Grover to “take the process by the horns and direct it.” Staff is your resource for the process, so tell us what you need, he said. Grover announced that Patty O’Toole is the “content lead” and Lynn Palensky is the “process lead” for the program amendments.

O’Toole said the Council received 65 sets of recommendations, which contained “a lot of good material.” The submissions came from a representative group of interests in the region, including 14 tribes, one tribal coordinating entity, four states, and eight federal agencies, with the remainder from local and other government and non-government organizations, businesses, and individuals, she reported. The submissions totaled over 3,700 pages, not including reference materials, and all have been posted on our website, according to O’Toole, who noted that the public can submit comments on the recommendations via the site. The comment period is open until June 12, she said.

The recommendations cover a broad range of issues, and staff prepared a table with a very brief summary of each submission, O’Toole explained. Among the issues, she listed the following:

- Federal Columbia River Power System (FCRPS) Biological Opinion (BiOp) and how to address it in the F&W program
- Memorandums of Agreement (MOAs) between federal agencies and the tribes and how they relate
- Recovery plans and whether to incorporate them
- Implementation plans for parts of the program not covered by the BiOp or draft MOAs
- Project selection and independent science reviews
- Biological objectives and the monitoring and evaluation framework
- Invasive species, climate change, and toxics – relatively new topics for the program.

O’Toole pointed out that BiOps on the FCRPS, Upper Snake, and harvest will be coming out in May, and the Willamette BiOp will be issued later this summer. We will need to delve into them and see how they fit with the Council’s F&W program, she said. The Hatchery Scientific Work Group will also be winding up its work this year, and we have recommendations that would bring this work into the program, O’Toole said.

The Council’s state and central staffs have scheduled the first of several workshops for April 22 to start talking about the content of the proposed amendments and how to address them, she continued. Since comments on the proposals will be coming in through June 12, we need to factor that into how we proceed, O’Toole indicated.

The schedule calls for the Council to release a draft program in August and then hold a series of public hearings, she explained. Comment on the draft would be open through October 17, after which the program would be finalized and readied for Council adoption in December, O’Toole said.

Grover noted that the Council had received proposed amendments from a number of entities that did not submit when the program was amended in 2000. We have “new players,” and there is not much going on for F&W in the Columbia River Basin that didn’t attract a recommendation, he said.

Dick Wallace suggested starting with the “higher level, framework” proposals before getting into the detail. We need a way to divide this up to be manageable, he said.

Booth said the Council needs to get organized soon to deal with the large volume of proposals. If we wait until public comment on the proposals ends in June, we’d have just two months to have discussions before the draft comes out, he said.

We have to get the public comments in the door before we go very far with the recommendations, O’Toole responded. We can’t get too far ahead of that, she said. We have our overall framework from the current program, which we think is still a good framework to work with, and we can fit the pieces into it, O’Toole said. In May, we will have the BiOp to deal with, which could be the subject for that meeting, she suggested.

Grover pointed out two fundamental issues: should the program address funding and what level of detail should be in the program amendments. The current program is not uniform in terms of the detail – we have a high-level approach in some areas, and others have exhaustive detail, he said.

It makes sense for the next meeting to identify the areas of the program where there is no interest in change and the areas where there is significant interest in change, Booth said. We need to set the stage so we are prepared for a full-day work session and “to start crunching through things” in June, he added.

We want to honor and respect the public comment period, but we can start making progress, Wallace pointed out. For example, we can deal with the framework and the level-of-detail issues, and we can have a preliminary discussion on “the big picture,” he suggested. We can’t let May slip by without making good progress, Wallace added.

Grover said he would start getting proposals into the hands of staff with the most expertise in each content area. Palensky pointed out that the staff has put on extra legal help to summarize the proposals, which are being subdivided into 35 content areas.

There are three areas in which I’d like to see “a rough cut” in May, Jim Yost said: toxics, in terms of how they relate to the Clean Water Act, the work of state water quality agencies, and where these recommendations would fit into our program; invasive species, in terms of the relationship to each state’s invasive species plan and what such a provision would look like in our program; and climate change and population growth, to help us get an idea of what’s available in these areas. There is work for the staff to do on these topics with state agencies, he added.

Karier said he too had three topics at which the Council could take an early look: project selection, MOAs, and subbasin plans. If we are going to work through specific project proposals in a project selection process, we could set those recommendations aside for

later consideration, he suggested. As for the MOAs, the Council could decide how it wants to deal with them – whether to pick out pieces or address them as a whole, Karier continued. With regard to subbasin plans, we’ve seen many recommendations that suggest adding to or changing them, and the Council could make “a global policy call” on that, he stated.

Grover pointed out that there was a recommendation to take the subbasin plans out of the F&W program. Yes, there are large policy decisions to make, Karier responded.



### **Proposals for F&W Run Deep and Wide**

The Council invited a number of entities to give an overview of the F&W program amendment proposals they submitted. The following are highlights from the 10 panels that made presentations.

**State and Tribal MOAs:** Greg Delwiche of BPA led off a presentation on the recently announced MOAs with tribes, representatives of which joined Delwiche on the panel: **Paul Ward**, Yakama Nation; **Gary James**, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation; **John Ogan**, Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation; and **Rob Lothrop**, Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC).

Delwiche said the MOAs signal “a new era in partnership and cooperation” and are the outcome of a collaboration ordered by the federal court overseeing litigation on the FCRPS BiOp. He noted that the MOA partners included three downriver tribes, one upper river tribe, and the states of Idaho and Montana. Judge Redden is interested in

measures that are reasonably certain to occur, and the MOAs add that assurance, Delwiche said. The negotiating team endeavored to satisfy the requirements of the BiOp and the Northwest Power Act, he added.

Under the MOAs, the Action Agencies, which include BPA, the Corps of Engineers, and Bureau of Reclamation, are making a funding commitment of just under \$1 billion over 10 years, Delwiche said. About 60 percent of the money is for new projects and expansion of existing work, he explained. The draft MOAs are out for comment and after April 23, the deadline for comments, the parties will decide whether to go forward, according to Delwiche. Assuming the answer is yes, we will bring the MOAs to court when the new BiOp is delivered on May 5, he said.

Delwiche noted the four tribal chairs that have endorsed the MOAs and said “a broad, eco-system focus” is a critical element of the agreements to match up with the tribes’ holistic approach to address both Endangered Species Act (ESA) and non-ESA listed stocks of fish. When you consider the resources that have been dedicated to litigation over the BiOp, it is exciting to think these resources will now be dedicated to implementing the MOAs, he added.

The MOAs contain a number of provisions, which Delwiche described, including an affirmation that the tribes agree not to join any lawsuit on FCRPS and fish issues – ESA, Northwest Power Act, and Clean Water Act – for the period of the agreement. There are also provisions for terminating the MOAs early and how BPA will address the funding requirements in its rates, he said. Delwiche noted that the MOAs were submitted April 4 as proposed amendments to be incorporated into the Council’s F&W program.

The Nez Perce tribe was also involved in the collaboration, but “did not get to closure on an MOA as a tribe,” he continued. We’re still hopeful we’ll get to closure with the Nez Perce, Delwiche said.

With regard to science review, he explained that there are projects in the MOAs that are already in the Council’s program, projects that are in the BiOp, and new projects. Many of the projects have already undergone science review, and the parties support science review for the rest, with some caveats about expediting the review and changing the scope, Delwiche indicated.

There are still many questions to answer about implementation of the MOAs, he acknowledged. The prospect is daunting, but we’ll roll up our sleeves and get to work on it, Delwiche summed up.

Ward said much of what the Yakamas will do in the upper Columbia is directed by subbasin plans and NOAA Fisheries’ recovery plan. He said the tribe would use existing salmon recovery boards and local entities to drive how the money from the MOAs is implemented on the ground. Lothrop of CRITFC reiterated that the MOAs represent implementation of subbasin plans that the Council adopted into its program. He noted that measures for the Pacific lamprey are prominent in the MOAs.

James pointed out that the MOA projects are grounded in the subbasin plans and are a logical extension of that work. There have been funding constraints in getting the subbasin plans implemented, but the MOAs will cover projects for which funds were lacking, he said. Ogan said the work outlined in the MOAs has direct links to subbasin plans. We can walk you through where the projects come from and how they will increase survival, he said. Ogan also pointed

out that the MOAs complement policies adopted by the Northwest governors for salmon recovery.

**CBFWA:** **Brian Marotz** of the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks said the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority's (CBFWA's) comprehensive set of recommendations represents consensus among 16 fish and wildlife management agencies. **Claudeo Broncho** of the Shoshone Bannock Tribes, **Wanda Johnson** of the Burns Paiute, **Lynn DuCharme** of the Salish Kootenai, **Dave Statler** of the Nez Perce, and **Paul Kline** of the Idaho Department of Fish and Game reiterated that the document represents a consensus among many sovereigns and took hundreds of hours of work and deliberations to complete. Johnson said there has been a shortfall of funding in the middle and upper Snake provinces, and the submittal identifies measures from the subbasin plans that should be funded through the Council's F&W program.

**James** of the Umatilla Tribes said the CBFWA submittal provides the Council with "a lot of good work." It highlights adaptive management and links population status with biological and programmatic objectives, he said. It consolidates information from a number of plans, including subbasin and recovery plans, and puts it into a common language, James added. **Bill Tweit** of the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife reiterated the links CBFWA has provided from the species status to the objectives and the gap that exists between the two. We want to urge you to define the gap in a measurable way so we can report back on how far we've come, he said, adding that the CBFWA work will contribute to the Council's ability to put out targeted solicitations for projects.

**Idaho:** **Kline** described the State of Idaho's individual submission and listed a number of

areas within the state's package of recommendations that specify where more funding is needed. These include data collection for resident and anadromous fish, habitat protection, hatchery expansion, establishing a genetic database, wildlife mitigation, and addressing aquatic nuisance species.

**Oregon:** **Tom Rein** of the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife said Oregon's recommendations stem from subbasin and recovery team plans, as well as Oregon's plan for salmon and watersheds. They are consistent with CBFWA's recommendations, he said. Oregon focused on research, monitoring, and evaluation (RME) in six areas, Rein explained, describing the need for 1.5 million additional PIT-tags to support an RME effort. Oregon is looking for further assessment in the John Day subbasin, additional monitoring of the white sturgeon population, and more measures to address wildlife loss, including a new assessment of habitat loss due to hydro system construction and inundation, he said.

**Washington:** **Bob Nichols** of the Governor's office said Washington would like to see more effective ways to measure progress in terms of biological and management success. We would like to see the Council strengthen its annual report to the governors and enlarge the scope beyond expenditures to include biological information, he suggested. Washington zeroed in on the variation in measurements from one subbasin to another that make it difficult to summarize results in an annual report, Nichols said.

Washington's salmon recovery office was represented by **Phil Miller**, who stressed the importance of using salmon recovery plans that have been drawn up in the region and assuring that the Council's program is

consistent with what's in those plans. He said the F&W program should encourage a coordinated approach to RME and consistency in reporting. Miller pointed out that the Council's F&W amendments should recognize the region's hatchery science review. Washington is encouraging watershed-scale modeling to gauge the effects of climate change and population growth, and acknowledgement of the role of returning fish to provide nutrients in streams, as well as protection of salmon strongholds, he said.

Washington has relied heavily on subbasin plans and the state's wildlife conservation strategies, according to **Tweit**. He said Washington recommends continuing a long-standing resident fish substitution policy for the blocked areas.

**Kalispel Tribe: Ray Entz** explained that the tribe has proposed a funding strategy, supports the resident fish substitution policy, and laid out the need for a capital funding plan. He said the tribe addressed regional data management, which debunks the need for a centralized data bank. We proposed a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan for the upper Columbia and a monitoring plan for wildlife, as well as an O&M policy for wildlife, Entz wrapped up.

**Nez Perce Tribe: Dave Statler** said the Nez Perce tribe proposes implementation of the subbasin plans for the next 10 years. He said the proposed amendments address how suggested F&W measures are consistent with the Council's program through the subbasin plans. The tribe points out the need for appropriate M&E for artificial production and habitat, according to Statler. The Nez Perce helped develop the process for adaptive management, and the proposed amendments add specificity about how it is carried out, he said.

**Utility Customers: Mark Johnson** of Flathead Electric, **Dan James** of PNGC Power, and **Bo Downen** of the Public Power Council outlined the customers' proposed amendments. James said the customers' proposal comes from "the entities that pay for the Council's program" and represents a broad cross-section of power and river users in all corners of the Columbia River Basin. He emphasized the need for a science-based program.

Downen listed the following five principles that underlie the customers' proposed amendments:

- Address only hydropower impacts – the Council's F&W program has gone beyond the scope laid out in the Northwest Power Act and should be refocused.
- Provide guiding principles and avoid prescriptive projects – the Council's program should have flexibility and leeway for the Council to respond to new information.
- Complement other regional programs – the Council is in a position to look at the region as a whole in developing its program and to be complementary, rather than counter-productive or duplicative of other efforts.
- Prioritize projects that benefit F&W and partner with others – the Council should steer three-quarters of its funding toward on-the-ground work and strive to share costs with others.
- Provide an ecologically based framework that creates clear priorities – the Council program could identify the highest priorities and solicit projects to fulfill them.

Johnson said the Flathead Electric board realizes the need to have a framework for the plan and a way to measure results. He pointed to the Council's bylaws and the

reference to “policy leadership” in urging a focus on policy and principles in the program and away from specific projects.

**BPA:** Greg Delwiche encouraged the Council to be realistic in formulating its program and “to work with the basin we have.” We can’t bring the basin back to its 1803 status, he said. Delwiche also noted that the region’s independent science bodies, including the Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP), have expressed concern about abundance-based mitigation objectives.

Under the Power Act, BPA funding should address the impacts of the FCRPS *only*, he went on, and go primarily toward on-the-ground efforts. The Council’s program should gear toward collaboration with others, Delwiche said. The obligation for off-site mitigation should be shared with others who created the need, and it should embrace potential new partners, including government agencies and foundations that want to be part of the effort, he added. The program should take into account requirements from other entities, such as FERC licensing, that can be complementary, Delwiche said.



### **Project Review Starts with a Walk on the Wild(life) Side**

Palensky presented a proposal, approved by the F&W Committee, that the F&W project review process begin with a categorical review of wildlife projects, starting this month. She explained that the wildlife effort would include five steps, and that subsequent categorical reviews would follow that pattern.

The first step is planning and deciding things such as who needs to be involved in the reviews, and identifying cross-cutting issues from past project reports, Palensky said. That

would take about one and one-half months, and then step 2 would commence, in which project sponsors would submit reports and information, she explained.

The third step would be ISRP review of the categorical projects, and the fourth would be joint development, with BPA, of recommendations about funding the projects, according to Palensky. The fifth and final step would be Council decisions about projects, she said.

After the wildlife projects are done, the next categorical review would deal with research, M&E, data management, and other systemwide projects, including habitat, ocean, harvest, hydro system, and artificial production, Palensky stated.

Rhonda Whiting said the one piece of the process the F&W Committee had “given the green light to” was the review of wildlife projects. Booth asked how the remaining questions and issues about the process would get resolved. The F&W Committee will hold a special meeting in late April or early May to work on them, and we hope to bring more recommendations to the Council at the May meeting, Whiting said.

Bruce Measure moved that the Council initiate the planning phase for categorical review of wildlife projects. Whiting seconded, and the motion passed.

**END NOTES** \_\_\_\_\_

**Generating Resources Advisory Committee Gets A Charter.** The Council approved the creation of a Generating Resources Advisory Committee to review data and assumptions for the Sixth Power Plan. Staffer Jeff King will chair the committee, and staffer Maury Galbraith will be vice-chair. Members are still to be determined.

**Council Budgets Coming at You.** The Council approved the release of its draft FY 2010 and revised FY 2009 budgets for public comment. The proposed FY 2010 budget of \$9,683,000 is 2.3 percent higher than the FY 2009 budget of \$9,467,000. Comments are due June 30.

# # #

**Council 2008 Calendar**

May 13-15	Walla Walla, WA
June 10-12	Spokane, WA
July 15-17	Montana
August 12-14	Spokane, WA
September 16-18	Astoria, OR
October 15-16	Missoula, MT
November 18-20	Coeur d'Alene, ID
December 9-11	Portland, OR