TCC Participants Present: (8)

Ray Croswell, RMEF
Kendel Emmerson, PacifiCorp Energy
Eric Holman, WDFW
LouEllyn Jones, USFWS
Kimberly McCune, PacifiCorp Energy
Kirk Naylor, PacifiCorp Energy
Bob Nelson, RMEF
Todd Olson, PacifiCorp Energy

Calendar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 8, 2009</td>
<td>TCC Meeting</td>
<td>Conference Call Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 14, 2009</td>
<td>TCC Meeting – Field Visit</td>
<td>Merwin Hydro Control Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assignments from August 12, 2009 Meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McCune: Add Eric Holman (WDFW) to the aquatic fund announcement mailing list.</td>
<td>Complete – 8/14/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assignments from July 8, 2009 Meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moore/Emmerson: Review RRMP and License to confirm if the 92 dispersed campsites is intended as a target or a mandatory number.</td>
<td>Complete - 8/10/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore/Emmerson: Provide additional clarification of where the potential new sites will be located and if these sites encroach on wildlife lands.</td>
<td>Complete – 8/10/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking lot items from August 12, 2009 Meeting:

| Assignment                                                                 | Status           |
| Schedule Unit 17 & 26 field trips for October 14, 2009 TCC meeting.       | Confirmed 10/14/09 |

Parking lot items from February 10, 2006 Meeting:

| Assignment                                                                 | Status           |
| Conservation Agreement – what is wanted?                                  | Ongoing – 4/28/06 |

Review of Agenda and Finalize Meeting Notes

Kirk Naylor (PacifiCorp Energy) called the meeting to order at 9:05am and announced the participating attendees. Naylor asked if the TCC attendees had any additions to the agenda. Kendel Emmerson asked to include time to provide an update and request for changes to the mowing schedule.
Naylor reviewed the TCC Draft July 8, 2009 meeting notes and asked for any comments and/or additional changes. The TCC meeting notes were approved with no changes at 9:10am.

**Lands Update**

Naylor informed the TCC attendees that Mason Bruce Girard (MB&G) is the contractor selected to handle property valuations for the Swift project.

**LouEllyn Jones (USFWS) joined**

MB&G received stand data and is currently reviewing forestry prescriptions for valuation modeling. Naylor indicated that we are right on schedule and to expect results delivered to the TCC in October 2009. The Subgroup will provide results of the valuation back to the TCC for their review on or about mid September 2009. The intent is to have a final product in November 2009 and to discuss the value of the Swift lands of interest.

In response to Eric Holman’s (WDFW) question Naylor communicated that the valuation will consider timber, harvest schedules (revenue generation) and benefit cost analysis.

Jones commented the Columbia Land Trust (CLT) submitted a very professional packet for a Section 6 Grant to acquire interests in land in the Pine Creek area,. Bull trout, spotted owl and wolf were included in the packet as endangered species in the Pine Creek area.

Details relating to certain property of interest is considered confidential and proprietary and not for public viewing. Detailed discussion took place regarding next steps, environmental assessment, appraisal, etc.

The specific details regarding interest in certain Yale lands is considered confidential and proprietary and not for public viewing.

In response to Holman’s question about aquatic funds Olson confirmed that ACC funds can be used for land acquisition but the proposal must come from an entity such as WDFW or RMEF and it must be submitted through the aquatic funding process for evaluation. Kimberly McCune (PacifiCorp Energy) informed Holman that the next round of funding will begin on or about September 5, 2009 and she will include him on the announcement mailing list.

**LouEllyn Jones departed**

**WHMP Implementation Topics**

*Raptor Survey Results* – Only 5 stations left to survey; nearly complete with all surveys. To date no nesting raptors have been located in project areas.

*Mowing* – Kendel Emmerson (PacifiCorp Energy) informed the TCC attendees that per the WHMP, the mowing deadline for meadows is August 16 through August 31, 2009 and the ROW forage areas is September 1 to October 15. Several of the forage areas and meadows are located near each other. To avoid paying for moving equipment into an area twice, she has instructed the
farmer to mow the meadows and ROW forage areas the last week of August. This will result in mowing the ROW forage areas slightly earlier. Emmerson requested approval from the TCC.

The TCC agreed that early is better due to the money it will save.

Naylor provided an update and recommended removal of invasive species present in the meadow in Unit 17 (Winter Creek Meadows). He suggested that the tansy ragwort be cut/pulled and removed from the meadow. There is also scotch broom present. Naylor suggested we Brush Hog the meadow with an addition of lime and over seed if necessary. In addition, for the new meadow being developed, rather than broadcast the seed he recommends the use of a Brillion drill whereby it puts the seed in the soil resulting in better establishment and less seed desiccation. The stumps and root masses have been removed and the area is ready to seed this fall 2009.

Property Encroachment Updates – Naylor and PacifiCorp property department continues to send requests for reimbursement for certain encroachments; zero responses from property owners to date so PacifiCorp is reviewing with legal counsel; small claims court is likely the next step.

Respond to Questions on Dispersed Recreation Sites

PacifiCorp received the attached emails in response to the following assignment (see Attachment A for further detail):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignments from July 8, 2009 Meeting:</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moore/Emmerson: Review RRMP and License to confirm if the 92 dispersed campsites is intended as a target or a mandatory number.</td>
<td>Complete - 8/10/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emmerson reported that the 92 sites identified in the Settlement Agreement and Recreation Resource Management Plan (RRMP) were the number of sites that were required to be inventoried for suitability. Of these 92 sites, about 30-40 were assumed to be suitable for overnight camping, but this would be determined in the inventory completed this spring (2009). Although recreation is predicted to increase in the next 30 years and the need for dispersed shoreline recreation sites (day-use and overnight camping) predicted to increase to 149 sites, the current objective is to determine which of the 2009 recorded dispersed recreation sites (92 original sites and newly discovered sites) are suitable for dispersed camping.

New Topics/Issues

TCC field visits to Unit 17 and Unit 26 possible in October 2009.

Next Meeting’s Agenda

- Review of 8/12/09 Meeting Notes
- Lands Update
- Logging Update
Public Comment Opportunity

No public comment was provided.

Next Scheduled Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September 9, 2009</th>
<th>October 14, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference Call</td>
<td>Merwin Hydro Control Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariel, WA</td>
<td>Ariel, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00am – 12:00pm</td>
<td>9:00am – 3:00pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting adjourned at 9:53am

Handouts

- Agenda
- Draft meeting notes from 7/9/09
- Attachment A – TCC comment emails regarding review of Recreation Resource Management Plan and License to confirm if the 92 dispersed campsites is intended as a target or a mandatory number.
As I read the material I have the following understanding:

1. The 92 boat in sites include both day use and overnight sites.
2. 30–40 of those sites are suitable for development for overnight use.
3. There is no target, requirement or intent to develop 92 overnight sites.

Is my understanding correct?

Attn: TCC Participants

In accordance with Section 3.3.1 of the Lewis River Recreation Resources Management Plan (RRMP) it states at least 92 dispersed shoreline campsites and day-use sites were identified in the project area (see language below). License Article 405 directs the Licensees to implement the RRMP.

Upon review of the RRMP the 92 dispersed sites is intended to be a target with the understanding that further analysis is needed to select suitable sites.

### Assignments from July 8, 2009 Meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moore/Emmerson: Review RRMP and License to confirm if the 92 dispersed campsites is intended as a target or a mandatory number.</td>
<td>Complete - 8/10/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.3.1 Defining Suitable Dispersed Shoreline Sites

During the 2001 relicensing studies, at least 92 dispersed shoreline campsites and day-use sites were identified in the project area (Exhibit L – Dispersed Shoreline Recreation Sites). Demand projections at that time indicated that as many as 57 new shoreline dispersed sites would be needed to accommodate future camping demand over the next 30 year period for a total demand of 149
dispersed shoreline camp and day-use sites. However, the ability to develop new dispersed shoreline sites is limited by a lack of suitable areas and by ecological constraints. Constraints related to the development of new sites, combined with continuing high user demand, is expected to cause increased competition for the limited supply of dispersed shoreline sites at the project reservoirs in the future. Visitor use levels and site impacts at some of the existing dispersed shoreline campsites appear to be approaching overall site capacity as defined in Exhibit E – Recreation Monitoring Indicators and Standards. This conclusion is based on impacts observed, such as vegetation damage and sanitation problems. However, at many other shoreline day-use sites, few impacts were observed and these day-use sites appear to be handling visitor use well with few observed problems.

Of the 92 existing dispersed shoreline day-use sites and campsites on the three reservoirs, many have characteristics that make them suitable for long-term use as campsites with the potential for site hardening (Exhibit L – Dispersed Shoreline Recreation Sites). Inventoried day use sites were typically much smaller and lacked evidence of overnight use and impacts such as fire rings, compared to the dispersed campsites.

Further analysis of which dispersed sites are suitable for long-term use as campsites is still needed; this will be conducted upon the new licenses becoming final. However, an initial evaluation conducted in 2001 indicated that approximately 30-40 dispersed shoreline campsites at Yale Lake and Swift Reservoir were suitable for long-term overnight camping and associated site hardening. Most existing day use dispersed sites did not require hardening and are thus not a focus of this program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignments from July 8, 2009 Meeting:</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moore/Emmerson: Provide additional clarification of where the potential new sites will be located and if these sites encroach on wildlife lands.</td>
<td>Complete – 8/10/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

David Moore and Kendel Emmerson are scheduled to conduct suitable dispersed site selection fieldwork on August 18th & 20th, 2009. An appendix will be added to the report summarizing site selection and the report distributed in October 2009.

Thank you.

Kimberly L. McCune - PacifiCorp Energy
Hydro Resources Project Coordinator
Phone: 503-813-6078
Fax: 503-813-6633
kimberly.mccune@pacificorp.com
Thank you. In the analysis, I would be interested in knowing the number of walk-in, boat-in, and vehicle-accessible sites. I would also be interested in a percent of each type that have characteristics suitable for long-term use.

Jim Eychaner

Attn: TCC Participants

In accordance with Section 3.3.1 of the Lewis River Recreation Resources Management Plan (RRMP) it states at least 92 dispersed shoreline campsites and day-use sites were identified in the project area (see language below). License Article 405 directs the Licensees to implement the RRMP.

Upon review of the RRMP the 92 dispersed sites is intended to be a target with the understanding that further analysis is needed to select suitable sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignments from July 8, 2009 Meeting:</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moore/Emmerson: Review RRMP and License to confirm if the 92 dispersed campsites is intended as a target or a mandatory number.</td>
<td>Complete - 8/10/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.1 **Defining Suitable Dispersed Shoreline Sites**

_During the 2001 relicensing studies, at least 92 dispersed shoreline campsites and day-use sites were identified in the project area (Exhibit L – Dispersed Shoreline Recreation Sites). Demand projections at that time indicated that as many as 57 new shoreline dispersed sites would be needed to_
accommodate future camping demand over the next 30 year period for a total demand of 149 dispersed shoreline camp and day-use sites. However, the ability to develop new dispersed shoreline sites is limited by a lack of suitable areas and by ecological constraints. Constraints related to the development of new sites, combined with continuing high user demand, is expected to cause increased competition for the limited supply of dispersed shoreline sites at the project reservoirs in the future. Visitor use levels and site impacts at some of the existing dispersed shoreline campsites appear to be approaching overall site capacity as defined in Exhibit E – Recreation Monitoring Indicators and Standards. This conclusion is based on impacts observed, such as vegetation damage and sanitation problems. However, at many other shoreline day-use sites, few impacts were observed and these day-use sites appear to be handling visitor use well with few observed problems.

Of the 92 existing dispersed shoreline day-use sites and campsites on the three reservoirs, many have characteristics that make them suitable for long-term use as campsites with the potential for site hardening (Exhibit L – Dispersed Shoreline Recreation Sites). Inventoried day use sites were typically much smaller and lacked evidence of overnight use and impacts such as fire rings, compared to the dispersed campsites.

Further analysis of which dispersed sites are suitable for long-term use as campsites is still needed; this will be conducted upon the new licenses becoming final. However, an initial evaluation conducted in 2001 indicated that approximately 30-40 dispersed shoreline campsites at Yale Lake and Swift Reservoir were suitable for long-term overnight camping and associated site hardening. Most existing day use dispersed sites did not require hardening and are thus not a focus of this program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignments from July 8, 2009 Meeting:</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moore/Emmerson: Provide additional clarification of where the potential new sites will be located and if these sites encroach on wildlife lands.</td>
<td>Complete – 8/10/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

David Moore and Kendel Emmerson are scheduled to conduct suitable dispersed site selection fieldwork on August 18th & 20th, 2009. An appendix will be added to the report summarizing site selection and the report distributed in October 2009.

Thank you.

Kimberly L. McCune - PacifiCorp Energy  
Hydro Resources Project Coordinator  
Phone: 503-813-6078  
Fax: 503-813-6633  
kimberly.mccune@pacificorp.com
Kim, I need to get in touch with David and find out if there are any archaeological sites near the shore line day use and over night camping that will require buffer around the sites and how enforcement will handled, thanks

--
Clifford Casseseka
Yakama Nation Cultural Resource Program
The Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation
casseseka@yakama.com
(509) 865-2151 x4720
(509) 941-0581 cell
jim, kurt etc.
correct in that an analysis of each site is where we wanted to go the
selections were deemed possible sites, that analysis includes possible
effects on wildlife and all the other issues to be considered. There was
not a firm statement that 92 sites would be created. Also, Port of
Woodland is considering development of a boat launch site park, at what
is now Lions park, cleaned up but undeveloped. It is port property
accessible by trespass permit as it stands. they are seeking input on
exactly what people would want. You might want to be in the loop. and it
may be considered an off site issue for some rec funds.

john