TCC Participants Present: (12)

Susan Cierebiej, WDFW
Ray Croswell, RMEF
Kendel Emmerson, PacifiCorp Energy
Eric Holman, WDFW (via teleconference)
LouEllyn Jones, USFWS
Kimberly McCune, PacifiCorp Energy
Kirk Naylor, PacifiCorp Energy
Bob Nelson, RMEF
Nathan Reynolds, Cowlitz Indian Tribe
Bill Richardson, RMEF
Cherie Kearney, Columbia Land Trust
Tom Tuchmann, US Forest Capital

Calendar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 11, 2010</td>
<td>TCC Meeting</td>
<td>Merwin Hydro Control Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 8, 2010</td>
<td>TCC Meeting</td>
<td>Merwin Hydro Control Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assignments from July 14, 2010 Meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naylor: Provide Kearney a copy of the letter from PacifiCorp to Jon Rose.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naylor: Review the proposed Purchase and Sale Agreement provided by CLT and provide comments to Kearney before July 29, 2010.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assignments from June 9, 2010 Meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McCune: Email map of existing Merwin Access Road to Susan Cierebiej at WDFW.</td>
<td>Complete – 6/14/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assignments from April 14, 2010 Meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emmerson: Submit PacifiCorp’s Bald Eagle Management Plan to the TCC for review and approval in approximately May or June 2010.</td>
<td>Complete – 7/28/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assignments from January 13, 2010 Meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McCune/Naylor: Coordinate with creating a land acquisition spreadsheet to include type designations for the TCC review and approval.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parking lot items from February 10, 2006 Meeting:  
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. Naylor asked if the TCC attendees had any additions or changes to the agenda. No additions were requested.

Naylor reviewed the pending TCC assignments and informed those in attendance that the Bald Eagle Management Plan is complete pending final internal review by PacifiCorp. The TCC can expect the document to be distributed for a 30-day review and comment period this month.

Naylor reviewed the TCC Draft 6/9/10 meeting notes and asked for any comments and/or additional changes. The meeting notes were approved at 9:10am without changes.

Discuss Old Growth Surveys and Unit 18 Raptor Surveys

Kendel Emmerson (PacifiCorp Energy) communicated to the TCC attendees the initial old growth evaluations are to be conducted according to the WHMP timing period, which is between April 15th and July 15th. To date the evaluations are only 40% complete and will not be completed by July 15. The evaluations were delayed due to the wet spring conditions, increase goshawk survey needs, and limited access to the Lewis River boats to access some old-growth areas; therefore Emmerson would like to extend the timing period to December 31, 2010. Emmerson stated that the WHMP timing was to coincide with raptor nesting season in hopes of anecdotally discovering unknown raptor nest.

The TCC agreed to extend the old-growth evaluation date.

Discussion was also had regarding the old growth objective ‘a’ which requires “the evaluation of existing old-growth stands (based on maps in PacifiCorp and Cowlitz PUD 2004)”. The discussion identified that re-mapping the vegetation cover type maps to improve the accuracy of vegetation types has identified other old growth stands that would not be part of the current evaluations. Emmerson further expressed that the Unit 11 raptor survey was completed last week and no nesting raptors were detected. Unit 22 has started but due to squatters discovered in this unit she discontinued the survey due to safety concerns. The Marine Board was contacted to address the squatter issue. She expects to return the week of July 19.

In Unit 28 (Eagle Cliff) Emmerson did not get any goshawk response but she did find a peregrine falcon. She is very confident it is an occupied site. The location would affect timber harvest SE of FS Road #25, but not NW. The second survey is scheduled for later this month.

The Unit 18 2009 goshawk surveys were based on 500 meters from the proposed road. The proposed timber harvest was moved from 2011 harvest to 2010 harvest. This left a 40-acre area left not surveyed. Emmerson proposed continuing and completing the Broadcast Acoustical Surveys for the 500 meters surrounding the proposed road and to conduct an Intensive Search Survey for the additional 40 acres not surveyed in 2009. With TCC approval, PacifiCorp and its consultants would begin the Intensive Search Survey tomorrow July 15, 2010.
The TCC attendees agreed with PacifiCorp’s raptor survey approach.

Emmerson also mentioned that during the spring 2010 eagle flight they identified five occupied sites and 3 were reproductively successful (Woodland, Brown Creek, and Twin Falls East).

Bill Richardson (RMEF), Cherie Kearney (CLT) and Tom Tuchmann (US Forest Capital) joined

Discuss Snags in Unit 11

Naylor reviewed the Wildlife Habitat Management Plan (WHMP) snags in Unit 11 (Attachment A) with the TCC attendees to include tree height, buffer distance and proposed harvest acres affected. Each snag (which is the same decay class) overlaps the proposed road with the exception of snag number 4. The proposed road location was selected to avoid the wet soils near the meadow area, which would require rocking the road (approximately $4,000 - $5,000 in additional costs). PacifiCorp recommends adjusting the proposed road location to leave snags 4 & 5 and remove snags 1, 2 & 3. None of the snags are in Canyon Creek roost or in the buffer. The purpose of the proposed timber harvest was reviewed to remind members of the elk forage objectives in the SW portion of Unit 11 and the NSO objectives in the north and NE portions of the unit.

Nathan Reynolds (Cowlitz Indian Tribe) joined

The TCC agreed to remove snags 1 & 2 and evaluate #3 to see if it can be saved, however removal of #3 is acceptable. Snags 4 & 5 will stay.

Columbia Land Trust Update (CONFIDENTIAL)

Naylor informed the TCC attendees that he and Cherie Kearney (Columbia Land Trust) personally met with Jon Rose of Pope Resources Olympic Property Group to discuss the TCC interests and the Settlement Agreement requirements. At this meeting, Naylor emphasized the importance of elk forage in the negotiations for a conservation easement, why it was of significance and the relationship to the Lewis River Settlement Agreement for conducting management on any lands acquired as a conservation easement. The meeting successfully communicated the interests of all parties and it was agreed that a field meeting to review PacifiCorp forest and wildlife land management practices would be a great opportunity to further specific discussions and mutual interests.

Kearney provided a handout to the TCC titled, “Proposal for TCC’s Consideration, dated July 14, 2010 of which is considered confidential and not for public viewing. The handout also provided a map illustrating Project Boundary, Priority Phase 1 Easement Area, Phase 1 Easement Area, Future Development Area and Fee Simple Purchase Area for TCC review. The TCC discussed this proposal and provided specific responses to CLT.

Naylor also communicated that he sent a letter to Jon Rose of Pope Resources which provided more detail regarding the TCC’s need for wildlife management on land it acquires under a conservation easement. Kearney requested a copy of the letter from PacifiCorp to Rose.
The detailed content of this portion of the meeting is considered confidential and proprietary and not for public viewing.

**Eric Holman (WDFW) departed**

<Break 10:30am>
<Reconvene 10:45am>

**Columbia Land Trust Update (CONFIDENTIAL) - cont’d**

Review of the CLT proposal continued. The detailed content of this portion of the meeting is considered confidential and proprietary and not for public viewing.

LouEllyn Jones (USFWS) encouraged the TCC to keep a visionary picture and focus on the long-term needs relative to land acquisition for wildlife management.

Naylor will review the proposed Purchase and Sale Agreement provided by CLT and provide his comments to Kearney before July 29, 2010.

**Yale Lands Update**

Bill Richardson (RMEF) informed the TCC attendees that the Option Agreement for the Yale parcel of interest is not signed yet; however it is expected to be signed by PacifiCorp early next week (July 20th). In addition, the chain of title is under a detailed review to confirm no conveyance/easement issues exist. The detailed content of this portion of the meeting is considered confidential and proprietary and not for public viewing.

Richardson also provided a few copies of the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation Newsletter for Washington Members, Volume 5, Spring 2010 to include an excerpt about the TCCs recent acquisition of an approximately 52 acre parcel for wildlife and habitat protection (Attachment B).

**New Topics/Issues**

None

**Next Meeting’s Agenda**

- Review of 7/14/10 Meeting Notes
- Lands Update

**Public Comment Opportunity**

No public comment was provided.
Next Scheduled Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August 11, 2010</th>
<th>September 8, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merwin Hydro Control Center</td>
<td>Merwin Hydro Control Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariel, WA</td>
<td>Ariel, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00am – 3:00pm</td>
<td>9:00am – 3:00pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjourn 12:30pm

Handouts

- Agenda
- Draft meeting notes from 6/09/10
- Attachment A – Wildlife Habitat Management Snags, Unit 11 Maps
- Attachment B – Excerpt from Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation Newsletter for Washington Members, Volume 5, Spring 2010 (Jackman parcel)
Lewis River
Wildlife Habitat Management Plan

Snags

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Snags</th>
<th>Snag Buffer</th>
<th>Proposed Timber Harvest Road</th>
<th>Proposed Road</th>
<th>Stream</th>
<th>Fish</th>
<th>Anadromous Fish</th>
<th>Non-fish Perennial</th>
<th>Non-fish Seasonal</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Snag 1</td>
<td>253.5'</td>
<td>2.3 Acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Snag 2</td>
<td>247.5'</td>
<td>2.2 Acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Snag 3</td>
<td>190.5'</td>
<td>1.3 Acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Snag 4</td>
<td>138'</td>
<td>.4 Acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Snag 5</td>
<td>186'</td>
<td>1.3 Acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are projected in UTM Zone 10, NAD83, meters.

No Warranty. With respect to any information, including but not limited to the Confidential Information, which a Party furnishes or otherwise discloses to another Party for the purpose of evaluating Compliance, it is understood and agreed that the Disclosing Party does not make any representations or warranties as to the accuracy, completeness or fitness for a particular purpose thereof. It is further understood and agreed that no Party or its Representatives shall have any liability or responsibility to another Party or to any other person or entity resulting from the use of any information so furnished or otherwise provided pursuant to this Agreement.
No Warranty. With respect to any information, including but not limited to the Confidential Information, which a Party furnishes or otherwise discloses to another Party for the purpose of evaluating Compliance, it is understood and agreed that the Disclosing Party does not make any representations or warranties as to the accuracy, completeness or fitness for a particular purpose thereof. It is further understood and agreed that no Party or its Representatives shall have any liability or responsibility to another Party or to any other person or entity resulting from the use of any information so furnished or otherwise provided pursuant to this Agreement.
Legend

- Snags
- Snag Buffer
- Proposed Timber Harvest
- Road
- Proposed Road
- Management Unit
- Stream Buffer
- Township/Range
- Section

Data Management/Geographic Information Systems

Data are projected in UTM Zone 10, NAD83, meters.

No Warranty. With respect to any information, including but not limited to the Confidential Information, which a Party furnishes or otherwise discloses to another Party for the purpose of evaluating Compliance, it is understood and agreed that the Disclosing Party does not make any representations or warranties as to the accuracy, completeness or fitness for a particular purpose thereof. It is further understood and agreed that no Party or its Representatives shall have any liability or responsibility to another Party or to any other person or entity resulting from the use of any information so furnished or otherwise provided pursuant to this Agreement.
Data are projected in UTM Zone 10, NAD83, meters.

No Warranty. With respect to any information, including but not limited to the Confidential Information, which a Party furnishes or otherwise discloses to another Party for the purpose of evaluating Compliance, it is understood and agreed that the Disclosing Party does not make any representations or warranties as to the accuracy, completeness or fitness for a particular purpose thereof. It is further understood and agreed that no Party or its Representatives shall have any liability or responsibility to another Party or to any other person or entity resulting from the use of any information so furnished or otherwise provided pursuant to this Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Height</th>
<th>Buffer Distance</th>
<th>Proposed Harvest Acres Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snag 1 169'</td>
<td>253.5'</td>
<td>2.3 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snag 2 165'</td>
<td>247.5'</td>
<td>2.2 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snag 3 127’</td>
<td>190.5’</td>
<td>1.3 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snag 4 92’</td>
<td>138’</td>
<td>.4 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snag 5 124’</td>
<td>186’</td>
<td>1.3 Acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend
- **Snags**
- Snag Buffer
- Proposed Timber Harvest
- Proposed Road
- Stream Buffer
- Stream
- Fish
- Anadromous Fish
- Non-fish Annual
- Non-fish Seasonal
- Other
- Wetlands
- Water Body

Lewis River
Wildlife Habitat Management Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Snags</th>
<th>Tree Height</th>
<th>Buffer Distance</th>
<th>Proposed Harvest Acres Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snag 1</td>
<td>169’</td>
<td>253.5’</td>
<td>2.3 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snag 2</td>
<td>165’</td>
<td>247.5’</td>
<td>2.2 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snag 3</td>
<td>127’</td>
<td>190.5’</td>
<td>1.3 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snag 4</td>
<td>92’</td>
<td>138’</td>
<td>.4 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snag 5</td>
<td>124’</td>
<td>186’</td>
<td>1.3 Acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legends: Snags, Road, Proposed Timber Harvest, Wetlands, Rivers, Water Body, Fish, Anadromous Fish, Non-fish Perennial, Non-fish Seasonal, Other, Stream Buffer, Township/Range, Section.

Data are projected in UTM Zone 10, NAD83, meters. No Warranty. With respect to any information, including but not limited to the Confidential Information, which a Party furnishes or otherwise discloses to another Party for the purpose of evaluating Compliance, it is understood and agreed that the Disclosing Party does not make any representations or warranties as to the accuracy, completeness or fitness for a particular purpose thereof. It is further understood and agreed that no Party or its Representatives shall have any liability or responsibility to another Party or to any other person or entity resulting from the use of any information so furnished or otherwise provided pursuant to this Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Snag</th>
<th>Tree Height</th>
<th>Buffer Distance</th>
<th>Proposed Harvest Acres Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snag 1</td>
<td>169'</td>
<td>253.5'</td>
<td>2.3 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snag 2</td>
<td>165'</td>
<td>247.5'</td>
<td>2.2 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snag 3</td>
<td>127'</td>
<td>190.5'</td>
<td>1.3 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snag 4</td>
<td>92'</td>
<td>138'</td>
<td>.4 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snag 5</td>
<td>124'</td>
<td>186'</td>
<td>1.3 Acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Washington Tracks Takes on a New Role

Last December at the State Resource Team meeting, the Stewardship Committee talked about making the Washington Tracks Newsletter available to all Washington members. The newsletter has been a wonderful resource for projects undertaken throughout the state, highlighting the latest projects and sharing successes with volunteers. Often times this newsletter has also been shared with donors and potential donors to educate them about projects undertaken with dollars donated.

"Why not share this information with the entire Washington membership?" was the question. And with much enthusiasm, the idea was unanimously approved by the Washington State Resource Team. While the Bugle Magazine highlights some of the Washington specific projects and interesting articles, it emphasizes a national approach. The purpose, then, of this publication will be to highlight Washington projects and activities.

Many people contribute to the information contained in this newsletter. Lands Managers, Regional Directors, State Volunteer Chairmen, Washington State Resource Team Members, RMEF staff, and individual RMEF members. It is hoped as the publication grows to have more contributions from the Washington RMEF members. Articles on special projects they participate in, articles on successful hunts and the excitement enjoyed, articles on banquet successes, articles on ideas that could help banquet success. After all, RMEF members have one goal in mind - **Ensure the future of elk, other wildlife, and their habitat.**

What You’ll See Inside

Mission Statement

Land Protection and Related Projects
- PacificCorp Protects Habitat on the Lewis
- The Rock Creek Partnership

Field Projects and Activities
- Asotin Creek - Smoothing Iron Ridge
- Mount St. Helen’s Tree Plantings
- Mount St. Helens Mortality Count

2010 Activities

Puzzled about Estate Planning?
Land Protection in Washington....

PacifiCorp Protects Habitat on the Lewis River

By Bill Richardson, Oregon and Washington Lands Manager

PacifiCorp, in collaboration with 24 other parties including the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, manages more than 10,000 acres around the Lewis River hydroelectric project in order to preserve and enhance wildlife habitat. Since the relicensing process for this project began in 1996, the company has been working with two dozen local entities—from state agencies to tribes to environmental groups—to develop and then implement a comprehensive plan to maintain and improve wildlife habitat (Wildlife Habitat Management Plan). The new federal license, granted in 2008, calls for PacifiCorp to invest in additional land acquisitions or conservation easements within the Yale valley area for the benefit of a broad range of wildlife, fish and native plant species. The first of these acquisitions closed in mid-December 2009.

- The first acquisition is approximately 52 acres located midway up the western shore of Yale Lake and is known as the Jackman property. It has long been prime elk habitat as well as serving as pasture for cattle and horses. The land is immediately adjacent to existing lands managed under the Wildlife Habitat Management Plan.

- There are about 16 acres of forestland on the property varying in age from 2 years-of-age to over 60 years-old and a central area of farm/pasture land that is approximately 11 acres. The management of the land will include plans to improve young forest stands on the property, manage invasive plant species, and promote the agricultural aspects of the land (grassland/pasture) for improved elk forage which is the biggest value of the acquisition.

The land was purchased following due diligence appraisals, environmental site assessments and coordination with the Lewis River Terrestrial Coordinating Committee (TCC). The TCC is a stakeholder group consisting of state and federal agency representatives, the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation and tribal representatives that continually review, consult and oversee implementation of the plan.

- The expertise of the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation (RMEF) in procuring lands for wildlife played a significant role in securing this habitat for PacifiCorp. The RMEF initiated the property owner contact and obtained an option to purchase the property on PacifiCorp’s behalf.

- The TCC saw the Jackman property as a prime acquisition candidate because the parcel:
  - Provides movement corridors for elk through the Yale Project area between high- and low-elevation winter ranges;
  - Protects low-elevation winter range;

- Provides land on which forage for elk may be maintained or cultivated. PacifiCorp has two wildlife biologists who implement the WHMP and already manage more than 40 acres of farmland and 60 acres of meadows as big game forage around the Lewis River as part of the WHMP. As PacifiCorp and the TCC spend more time getting to know this new property, they will develop more specific management plans to protect and enhance the habitat for a diversity of wildlife.

- All of PacifiCorp’s lands managed under the WHMP prohibit the use of OHV’s in order to ensure the protection of the wildlife and habitat.

- The previous property owners are Ronald and Patricia Jackman. George Ham (a relative of Ron Jackman) had owned the property for more than 30 years prior to Ron and Patricia acquiring the property 6 years ago shortly after Mr. Ham passed away. As many as 100 elk were often seen grazing the property historically. Recent estimates of only 40 head of elk have been seen, but the property’s meadow hasn’t been managed (mowed) in recent years. PacifiCorp biologists intend to reestablish meadow management. PacifiCorp had long ago talked with George Ham about the value of the property to wildlife and had even provided him with a wood duck nest box for a small wetland on his property because he liked the wildlife there. George Ham had shared his desire to see the property remain undeveloped and continue to provide wildlife habitat. Ron Jackman shared in that desire, and with this purchase by PacifiCorp, the property will be managed for just that purpose.