

**FINAL Meeting Notes**  
**Lewis River License Implementation**  
**Terrestrial Coordination Committee (TCC) Meeting**  
**October 21, 2005**  
**Ariel, WA**

**TCC Participants Present: (10)**

Brock Applegate, WDFW  
 Monte Garrett, PacifiCorp  
 Diana Gritten-MacDonald, Cowlitz PUD  
 LouEllyn Jones, USFW (via teleconference from 9:00am – 12:00pm)  
 Curt Leigh, WDFW (via teleconference from 9:40am-3:00 pm)  
 Kimberly McCune, PacifiCorp  
 Colleen McShane, EDAW, Inc.  
 Kirk Naylor, PacifiCorp  
 Bob Nelson, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation  
 Mitch Wainwright, US Forest Service

**Calendar:**

October 21, 2005	ACC Meeting	Merwin
November 9, 2005	TCC Meeting	Merwin
November 10, 2005	ACC Meeting	Merwin
December 2, 2005	TCC Meeting	Lacey, WA

<b>Assignments from October 21st Meeting:</b>	<b>Status:</b>
Applegate – Email full citation regarding seeps and small temporal pools to McShane relating to Section 3.2.1.	<b>Pending as of 11-9-05</b>
McShane – Add additional language to Section 3.2.4 that defines what a “site tree” is.	<b>Complete - 10/31/05</b>
Naylor - Create a revised map of Merwin and Yale using USFS guidelines.	<b>Complete 11-8-05</b>
McShane - Write draft goals for riparian and wetland buffers.	<b>Complete 10-31-05</b>
Naylor – Add in all the percentages when the revised maps area created.	<b>Complete 11-8-05</b>

<b>Assignments from October 3rd Meeting:</b>	<b>Status:</b>
Garrett – Send more detailed materials regarding land acquisition to the TCC who have signed a Confidentiality Agreement.	<b>Materials emailed - 10/6/05</b>
Garrett - Contact each of the TCC participants who have signed a Confidentiality Agreement to schedule a conference call and discuss the land acquisition opportunity in more detail.	<b>Complete – 10/7/05</b>
Gritten-MacDonald - Proposed an addition to the 11/9/05 Agenda to include a site visit to Devils Backbone. The timing for this site visit will be confirmed at the TCC’s next meeting on 10/21/05.	<b>Need status</b>

## **Opening, Review of Agenda, Finalize Meeting Notes**

Colleen McShane (EDAW) called the meeting to order at 9:20am. The purpose of the meeting is to continue the review of the draft WHMP Standards and Guidelines document, beginning with section 3.9 (Forestlands).

The TCC reviewed the Agenda and Brock Applegate (WDFW) requested altering the order of the TCC discussions of the Standards & Guidelines as follows:

- Wetlands
- Forestlands
- Wetland Buffers

The TCC approved the modification to the Agenda.

and considering Brock Applegate's (WDFW) comments to this section, and to discuss Kirk Naylor's concerns that some of the objectives do not provide enough direction to be able to prepare the PacifiCorp's WHMP.

McShane reviewed the draft meeting notes with the TCC for 10/3/05. The meeting notes were approved at 9:25am with no changes.

### **3.2.1 Wetland Habitat (Background Information)**

General discussion about seeps, buffers, importance of seeps to wildlife.

Modify the first paragraph to read as follows:

*Wetlands occur because conditions of soil and hydrology combine to result in the formation of unique plant communities (King County 2004). Overall, hydrology is recognized as being the single most important determinant of wetland establishment, processes, and type (Mitch and Gosselink 1993). There are a wide variety of wetland types, depending on the frequency and extent of inundation and dominant plants species and structure (Cowardin et al. 1997). Wetlands range from shallow ponds to forested areas that may have standing surface water only rarely (King County 2004). Wetlands include seeps and small, temporal pools (Semlitsch and Brody 1998, Snodgrass et al. 2000). Wetlands are recognized as performing a number of critical environmental functions, including flood storage and retention, groundwater discharge/recharge, water quality maintenance and protection, and fish and wildlife habitat (NRC 2001).*

### **3.2.3 Wetlands on WHMP Lands**

General discussion regarding buffers, flexibility on a case-by-case basis, forage coverage ratio, rookeries, natural wetlands, source areas for bull frog use, riparian habitat area, PHS riparian buffer, applying wetland widths and converted to buffer widths, hiding cover, balanced approach to riparian widths and enhanced forage.

Add the following text in the second to the last paragraph:

*Managing bull frog source areas is an important consideration in controlling populations of this species.*

### 3.2.4 Wetland Habitat Goals and Objectives

Modify Analysis Species to read as follows:

*Beaver, great blue heron (rookeries), and wood duck.*

Modify Objective b to read as follows:

*Objective b: Identify forested wetlands with < 20% shrub cover and manage to increase overall shrub cover by at least an additional 5% (as determined by the line intercept method) without tree harvest by TY17 to benefit the yellow warbler and mink.*

The following Table and text were suggested, but have not been approved by the TCC:

**Table 3-4.** Buffers for planning management actions near wetlands.

Wetland Type	Recommended widths
Wetlands greater than 1 acre in size	150 feet, measured from the edge of the hydric vegetation (or height of one site potential tree, whichever is greater)
Wetlands less than 1 acre in size	Height of one site potential tree

*Objective e: Identify and establish buffers to maintain and protect wetland habitat and functions, adapted from USFS riparian guidelines, as a starting point for planning (see Table 3.4).*

- **Objective f:** Protect heron rookeries from disturbance and structure removal. Prepare colony-site management plans for any future rookeries (PHS Management Recommendations for great blue herons).

The TCC agreed to table the wetland buffer discussion at this time and move on to Forestlands.

Break <10:50am>

Reconvene <11:05am>

Naylor brought two (2) maps which illustrated 150' – 200' buffers on each side of Merwin & Yale streams. Naylor pointed out that wetland and highway buffers were not included. In addition, he pointed out the areas which are not available for forage and that there are constraints at Merwin and Yale relating to topography (steep slopes) which affect connectivity.

Naylor suggested for minimum planning numbers to use USFA guidelines as a starting point and adjust to larger or smaller as needed for riparian buffers.

Lunch <12:05pm>

Reconvene <12:45pm>

McShane communicated to the TCC a summary of Naylor's discussion with the group –

- 1) Clarification for Naylor regarding what he can do with snags in the buffer areas.
- 2) Determine size of buffer zones.

Applegate suggested that Naylor create a revised map of Merwin and Yale using USFS guidelines and see what kind of percentages we arrive at.

The TCC agreed to defer the final decision on buffer zone sizes until Naylor presents the revised USFA guidelines map.

McShane will write draft goals for:

- Riparian Buffers
- Wetland Buffers

The TCC will review McShane's buffer language at the next meeting on November 9, 2005.

Applegate requested Naylor add in all the percentages when the revised maps are created.

### **Potential Land Acquisition Update**

Garrett provided an update on a potential land acquisition opportunity with the TCC. This discussion was confidential and proprietary and not for public viewing.

### **3.9.2 Forestlands in the Region**

**Modify the second to the last paragraph (above the bullets) to read as follows:**

*About 5,000 acres of PacifiCorp forestlands are within the MWHMA and are managed to enhance conditions for wildlife in general, and to provide for a 50:50 forage:cover ratio for elk (PacifiCorp 1998). Measures in the SOP designed to improve forest stand conditions at various seral stages include:*

### **3.9.3 Forestland on WHMP Lands**

Modify the first paragraph to read as follows:

*There are over \*\*\*\* acres of forestlands within the WHMP lands, far more than any other habitat type (Table 2-6). Of these forestlands \*\*\* are designated as buffers, or conservation*

covenants, leaving about \*\*\*\* available to be managed using silvicultural prescriptions to enhance wildlife habitat. For forestland management purposes, PacifiCorp has developed "management units" for the MWHMA. Unit borders are based on topography or natural breaks, such as roads. Management units range from about 400-800 ac in size and encompass a variety of a forestland types and stand ages, as well as other habitats. Harvest areas (typically 3-10 ac) are distributed within and between units to meet forage:cover ratios for elk and develop habitat components for other wildlife. It is anticipated that a similar system of management units and harvest areas would be developed for the WHMP for other PacifiCorp lands.

Modify Table in 3.9.3 as follows:

**Table 3-9** Area of forestland types in the WMHP outside of buffers (correct numbers to be added at later date)

COVER TYPES	Project Area						Grand Total
	Merwin	Swift No. 1	Lewis River Bypass	Swift No. 2 Canal	T-line	Yale	
<b>Conifer Forests</b>							
Seedling/Sapling-new (SS1)							
Seedling/Sapling (SS)							
Pole Conifer (P)							
Pole Conifer-thinned (P-t)							
Mid-Successional Conifer (MS)							
Mid-Successional Conifer-thinned (MS-t)							
Mature Conifer (M)							
<b>Conifer Forest Total</b>							
<b>Upland Deciduous Forests</b>							
Young Upland Deciduous (YUD)							
Upland Deciduous (UD)							
<b>Upland Deciduous Forest Total</b>							
<b>Upland Mixed Forests</b>							
Young Upland Mixed (YUM)							
Upland Mixed (UM)							
Upland Mixed-thinned (UM-t)							
<b>Upland Mixed Forest Total</b>							
<b>Forestland Total</b>							

### 3.9.4 Forestland Goals and Objectives

Modify 3.9.4 Evaluation Species to read as follows:

*Evaluation Species: Black-capped chickadee, savannah sparrow, pileated woodpecker, and elk*

**Modify Objective b to read as follows:**

*Objective b: Over the life of the licenses, maintain or develop at least 2 snags/acre ( $\geq 20$ " dbh), 3 reserve trees/acre ( $\geq 15$  in. dbh) and 4 logs/acre ( $\geq 24$  in. dia and 50 ft long) if available in harvest areas, with the intent of meeting PHS snag guidelines for the pileated woodpecker at the management unit level.*

Next meeting the WHMP Standards & Guidelines discussion to begin with 3.9.4, Objective b.

### **Agenda Items for November 9, 2005**

- WHMP Discussion, starting with forestlands and then continuing onto riparian/wetland buffers and Shrublands, Farmland/Idle Field/Meadow, Orchards.
- 2006 Meeting schedule

### **Next Scheduled Meetings**

#### **November 9, 2005**

Merwin Hydro Facility  
Ariel, WA  
9:00am – 3:00pm

#### **December 2, 2005**

US Fish & Wildlife  
Lacey, WA  
9:00am – 3:00pm

Meeting adjourned at 3:00pm

### **Handouts**

1. Final Meeting Agenda
2. Draft WHMP Goals & Objectives (101205)
3. Applegate's edits to Wetland habitat
4. Draft meeting notes from 10/03/05
5. Should we guarantee the Size of Buffers?
6. WDFW Management Recommendations for Washington's Priority Habitats – Riparian Appendix B