

FINAL Meeting Notes
Lewis River License Implementation
Terrestrial Coordination Committee (TCC) Meeting
May 11, 2005
Ariel, Washington

TCC Participants Present: (13)

Brock Applegate, WDFW
 Mike Iyall, Cowlitz Indian Tribe
 John Clapp, Lewis River Citizens at-Large
 Monte Garrett, PacifiCorp
 Diana Gritten-MacDonald, Cowlitz PUD
 Curt Leigh, WDFW
 Kimberly McCune, PacifiCorp
 Colleen McShane, EDAW, Inc.
 Kirk Naylor, PacifiCorp
 Bob Nelson, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Inc.
 Todd Olson, PacifiCorp
 Gene Stagner, US Fish & Wildlife
 Mitch Wainwright, USDA Forest Service

Calendar:

May 19, 2005	ACC Meeting	Toledo, WA
June 8, 2005	TCC Meeting	Lacey, WA
June 9, 2005	ACC Meeting	Merwin, WA
June 23, 2005	TCC Site Visit	Merwin, WA
June 24, 2005	TCC Site Visit	Merwin, WA

Assignments from May 11th Meeting:	Status:
McCune Add return receipt notification for emails to Gene Stagner (WDFW)	Complete – 5/16/05
McCune: Distribute draft meeting notes within (7) seven business days.	Complete – 5/18/05
McCune: Modify confidentiality agreement and redistribute to TCC	Complete – 5/12/05
Garrett: Add Swift and Lewis language to introductory statement.	Complete – 5/25/05
Garrett: Add clarification that there are three (3) different funds to Land Acquisition document and to include when they come available	Complete - 5/24/05
McCune: Naylor and Applegate to set site visit off-line and McCune will inform the TCC.	Complete - 5/25/05
McShane: Report back to the TCC with changes to the Goals & Objectives document one week before the next scheduled meeting on June 8, 2005.	Complete – 5/31/05
TCC: Comments on maps are due to Kirk Naylor on or before May 18, 2005.	Complete

Assignments from April 13th Meeting:	Status:
Decision to formalize TCC Confidentiality Agreement on May 11, 2005.	Approved - 5/11/05
McCune: Distribute draft meeting notes within (7) seven business days.	Complete - 4/22/05
Olson: Make recommended changes to Ground Rules and distribute to TCC	Complete - 4/14/05

McCune: Include contact number of TCC Coordinator on each Agenda and contact number of meeting location.	Complete - 4/14/05
Olson: Confirm with Gene Stagner if he approves of striking Section E of Comments, Decisions and Recommendation in the CC Structure and Ground Rules document.	Approved - 4/21/05
McCune: Distribute the PacifiCorp Forestry Management Policy to the TCC	Complete - 4/22/05
McCune: Setup conference call for TCC on April 25, 2005 at 2:00pm to discuss land acquisition proposal.	Complete - 4/14/05

Opening, Review of Agenda and Meeting Notes

Monte Garrett (PacifiCorp) asked if the TCC wanted additions to the agenda or did they have any comments. Curt Leigh (WDFW) requested a modification to page four (Managed Forestland Goal), and remove the comma after the word “species”, to read as follows: *Manage forestlands to promote stand species composition and structures that benefit wildlife species and to provide an appropriate mosaic of big game hiding cover and forage.*

CC Ground Rules

Todd Olson (PacifiCorp) clarified to Gene Stagner (WDFW) the issues/comments surrounding section (e), page 3 of the CC Ground Rules. Stagner is fine with section (e) as written.

Olson said that the CC Ground Rules represent both ACC and TCC comments. In addition, Olson communicated to the group that PacifiCorp added Appendix C (pertinent provision from the Lewis River Settlement Agreement) as a convenience for the ACC and TCC participants.

Garrett asked the TCC if any disagreement regarding formal approval of the CC Structure and Ground Rules. No disagreement from the TCC – **document is approved by the TCC.**

Confidentiality Agreement (CA)

Olson said that the CA document represents a final draft. There was general discussion about designated agents, and authorized signers.

Kimberly McCune (PacifiCorp) communicated to the TCC that the CA could in fact be signed via facsimile or in counterpart, should this help with internal procedure for the TCC participants.

Curt Leigh (WDFW) noted that their legal review of the CA is still underway. Olson noted his preference to wait to sign the CA until such time feedback is received from Leigh.

Diana Gritten-MacDonald (Cowlitz PUD) requested a revision in Section A, page 1 and add an “s” in the word “order” as follows: *The Parties anticipate that the Commission will adopt the Relicensing Settlement Agreement in forthcoming licensing orders, and that the Commission will issue new licenses for the Projects consistent with the Relicensing Settlement Agreement.*

Leigh requested a revision to Section B, page 1 and remove the word “certain” to read as follows: *Among other things, the TCC will (i) provide a forum for coordination between the Licensees and the other Parties on terrestrial resources PM&E Measure implementation, and (ii) oversee aspects of the wildlife habitat management plan*

PacifiCorp will make the requested changes and email the revision back to the TCC for their review.

Garrett asked if any additional changes and/or comments regarding the CA. No additional comments or changes from the TCC.

WHMP Goals & Objectives

Colleen McShane (EDAW) suggested to the TCC to make Objectives more specific. McShane handed out the Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge Goals & Objectives for TCC review. The format and structure is the purpose of the Nisqually example.

Old-Growth Objectives:

There was general discussion among the TCC regarding minimum patch size, what definition do we use as old-growth, snag size, HEP analysis, pileated woodpecker, mapping criteria, more specificity in the Objectives, connectivity Objectives and shoreline buffers.

Stagner requested the TCC look at desired future conditions rather than limiting ourselves to a certain percentage now. Stagner also communicated that the TCC should set Objectives that take us through the term of the License and consider acquisition phases.

McShane said that the TCC could have short and long term time frames built into their Objectives.

McShane will add the HEP/cover type definition to the Goals & Objectives and HEP/HSI information.

McShane suggested an explanatory paragraph be added for each Goal.

The TCC agreed that these additions would add longevity to the WHMP and add clarity to the intent of the Goals & Objectives. The additions will add the logic that drives the process.

Stagner emphasized that the Objectives have to be measurable. Stagner said he thought it was acceptable for the TCC to key in on what other adjacent land owners are doing and leverage what the TCC is doing with our WHMP such that we complement other property owner management activities.

The TCC requested the definition of buffers & connectivity for Objective B in context of pileated woodpecker and old-growth.

Brock Applegate (WDFW) inquired on the size of old-growth or future old-growth patch sizes for pileated woodpeckers. Should we manage for species that require larger old-growth patch sizes such as Northern spotted owls or marbled murrelets?

Mitch Wainwright (USDA Forest Service) felt that PacifiCorp did not have enough area on their mitigation lands to maintain larger old-growth patch sizes species but could coordinate management of these species with other owners.

McShane indicated that she would put a place-hold on including a process to evaluate new lands to management habitat plan (integration).

<Break 10:40am>

<Reconvene 10:55am>

WHMP Goals & Objectives (cont'd)

Old-Growth Habitat Objectives:

Mitch Wainwright (USDA Forest Service) suggested the TCC manage toward a percentage of old-growth on PacifiCorp and Cowlitz PUD lands.

Olson said PacifiCorp would like to not manage towards a percentage, rather identify what is available and it's potential, then manage towards that.

Brock Applegate (WDFW) said we could manage for species habitat instead of a percentage. We may want to decide which species and how many we want on our wildlife lands. In Objective C, we should expand future old-growth areas for more reasons than just connectivity. For example, we may desire to expand old-growth patch sizes and this objective may include management with adjacent landowners.

Leigh suggested editing Objective C to read: "*additional old-growth habitat characteristics and connectivity.*" Leigh also said to keep in mind the acquisition time frame as it relates to the WHMP time frame.

Mike Iyall (Cowlitz Indian Tribe) asked if newly acquired lands be integrated into the existing WHMP.

Modify Objective C to read as follows: *Within five (5) years and as new lands are required evaluate and determine the need to identify specific mature stands that will be managed to develop additional old-growth habitat characteristics and connectivity.*

Iyall communicated to the TCC that we are talking general guidelines not a specific rule, so the 5-year timeline is acceptable. The TCC all agreed.

Stagner said it may depend upon when we add the definition of old-growth if we need additional Objectives under old-growth.

It was suggested that McShane build categories from the Settlement Agreement into the Goals & Objectives strategies or explain how the categories are now covered:

- Category 1 – stands with few if any old-growth characteristics
- Category 2 – Young – mature
- Category 3 – Old-growth

The TCC concurred that the explanatory paragraph McShane will write into the old-growth habitat goal will include categories 1, 2 & 3 as background information and not directly in the goal.

Garrett read the definition of old-growth cover type used in the HEP study to the TCC.

Wetland Objectives:

McShane communicated to the TCC the rationale of how she developed Objectives a, b & c. She further communicated that what the TCC can do is fairly limited as there is not a significant amount of wetland area.

Applegate would like to add “waterfowl nesting” to Objective C.

Stagner requested that Objective C be edited to be more measurable.

Modify Objective A to read as follows: *Manage water levels in existing man-made wetlands with water control structures to improve habitat and reproductive success for native amphibians (especially red-legged frogs) and discourage bull frog use.*

Modify Objective C to read as follows: Within five (5) years identify opportunity to enhance select wetlands to benefit waterfowl nesting.

Riparian Area Objectives:

Modify Objective B to read as follows: *Protect and maintain riparian mixed forests with the objective of reaching at least 4 per acre with a target of TY 45 (increasing pileated woodpecker HSI from 0.46 to 0.53 at Swift and 0.5 to 0.65 at Merwin).*

Note: the TCC concurred that additional edits in Objective B are needed relating to increasing the mean number of large trees.

Modify Objective C to read as follows: *Protect existing snags and evaluate and determine if creation of additional large snags (> 20 in. dbh) in select stands of riparian mixed forest is needed to increase numbers (≥ 0.2 /ac) for pileated woodpecker (increasing pileated woodpecker HSI from 0.46 to 0.53 at Swift and 0.5 to 0.65 at Merwin).*

<Lunch 12:20pm>
<Reconvene 1:00pm>

Shrubland Objectives:

Modify Objective A to read as follows: *Evaluate and manage cover typed shrub stands to prevent the encroachment of trees and conversion to forest and to maintain a mix of shrub age and structural characteristics.*

Modify Objective B to read as follows: *Maintain existing native shrub patches in the transmission line ROW to provide browse and screening cover for elk and deer that use the ROW for forage or as a travel corridor.*

Naylor suggested two Objectives under the Shrubland Goal:

- 1) One about trees
- 2) One about shrubs

After some discussion, the group agreed to make Objective B one of the ROW objectives and to incorporate Objective C as an objective under both the ROW and Farmland/Old Field/Meadow goals.

Farmland/Old Field/Meadow Objectives:

Modify Objective A to read as follows: *Intensively manage designated farm fields at Saddle Dam Farm and on acquired lands and select meadows to provide quality forage for wintering elk (November 1-April 30).*

Modify Objective B to read as follows: *Manage hedgerows between farm fields and meadows to provide screening/hiding cover for elk.*

Modify Objective C to read as follows: *Manage select meadows and old fields to prevent shrub/tree encroachment, and to maintain a diverse composition of desirable grasses and forbs for birds and mammals.*

Add new Objective D: Maintain native fruit or soft mast bearing species in shrub patches in hedgerows.

Orchard Goal:

Modify Orchard Goal to read as follows: *Protect and maintain existing orchards to provide healthy fruit bearing trees for big game and upland game birds.*

Orchard Objectives:

Modify Objective A to read as follows: *Replace dead fruit trees, as needed, to maintain existing orchards.*

Add new Objective C: Evaluate existing orchards and determine the feasibility and desirability of expanding the number of trees.

Transmission Line Right-of-Way (ROW) Objectives:

Modify Objective A to read as follows: *Identify suitable areas within the ROW at Cougar and Speelyia between Swift Dam and Yale to provide forage for big game.*

Add new Objective C to read as follows: Identify suitable areas within the ROW between Swift and Yale dams (Cougar – Speelyai line?) for management of enhanced elk forage and shrub patches.

McShane will report back to the TCC with her changes to the Goals & Objectives document one week before the next scheduled meeting on June 8, 2005.

Updates (Site visit, Secondary Use Lands, summary of conference call discussion)

Kirk Naylor (PacifiCorp) asked the TCC if any additional interest at this time in a site visit. Applegate and Naylor will set a site visit off line and McCune will inform the TCC.

Naylor informed the TCC of the following changes which were made to the maps relating to secondary management areas:

- Yellow areas indicate excluded areas.
- Sheet 6 of 11 addresses Leigh's concern re: Cresap Bay.
- The dotted line is seasonal secondary use lands.

Garrett explained to the TCC that within the WHMP, PacifiCorp would further discuss the meaning and intent of Cresap Bay and the dotted line.

Leigh requested the word "secondary" be removed relating to Cresap Bay Campground. This area is unique to wildlife and requires special designation and different treatment than secondary use lands. He finds it acceptable if PacifiCorp uses the term "seasonal management area".

Olson said that the key piece is the details to be written in the WHMP. Olson agreed to remove the word "secondary" as it relates to Cresap Bay Campground on the maps and identify its uniqueness in the WHMP.

Noting a new addition to the maps, Naylor said that on Page 11 of 11 there is a small rectangle called a "house lease." One of the homes belongs to PacifiCorp and Naylor called it out on the map.

Naylor further communicated that the maps are written as draft and need a final review. Comments from the TCC on the maps are requested by one week from today, which is May 18, 2005.

Summary of Conference Call (RMEF)

Garrett updated the TCC regarding the conference call with Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation (RMEF). This discussion was confidential and proprietary and not for public viewing.

Garrett will inform the TCC of the final outcome with RMEF

Land Acquisition Decision-making Process Update

Garrett provided a review of the revised draft Land Acquisition document. Garrett communicated that criteria a, b and c is specific language from the Lewis River Settlement Agreement, which applies to Yale only. Garrett further communicated that based upon original criteria, this document is not a pass/fail document but rather a list of considerations. The first five considerations are related to cost effectiveness, and the last three are "other factors".

PacifiCorp was requested to modify the third consideration to read as follows: PROXIMITY TO OTHER STATE, FEDERAL AND CONSERVATION LANDS

And, add number 8 to "OTHER FACTORS" to read as follows: How does the parcel contribute to the Goals & Objectives of the WHMP.

Applegate requested that number four in "OTHER FACTORS" be modified to read as follows: Presence of endangered or other listed species habitats.

Leigh to provide later comment relating to elevations in the consideration entitled "ASPECT / SLOPE / ELEVATION.

Leigh also requested expansion of the introductory discussion within the document. He requested adding clarification that there are three (3) different funds and to include when they come available. Garrett will add Swift and Lewis River Fund language to introductory statement.

Miscellaneous

Agenda Items for June 8, 2005

- Review notes of last meeting
- Status of Yale acquisition
- Continue discussion of Goals & Objectives
- Confidentiality Agreement
- Land Acquisition Decision

Next Scheduled Meeting

Wednesday, June 8, 2005
US Fish and Wildlife
Lacey, WA
9:00am – 3:00pm

Meeting adjourned at 3:00pm

Handouts

1. Final Meeting Agenda
2. Draft TCC Confidentiality Agreement
3. Draft Meeting Notes for 4-13-05
4. Final CC Structure and Ground Rules
5. Draft WHMP Goals & Objectives