

FINAL Meeting Notes
Lewis River License Implementation
Terrestrial Coordination Committee (TCC) Meeting
August 10, 2005
Ariel, Washington

TCC Participants Present: (13)

Brock Applegate, WDFW
 John Clapp, Lewis River Citizens at-Large
 Diana Gritten-MacDonald, Cowlitz PUD
 Eric Holman, WDFW
 Mike Iyall, Cowlitz Indian Tribe
 LouEllyn Jones, US Fish and Wildlife
 Colleen McShane, EDAW, Inc.
 Kirk Naylor, PacifiCorp
 Bob Nelson, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Inc.
 Todd Olson, PacifiCorp
 Arianne Poindexter, PacifiCorp
 Gene Stagner, US Fish & Wildlife
 Mitch Wainwright, USDA Forest Service

Calendar:

August 22, 2005	TCC Meeting	Longview, WA
Sept. 8, 2005	ACC Meeting	Conference Call-in
Sept. 16, 2005	TCC Meeting	Merwin Hydro
October 3, 2005	TCC Meeting	Lacey, WA

Assignments from August 10th Meeting:	Status:
McCune: Post final 7/13/05 meeting notes.	Complete – 7/16/05
Olson: Confirm the number of Settlement Agreement signatures and report back to McShane.	Complete – 7/15/05

Assignments from July 13th Meeting:	Status:
McCune: Post final 6/8/05 meeting notes to include modifications.	Complete - 7/15/05
Olson: Bring in a laptop & projector to assist with document edits during our next TCC meeting scheduled on August 10, 2005.	Complete - 8/10/05
McCune - Post the Merwin Raptor Management Plan on the Lewis River website (password protected).	Complete – 7/19/05
McCune – Post the PacifiCorp Bird Management Program on the Lewis River website, to include collision and electrocution program (password protected).	Complete – 7/19/05
Gritten-MacDonald - Present language to TCC relating to avian interactions with electrical equipment.	Complete – 7/18/05
McCune - Post Land Acquisition Decision-making Process Update on the	Complete – 7/15/05

Lewis River website as a final document.	
McCune - Email TCC Confidentiality Agreement to all Settlement Agreement Parties with an explanation that TCC representatives who will be attending and/or participating in future TCC meetings will be involved from time-to-time in confidential conversations, and in order to participate in such conversations, representatives will need to provide the appropriate signature/authorization within their organizations on the TCC Confidentiality Agreement.	Complete – 7/15/05

Opening, Review of Agenda and Meeting Notes

Todd Olson (PacifiCorp) reviewed the Agenda and the July Meeting Notes with the TCC. All participants decided to approve the notes prior to the morning break.

Colleen McShane (EDAW) informed the TCC that they would be reviewing Version 80205 of the WHMP Standards & Guidelines document, and that the group will try to get as far as possible.

Kirk Naylor (PacifiCorp) informed the TCC that he and Diana Gritten-MacDonald (Cowlitz PUD) would be writing the respective WHMPs, annual reports, etc. after the WHMP Standards & Guidelines document is complete.

- 1) Start WHMP while simultaneously finishing WHMP Standards and Guidelines document.
- 2) The TCC will be able to review drafts before submitting to FERC next year. Gritten-MacDonald has hired consultant to write Cowlitz PUD's WHMP and first year Annual Plan portion. The TCC communicated that it is acceptable for PacifiCorp and Cowlitz PUD to meet separately with TCC to review drafts.

McShane indicated that she has captured all of June and July revisions to the draft WHMP Standards and Guidelines. The blue highlights are from Brock Applegate (WDFW), yellow highlights from McShane, gray highlights from Naylor, and green from Mike Iyall (Cowlitz Indian Tribe).

The following represent points of discussion as the TCC reviewed the new version:

1.0 Introduction

Gritten-MacDonald and Mitch Wainwright (USDA Forest Service) wanted to move the paragraph in Section 1.5 proposed by Applegate and combine in page 4, Section 1.4.

John Clapp (Lewis River Citizens at-Large) wanted to also include “other information sources”, in order to not exclude anything.

The TCC participants noted that the text relating to number of Settlement Agreement signatures does not add up, so Olson will confirm.

Applegate asked if the TCC would stay together after the WHMP is finalized. Olson replied that at a minimum of once per year, the TCC would meet to discuss actions for future year and what transpired over the past year. In addition, Olson stated that perhaps quarterly meeting are appropriate.

McShane added that in the beginning the TCC would meet more often.

Applegate requested more assurance that the TCC will be approving projects. Applegate was informed that Section 14.2.6 of the Settlement Agreement covered this concern. Olson communicated that the Annual Plan will be submitted to the TCC prior to implementing any projects for that year.

Gene Stagner (US Fish & Wildlife) expressed concern about hazard trees. Stagner communicated that the TCC does not agree about what a hazard tree is, which leaves a huge area of interpretation. He wants the TCC to develop specific plans so enough tracks are left that a new group of TCC representatives could follow the intent. The TCC concurred that this topic could be discussed later in the document.

The TCC agreed to add the following text to Section 1.2, Page 3:

As provide by Section 14.2.6 of the Settlement Agreement, the annual plan will be submitted , and associated meeting held, prior to implementing any projects fro that year (in general, the first quarter of each calendar year).

Eric Holman (WDFW) asked if there would be any field review, and Olson replied yes, as it is needed or requested.

1.3 Lands Covered by the WHMP's

Olson questioned Applegate's added language in Section 1.3 regarding inundation of the reservoirs behind the dams and its causation in the low number of wetlands. Stagner added that he did not think we could say that about wetlands and suggested changing the language from, "due mainly to" to "partially due to".

Regarding Applegate's suggested language, Gritten-MacDonald noted this document goes forward, this is editorial comment. Stagner describe what we have and go forward. Language not needed. Bob Nelson (RMEF) agrees with Stagner.

Applegate remarked that if we state the type of habitat and species lost during to the dam and reservoir construction, we know the kind of habitat we should manage and mitigate for and species we should consider in the WHMP.

Stagner and Gritten-MacDonald want to add the following language from the Settlement Agreement in Section 10.1 and include on page 4 of the WHMP document:

“..... as additional Interests in Lands.....” , as defined in Section 10.1 of the Settlement Agreement.

2.0 Wildlife Habitat Goals and Objectives

The TCC concurred that Gritten-MacDonald and Naylor will ensure that the management plans are consistent with all State and Federal laws (i.e. Migratory Bird Treaty Act).

Stagner expressed that he did not like that the Managed Forestlands only identifies the habitat types. The TCC agreed to strike “Managed” from Managed Forestlands.

Prior to the break, the TCC adopted the July 13, 2005 meeting notes.

<Break 10:30am>

<Reconvene 10:40am>

Applegate requested the addition of the following language to page 7 after “..... lessons learned in implementing the Merwin SOP, utility policies.....”:

“updated studies, habitat requirements, recent research and state, federal management plans and regulations.”

McShane will illustrate these in bullets.

Applegate requested that the TCC should include, manage, and consider other species (i.e. Analysis species, PHS species, state and federally-listed species, etc.) beyond the HEP species. The TCC should manage for any species it deems appropriate and the SA refers to the species the TCC should address in the opening statements of the SA in Section 10.8. Applegate requested language from Settlement Agreement (Section 10.8) “The Purpose of the WHMP’s shall be to benefit a broad range of fish, wildlife, and native plant species, including, but not limited to, large and small game, amphibians, bats, forest raptors, neo-tropical birds, and culturally significant native plants.”

2.1.1 Old-Growth Forest Habitat (Background Information)

Stagner expressed concern that some person might be able to apply criteria that is not intended. Stagner will think about this more. The TCC should include an option that would include consideration of the management of adjoined acreage, etc.

<Lunch 12:30pm>

<Reconvene 1:00pm>

2.1.4 Old-Growth Habitat Goals and Objectives

Objective a: The TCC determined that there are two objectives in this language, so McShane will split into two.

Applegate would like to add measure for snags such as retaining at least two of the snags over 84' tall, 37 snags/acre, 22" diameter, 6' tall.

Gritten-MacDonald reminded the TCC that the use of the HEP Model and its results are the mechanism to measure success. She doesn't want to include a new set of standards.

The group discussed how new information can be used to help guide implementation of measures that improve habitat values beyond what would be needed to meet the HEP standard. Information will not change the measurement for the utilities, but rather it could influence how things get done.

A minimum standard of HEP was established during licensing process. If within funding guidelines, the TCC could look at options for further increasing habitat value. McShane will rework this language.

The TCC agreed to add the following language:

"The minimum measurement standard for each objective will be based on the habitat parameter as defined by the species models used by the HEP. The TCC may decide to implement management measures that exceed these standards on a case-by-case basis."

Objective b: Wainwright does not like the term "no disturbance". The intent is based on development of old growth, connectivity issue. Look at polygons on map and then look at areas that would provide connectivity. Manage and maintain the buffer for old growth was suggested language.

Objective c: Iyall thinks "additional acreage" is covered in land purchase.

<Break 2:00pm>

<Reconvene 2:15pm>

2.1.4 Old-Growth Habitat Goals and Objectives (cont'd)

Applegate suggested a new objective d. Retain trees, snags and stumps with existing pileated woodpecker nest cavities and foraging excavations.

Olson recommended working this language into objectives b or c or addressing it in the management plan. The TCC resolved to address Applegate's issues in the management plan.

2.2 Wetland Habitat

Add new Objective e to read as follows:

"Identify buffers to maintain and protect wetland habitat and wetland function, considering existing PHS standards and guidelines as a starting point".

McShane will add PHS standards in the document as a table.

Olson copied the WDFW information “Snags” and distributed to the TCC participants,

McShane will look for the PHS guidelines for Wetlands from WDFW site. If she can’t find them she will go to the DOE.

McShane will check on role of TCC in the language of the WHMP –

- 1) Licensee does evaluations.
- 2) TCC recommends what to do.
- 3) Licensees implements actions.

2.3 Riparian Habitat

The group discussed additional objectives for protecting existing snags and size of buffers.

Olson noted the interest of the ACC in this section. The ACC would like to review any actions that may occur in riparian areas as part of the WHMP. Each year when the TCC reviews the annual plans, the ACC could be notified of such actions.

Given time limitations, discussion was stopped mid-way through review of the Riparian Habitat Goals and Objectives.

RMEF Agreement

Garrett updated the TCC. This discussion was confidential and proprietary and not for public viewing.

Meeting Notes

TCC adopted July 13, 2005 meeting notes.

Agenda Items for August 15, 2005

- WHMP Discussion

Next Scheduled Meetings

Monday August 15, 2005
US Fish and Wildlife Office
Lacey, WA
9:30am – 3:00pm

Monday, August 22, 2005
Cowlitz PUD

Longview, WA
9:00am – 3:00pm

Friday, September 16, 2005
Merwin Hydro Facility
Ariel, WA
9:00am – 3:00pm

Meeting adjourned at 3:00pm

Handouts

1. Final Meeting Agenda
2. Draft Meeting Notes for 7-13-05
3. Draft WHMP Goals & Objectives
4. WDFW Habitat Program – SNAGS – June 1995