

FINAL Meeting Notes
Lewis River License Implementation
Terrestrial Coordination Committee (TCC) Meeting
August 22, 2005
Longview, Washington

TCC Participants Present: (13)

Brock Applegate, WDFW
Monte Garrett, PacifiCorp
Diana Gritten-MacDonald, Cowlitz PUD
Eric Holman, WDFW
Mike Iyall, Cowlitz Indian Tribe
LouEllyn Jones, US Fish & Wildlife
Curt Leigh, WDFW (via teleconference)
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

Calendar:

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 22nd Meeting:	Status:
Naylor: Provide recommendation of language which defines the term "sustainable" for the TCC to review and approve.	Next Meeting: 9/16/05
McShane: Provide summary regarding the type and number of snags based upon historic data gathered during licensing as part of the data collection effort for the HEP.	
Naylor: Provide TCC an example of unit level forest management plan	On-going

Assignments from August 15th Meeting:	Status:
Olson requested TCC to send any signed Confidentiality Agreements to McCune via mail or email at the earliest convenience	On-going
McCune: Email Final Confidentiality Agreement to Mike Iyall	Complete – 7/16/05
Gritten-MacDonald: Confirm acreage in Table 2.3 and inform McShane	In progress
Naylor: Add number of acres PacifiCorp has harvested in Yale and Swift 1 project areas.	Next meeting: 9/16/05

Opening, Review of Agenda

Colleen McShane (EDAW) called the meeting to order at 9:30am. Purpose of the meeting is to continue the review of the draft WHMP Standards and Guidelines document.

2.9.4 Forestland Goals and Objectives

The TCC continued their review of Version 80205 of the WHMP Standards & Guidelines document, beginning with group discussion of Forestland Goals and Objectives, Section 2.9.4 WDFW presented a suggestion relating to diversity of tree size classes instead of cover/forage ratios. Additional discussion was had on trees per acre planted (currently varies from 300 to 325 approximately), minimum stocking density, pre-commercial thinning, under-story grasses, seral stages, forage, sustainability tree composition, dbh class, small clear cuts, timber models, stocking rate, stem density, forage cover ratios, forestlands unit size, successional stages, deciduous component, late successional old-growth reserve, and hiding and thermal cover

The question was raised again about how the TCC continues to have on-going input to and review of the management activity, how the TCC engaged, how is accountability shared, and can Kirk Naylor (PacifiCorp) provide a baseline suggestion for the TCC review and approval? It was explained that the TCC should again review the Settlement Agreement dealing with coordination, and that annual reports and meetings will provide opportunities for review. The utilities are committed to the process of involving other TCC members in WHMP implementation over the entire license period.

McShane indicated that she will be cognizant when the term “we” is used in the document to add clarification to references of the Utilities vs. the TCC.

Curt Leigh joined us the meeting via tele-conference at 10:30am.

Brock Applegate (WDFW) communicated that the agencies may be slightly gun-shy because the forest management plan seems like more of a notification than coordination and that they’d like to be more engaged. One of their interests is to participate in the review and approval of forest activities on WHMP lands.

Break <11:15am>

Reconvene <11:25am>

2.9.4 Forestland Goals and Objectives (cont’d)

Curt Leigh (WDFW) indicated to the TCC that the word “sustainable” is difficult to define. Naylor responded that he will provide a recommendation of language which defines the term “sustainable” for the TCC to review and approve.

Objective a: Modify as follows (TCC may further modify on September 16, 2005):

Within one year develop a forest management plan that provides a range of alternatives for maintaining a mix of sustainable forage and hiding cover for elk, considering adjacent land management over the life of the licenses.

Objective b: General discussion took place regarding forage for pileated woodpeckers, snags per acre, safety issues relating to snags, periodic snag survey monitoring plan by sample, monitoring vs. habitat enhancement, pileated woodpecker foraging guidelines and costs associated with surveying snag count.

McShane will provide summary regarding the type and number of snags based upon historic data gathered during relicensing as part of the data collection effort for the HEP.

Leigh requested some emphasis on identifying soft and hard snag classes in varying age decay states. There was also some discussion on the terms management unit versus management area. These will need to be defined in the text of the standards and guidelines.

The TCC recommended maintaining the original Objective b language with the following modifications:

Over the life of the licenses, manage forestlands at a unit level to maintain or increase the availability of wildlife reserve trees (snags) in a variety of decay stages and logs, using PHS guidelines as a unit goal.

Lunch <12:40pm>

Reconvene <1:10pm>

Naylor drew an illustration for the TCC to include a management unit (approx 100 acres), including shrubland and riparian areas, buffers and a harvest area, which represents how he is managing forestland now to develop forage and manage snags. Using this example he explained what the distribution of reserve trees and snags might be like. He further described what OHSA will allow during a harvest relating to safe distances from snags (1 and ½ tree heights around existing snags). At approximately age 30 when commercial thinning might be conducted, the buffer around existing snags would limit the ability to thin in many areas. For example, if the PHS goal for the harvest area were 12 snags per acre there wouldn't be an opportunity to provide enhanced forage for elk to meet WDFW goals. He further expressed natural attrition will create snags in some of the unmanaged areas. Besides the snags or reserve trees that are left or developed in harvest acres, there are snags being developed in the shrublands, old growth areas and riparian areas. To go out and count snags over the WHMP lands would be expensive. Naylor indicated that he currently looks for a minimum size of 20" dbh for developing snags or "leave" trees as large diameter snags last longer.

Applegate (WDFW) and LouEllyn Jones (USFWS) requested language that established a unit goal and a minimum goal for the harvest area.

Applegate agreed that Naylor's illustration is reasonable.

After this discussion, the TCC agreed not to use the original Objective b, as revised prior to lunch and to modify Kirk's Objective b as follows:

Over the life of the licenses maintain or develop at least 2 snags per acre (>20" dbh) 3 reserve trees (>7"/5" dbh) and 2 logs (20" diameter, 20' long) at the harvest area level with the objective of meeting PHS guidelines for pileated woodpecker for snags in the management unit.

Monte Garrett (PacifiCorp) pointed out that the "at least" language gives the TCC the flexibility of doing more if there is available budget. The 2 snags per acre are not intended to be a constraint.

Objective c: General discussion took place regarding the state Forest Practices Act, clear cuts, requirements on harvesting areas, progress checks, field monitoring, alder stands, riparian management and conifer components.

The TCC agreed to modify Objective c as follows, but may need further modification on September 16, 2005.

Promote habitat diversity by increasing or maintaining native tree species composition where appropriate site conditions exist over the life of the license.

<Break 2:15pm>

<Reconvene 2:25pm>

2.9.4 Forestland Goals and Objectives (cont'd)

The TCC agreed to strike the following proposed Objective d:

Over the life of the licenses, implement forest management activities that meet or exceed Washington Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) protection measures to maintain riparian and wetland habitats and functions, as determined by a wildlife biologist on a case by case basis

Objectives related to buffers are already provided in the riparian and wetland programs and do not need to be repeated here. The text in the forestland section will reference back to these other sections.

Plan-Wide Goals

The TCC agreed to modify the Goal as follows:

Prevent the establishment and spread of weeds currently listed by the Washington State Noxious Weed Control Board and Clark, Cowlitz, and Skamania county weed boards, and other undesirable or invasive plant species identified by the TCC (see Exhibit C for list of invasive species).

The TCC agreed to modify Objective a as follows:

Inventory for new infestations of invasive plant species as part of Annual Plans for habitat management activities.

McShane will wordsmith the following Objective b and present to the TCC for their review and approval on September 16, 2005:

Develop, implement and monitor the effectiveness of control measures over the life of the licenses to limit the establishment of invasive plant species on WHMP lands.

The TCC agreed to modify Objective c as follows:

Coordinate with public land managers to control known infestations of invasive non-native plant species on their lands within the Project boundary.

Raptor Site Management Goal

The TCC agreed to modify the Goal as follows:

Provide habitat for and minimize or avoid disturbance to raptors, including northern bald eagles, ospreys, accipiters, and owls.

The TCC agreed to modify Objective a as follows:

Survey areas scheduled for habitat management to identify active and inactive raptor nests sites, as well as perch and roost sites, if possible, and implement appropriate measures to protect these sites.

The TCC agreed to modify Objective b as follows:

Identify and implement measures to minimize disturbance to raptors at known nest sites from habitat management activities.

The TCC agreed to modify Objective c as follows:

Within 5 years of WHMP implementation and then as needed, identify areas that could be enhanced to provide future nesting, perching, or roosting habitat for raptors.

The TCC agreed to modify Objective d as follows:

Conduct 2 annual aerial surveys of WHMP lands to determine use by breeding bald eagles and osprey.

The TCC agreed to modify Objective e as follows:

Continue to manage PacifiCorp electrical, distribution, and transmission facilities according to PacifiCorp standards and guidelines, which are based on the avian protection on power lines (Avian Power Lines Interaction Committee [APLIC] 1994, 1996).

The TCC agreed to modify Objective f as follows:

If identified, manage avian interaction problems with Cowlitz PUD electrical, and transmission facilities, as described in Exhibit B of the Settlement Agreement, consistent with the Avian Power Lines Interaction Committee 1994 and 1996 guidelines.

Agenda Items for September 16, 2005

- Review and approval of meeting notes for 8/10/05, 8/15/05 and 8/22/05
- WHMP Discussion

Next Scheduled Meeting

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

Monday, October 3, 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