

**FINAL Meeting Notes**  
**Lewis River License Implementation**  
**Terrestrial Coordination Committee (TCC) Meeting**  
**September 16, 2005**  
**Merwin Headquarters**

**TCC Participants Present: (11)**

Brock Applegate, WDFW  
 Monte Garrett, PacifiCorp  
 Diana Gritten-MacDonald, Cowlitz PUD  
 Eric Holman, WDFW  
 Mike Iyall, Cowlitz Indian Tribe  
 Curt Leigh, WDFW (via teleconference)  
 Colleen McShane, EDAW, Inc.  
 Kirk Naylor, PacifiCorp  
 Todd Olson, PacifiCorp  
 Veronica Stofiel, PacifiCorp  
 Mitch Wainwright, US Forest Service

**Calendar:**

October 3, 2005	TCC Meeting	Lacey, WA
October 6, 2005	ACC Meeting	Merwin
October 21, 2005	TCC Meeting	Merwin
November 9, 2005	TCC Meeting	Merwin

<b>Assignments from September 16th Meeting:</b>	<b>Status:</b>
McCune: Confirm rooms for 10/3, 10/21, and 11/9 TCC meetings.	<b>Complete – 9/22/05</b>
Naylor: Review objectives (primarily habitat) for appropriate level of guidance; notify TCC of issues needing further guidance	<b>Next Meeting: 10/03/05</b>

<b>Assignments from August 22nd Meeting:</b>	<b>Status:</b>
Naylor: Provide recommendation of language which defines the term “sustainable” for the TCC to review and approve.	<b>Next Meeting: 10/03/05</b>
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	<b>Next Meeting: 10/21/05</b>
Naylor: Provide TCC an example of unit level forest management plan	<b>On-going: Next meeting 10/03/05</b>

<b>Assignments from August 15th Meeting:</b>	<b>Status:</b>
Olson requested TCC to send any signed Confidentiality Agreements to McCune via mail or email at the earliest convenience	<b>On-going</b>
McCune: Email Final Confidentiality Agreement to Mike Iyall	<b>Complete – 7/16/05</b>
Gritten-MacDonald: Confirm acreage in Table 2.3 and inform McShane	<b>In progress</b>
Naylor: Add number of acres PacifiCorp has harvested in Yale and Swift 1 project areas.	<b>Next meeting: 10/03/05</b>

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

Colleen McShane (EDAW) called the meeting to order at 9:00am. Purpose of the meeting is to continue the review of the draft WHMP Standards and Guidelines document, beginning with section 3.3 and to review Brock Applegate's comments.

The group reviewed the draft meeting notes from the August 10, 15, and 22 TCC meetings. All were approved with changes noted as follows:

August 10:

Page 2: typo in item no. 2 – should read “*PUD's WHMP and first year Annual Plan portion*”

Page 3: last sentence – “Lands” should be capitalized in “*Interest in Lands*”; Diana MacDonald also explained that “Interest in Lands” is defined in Section 10.1 of the Settlement Agreement

Page 4: Section 2.1.1 – Delete question “*what criteria*”. Applegate will discuss with Gene Stagner.

August 15:

Page 4: Section 2.7.2, paragraph beginning “Cowlitz PUD . . .” MacDonald verified that wording about the transmission line was correct

Page 6: First sentence. Acreages are still being evaluated by each utility. Unable to confirm at this meeting. It was requested that the notes indicate such.

August 22:

No changes; however, Todd Olson provided an update on the confidentiality agreement. The USFS has signed, still waiting on USFWS.

All three notes approved with edits/comments noted.

## **3.3 Public Access Management**

The TCC continued their review of the WHMP Standards & Guidelines document (Version 90805), beginning with group discussion of Public Access Management, Section 3.3.

In Section 3.3.1, WDFW would like the second paragraph to reference birds and amphibians in addition to mammals. McShane will add text to that effect. WDFW also raised the issue of the effects of roads on predators/predation and whether or not that should be addressed in this paragraph. McShane will review the literature (Foreman et al, 2003).

Third paragraph: discussed other sources of literature. McShane stated that she used Witmer because it was specific to the NW but would review other sources (Starkey). McShane will also add info on the effect of 1 mile per mi<sup>2</sup>.

In Section 3.3.2, Mitch Wainwright explained exactly where the small gravel portion of Forest Road 90 is. The road is largely asphalt.

In Section 3.3.3, MacDonald asked that there be a separate paragraph describing public access to Cowlitz PUD's lands. She read proposed language to the group (emailed to McShane). The group had no objections. MacDonald also provided revisions to the second paragraph concerning the gate of the neighboring landowner (emailed to McShane). These revisions will appear in the next version.

In Section 3.3.4, Public Access Management Goals and Objectives, the TCC reviewed the revisions to the goals and objectives in the version 908050 document and Applegate's proposed further revisions and new objectives. Discussion and revisions at the meeting as follows:

### **Goal**

The group refined the wording of the goal for clarity.

New text reads: *Protect wildlife from disturbance and their habitats from degradation, while managing access for non-motorized recreation, which includes legal hunting and fishing.*

### **Objective A**

Objective A was modified to say "Interest in Lands" instead of "new lands", in keeping with the Settlement Agreement. Scheduling information was added from Objective B.

New text reads: *Within 5 years of WHMP implementation or acquisition of Interest in Lands, identify roads for closure, and type of closure, to motorized use by the public and schedule appropriate treatments.*

### **Objective B**

The group felt the meaning of this objective was vague and could not remember the intention when it was developed. It was agreed to delete it and address scheduling in Objective A. Subsequent objectives will be renumbered on next draft

### **Objective C**

There were no changes to Objective C.

### **Objective D**

The group discussed the need for the TCC to work with the recreation resource managers when identifying and managing dispersed sites. Olson reminded the group that dispersed recreation is inevitable and impossible to eliminate; the TCC must have the means to heavily monitor and set criteria along with the recreation managers.

New text reads: *The TCC and recreation resource managers will coordinate to develop criteria for continued use of dispersed sites, monitor dispersed camp sites, monitor that use, identify resource concerns, and determine appropriate management actions. Site pioneering and site creep should be monitored on a schedule consistent with the RRMP over the life of the licenses.*

## **Objective E**

There was general discussion that pioneered roads, etc. may be created through means other than motorized vehicles (i.e., mountain bikes, unknown future activities). The objective was modified to reflect all unauthorized activities. The group also agreed to identify in this objective the potential means by which these roads will be closed (signs, gates, etc.), as a way to address Applegate's concern for clear marking in one of his new proposed objectives.

New text reads: *Identify and close any pioneered "roads", trails, and paths created by unauthorized activities. Create and implement a plan (i.e., signs, gates) and PacifiCorp will also coordinate with law enforcement annually to discourage these activities on wildlife lands through the closure of pioneered "roads" and trails.*

## **Objective F**

The TCC accepted McShane's proposed new wording with modification. McShane will further modify as indicated in new text.

New text reads: *Prior to constructing new roads or making major improvements to existing roads (ie., widening, etc – Colleen to list examples), identify and implement measures to minimize impacts to wildlife habitat and increased vehicle access by the public.*

Next the group discussed Brock Applegate's proposed new objectives H – K (no Objective G)

Proposed **Objective H** addressed road densities and road closures. The group discussed the budgetary implications of closing every road possible and the need to prioritize. Kirk Naylor (PacifiCorp) felt that there is not a great road density in the project area and that, in large part, the roads that are there serve a purpose (i.e., annual maintenance). Road density was calculated during relicensing to be approximately 35 miles of road over 12,000 acres. The group felt that the intent of this objective is covered under Objectives A and C and agreed not to adopt.

Proposed **Objective I** addressed installation of ownership signs at obvious property boundaries with access or in areas with trespassing issues. Naylor addressed the budget implications of such signage and explained that it is already part of the FERC plan to identify boundaries and post signs as necessary. While Naylor stated he appreciated the comment and need to cut down on unauthorized trespass/use, ultimately this is a law enforcement issue and it should be addressed in that arena. The group did agree, however, to add language to Objective E that may in part address the need for signs and/or gates.

Proposed **Objective J** addressed enforcement of road closures and trespassing violations. Naylor discussed the current law enforcement situation and legal issues around using the word "trespass". He thought the idea was to target unauthorized motorized use. The group agreed that this was covered largely in Objective E, and further modified the language of E to include a reference to law enforcement; it was also touched on in C. The group did not adopt as a new objective.

MacDonald discussed how Cowlitz PUD does not have the same obligations as PacifiCorp under the WHMP. She will develop sentence explaining Cowlitz PUD's obligations in its plan.

McShane suggested identifying the objectives that apply to Cowlitz PUD after all wording is complete. The issue will be revisited at a later date.

Proposed **Objective K** addressed discouraging use and construction of individual private docks on reservoirs.

Olson related that in certain instances, especially in neighborhoods, it has generally been PacifiCorp's policy to allow one private boat dock, because the company has found that if they do not allow this at all, people will build temporary private ones, without the appropriate state permits. However, if the company permits it, then they can allow public access to the reservoir. The group agreed that the purpose of this objective was covered elsewhere and decided to delete it.

The TCC then discussed issue of coordination, which had been tabled several months ago, and whether or not it was necessary to have coordination goals and objectives. It was decided to draft a new Section 1.7 of the Standards and Guidelines document. All agreed. McShane will draft a Section 1.7 for a future draft of the document.

### **Section 3.5 Monitoring**

There was a general discussion of whether or not the WHMP was "HEP-heavy". Applegate stated he thought the TCC should go beyond HEP. WHMP can be revised for effectiveness in year 17. McShane suggested discussing goals and objectives and revisiting this issue based on that conversation.

#### **Goal**

No changes.

#### **Objective A**

There was general discussion around adding reference to using new species models as indicated in the Settlement Agreement and to address Applegate's concern that the latest methodologies always be used, as expressed in his proposed Objective E.

New text reads: *Repeat the HEP in year 17 of the licenses, using new species models.*

#### **Objective B**

No changes.

#### **Objective C**

There was a general discussion as to whether or not reporting results should be included under reporting requirements of section 14.2.6 of the Settlement Agreement. There were differing opinions – some felt the results only needed to be reported to the TCC, others that it might be part of the larger requirements. No decision was reached, as exactly where the results would be reported was not part of this objective.

New text reads: *Conduct implementation monitoring for the measures included in each of the major habitat programs covered by the WHMP. Report results as part of the annual planning process.*

Next the group discussed Brock Applegate's proposed new objectives D – F

Proposed **Objective D** addressed annual reporting, timing of reporting around annual coordination meetings, and TCC approval of implementation of plans in annual reports. The group thought that, while it may be worthwhile to spell out reporting, timing and approval requirements elsewhere in the document, it did not think it needed to be an objective in its own right.

Proposed **Objective E** addressed using the most effective and recognized survey methods and protocols to complete the monitoring, including making survey methods and protocols known to the group. Some felt this was already included in the document elsewhere and others felt that it was a foregone conclusion that the latest methods would always be used. The decision was to modify Objective A as stated above.

Proposed **Objective F** addressed making field data sheets from monitoring available and included in the annual plan/reports. There was general discussion around WDFW's desire for a written objective on data sharing. Although they have no complaints about PacifiCorp's willingness to share data sheets, they have had issues in other proceedings so they want to ensure data will be shared on this project. The group thought it did not need to be an objective in this section, but agreed to add language to this effect in the new Section 1.7 on coordination. WDFW agreed this would be an appropriate way to address their concern.

The group then returned to a discussion of section 3.2.4 Raptor Management from the 8/22/05 meeting, to address Applegate's comments.

### **Goal**

There was a general discussion of adding more detail to the goal, but the group felt it was meant to be a broad statement and left it unchanged.

### **Objective A**

There was general discussion around identifying winter/year-round roost sites and surveying practices. The group decided to reference winter sites.

New text reads: *Survey areas scheduled for habitat management to identify active and inactive raptor nests sites, and roost sites (including winter roosts in suitable areas), if possible, and implement appropriate measures to protect these sites.*

### **Objective B**

There was a general discussion of the original text of B being covered under Objective A. It was decided to delete the original Objective B and replace with a bald eagle objective.

New text reads: *Develop management plans for active bald eagle nests sites within 3 years of WHMP implementation or discovery on a new active nest.*

**Objective C**

No changes.

**Objective D**

No changes.

**Objective E**

Discussed Applegate's comments on Avian standards and guidelines in relation to PacifiCorp's facilities. The group decided to reference the APP in the objective. There was general discussion around PacifiCorp and/or Cowlitz PUD's protocol for surveying around electrical/distribution facilities. Garrett stated that there is regular surveying for dead birds at PacifiCorp facilities and, if one is found, the pole is modified to raptor-safe engineering standards. Applegate asked about the percentage of unsafe facilities in PacifiCorp's project area. Garrett indicated that everything has been surveyed and is repaired as necessary. PacifiCorp personnel have been trained to report the incidence of dead birds found near company facilities, and there very few records of dead birds in the project area.

New text reads: *Continue to manage PacifiCorp electrical, distribution, and transmission facilities according to PacifiCorp standards and guidelines, which are based on industry standards for avian protection on power lines (Avian Power Lines Interaction Committee [APLIC] 1994, 1996; APLIC and USFWS 2005).*

**Objective F**

Discussed Applegate's comments on Avian standards and guidelines in relation to PacifiCorp's facilities. MacDonald stated that Cowlitz PUD does not have written guidelines for avian protection and that their distribution system is not covered by the WHMP. If transmission lines at Swift 2 require replacement, when replaced they will be built to avian-safe standards under the WHMP. She also noted that problems are repaired when dead birds are found.

New text reads: *If identified, manage avian interaction problems with Cowlitz PUD electrical, distribution, and transmission facilities, as identified described in Exhibit B of the SA, consistent with the APLIC (1994 and 1996) guidelines.*

Next the group discussed Brock Applegate's proposed new objectives G - J

Proposed **Objective G** addressed retention of trees that eagles and ospreys can use for perch, per management recommendations for bald eagles from PHS. The group agreed that this would be covered under Objective A and that it was not necessary to include the proposed reference to management recommendations from the PHS, as that is an old document and there are many other newer regulations that are followed.

Proposed **Objective H** addressed surveying and monitoring of new and known bald eagle winter roosts. The group agreed that this would be covered under Objective A and did not accept.

Proposed **Objective I** addressed of surveying spotted owl habitat. The group discussed the fact that there have been no spotted owl surveys since the mid 1990s and do not know if those sites are active anymore. The group agreed to add a spotted owl objective and added the proposed draft language. The group will review this new objective at a future meeting.

**New proposed objective:** *Limit noise-disturbing mgmt activities in suitable nesting habitat (based on WDNR definitions) within 1.8 miles of known spotted owl nest sites to July 1 – February 28; limit any actual habitat manipulation to September 1 – February 28 or conduct surveys.*

Proposed **Objective I** addressed managing people and disturbances around concentrations of bald eagles roosting or foraging sites. Olson stated that this would be very difficult given the recreation mandates at the project. However, this issue can be considered while developing new recreation sites. It was decided that McShane would add language to address the public access section of this document and the group would review at the next meeting. New language will be along the lines of: *Consider the locations of bald eagle nest sites, roosts and winter concentrations when siting new developed recreation facilities.*

### **Agenda Items for October 3, 2005**

- WHMP Discussion
- Discuss level of guidance and guidance needs in objectives (Naylor)

### **Next Scheduled Meetings**

Monday, October 3, 2005  
US Fish & Wildlife  
Lacey, WA 98503  
9:00am – 3:00pm

Friday, October 21, 2005  
Merwin Hydro Facility  
Ariel, WA  
9:00am – 3:00pm

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

### **Handouts**

1. Final Meeting Agenda
2. Draft WHMP Goals & Objectives (90805)
3. Applegate's edits to Draft WHMP Goals & Objectives (80205 version)
4. Applegate's edits to Raptor Site Management of WHMP
5. Draft meeting notes from 8/10, 8/15, 8/22