

**Meeting Notes**  
**Lewis River License Implementation**  
**Terrestrial Coordination Committee (TCC) Meeting**  
**April 11, 2012**  
**Hydro Control Center, Ariel, WA**

**TCC Participants Present: (8)**

Bob Nelson, RMEF  
 Ray Crosswell, RMEF  
 Peggy Miller, WDFW  
 Nathan Reynolds, Cowlitz Indian Tribe  
 Erik White, Cowlitz Indian Tribe  
 Kirk Naylor, PacifiCorp Energy  
 Kendel Emmerson, PacifiCorp Energy  
 Kimberly McCune, PacifiCorp Energy

**Calendar:**

May 9, 2012	TCC Meeting at Merwin HCC	HCC
June 13, 2012	TCC Meeting at Merwin HCC	HCC

<b>Parking lot items from April 13, 2011 Meeting</b>	<b>Status</b>
Naylor: Provide TCC with Riparian Management Plan for review.	<b>Pending</b>

<b>Assignments from October 12, 2011 Meeting:</b>	<b>Status</b>
Naylor and Richardson will inquire as to the cost of acquiring the mineral rights in conjunction with the land purchase and report back to the TCC	<b>In Progress</b>

**Review of Agenda and Finalize Meeting Notes**

Kirk Naylor (PacifiCorp Energy) called the meeting to order at 9:20am. Naylor reviewed the agenda and the March 14, 2012 meeting notes and asked the TCC if there were any changes. An error was noted in the March 14, 2012 Field Notes that included the incorrect employer for LouEllyn Jones. Kim McCune (PacifiCorp Energy) indicated she will correct LouEllyn's employer to read, USFWS. No changes were requested to the agenda or the March 14, 2012 confidential meeting notes. The March 14, 2012 Meeting Notes, Confidential Meeting Notes and the March 14 & 15, 2012 Field Notes were approved at 9:20am.

**Land Transaction Status**

**\*\*\*\*\*CONFIDENTIAL SECTION BEGIN\*\*\*\*\***

**Shrubland Report**

Kendel Emmerson (PacifiCorp Energy) informed the TCC that the Shrubland Report is out for review (electronically on the Lewis River website) and the comments are due **on or before May 4, 2012**. The purpose of the Shrubland report is to describe the results of the shrubland initial inspection that field-checked each shrubland greater than 1.0 acre to determine if the area met the definition of a WHMP shrubland and what, if any, management actions should occur to improve the shrubland area. This

inspection and report will in part fulfill Shrubland Habitat Objectives a and b. Currently there are two datasets that identify WHMP shrublands: the Merwin Wildlife Habitat Management Program (MWHMP) Standard Operating Procedures and the vegetation cover type data. In addition, there is a 1989 shrubland management report that details a comprehensive evaluation of each of the MWHMP shrubland habitat areas that was used to assess changes in structure or vegetation in the shrubland habitat. The differences in acres between the three datasets (MWHMP, 1989 report, and vegetation cover type) are shown in Table 1.1 and Appendix B of the report.

The initial inspection reduced the number of shrubland significantly from a potential of 290 acres to 19 acres. This is mostly because the MWHMP habitat typing had only a few habitat types and it appears that shrublands seemed to be a catch-all habitat type that included several other types of vegetation cover. Also, the vegetation cover typing that was completed during relicensing was largely done from aerial photo interpretation, so many of the areas identified as shrubland were actually upland deciduous or upland mix forest when field verified. Appendix B compares the pre vs. post initial shrubland inspection vegetation cover typing.

Naylor expressed to the TCC that it is critical to resolve the questions of what was actual shrubland. Peggy Miller (WDFW) asked for clarification of the management actions that will occur to maintain shrubland. In addition, she further communicated that she was confused about the time table of when they were written and suggested in Table 1.1 (below) that MWHMP include a date or the citation under those columns.

**Table 1.1 Shrubland MWHMP, Shrubland Report, and Vegetation Cover Type Acres**

Shrubland Identification Number	MWHMP Acres	1989 Shrubland Management Report	Vegetation Cover Type
3-2a	3.50	13.00	4.88
3-2b	0.00	0.00	3.39
4-6a	4.40	7.20	0.00
4-6b	37.10	35.70	0.00
4-6c	5.50	3.80	0.00
4-6d	1.60	0.5	0.00

Emmerson responded that she will add the appropriate clarification.

Miller also asked if PacifiCorp is currently doing any of Objective A & B (outlined below):

- **Objective a:** Within 5 years of WHMP implementation, evaluate all cover typed shrub stands to determine tree composition and size classes, as well as shrub size and structural characteristics. Where appropriate, manage to prevent conversion to forest and maintain/improve a mixture of shrub ages and sizes; re-evaluate stands every 15 years.
- **Objective b:** Within 5 years of WHMP implementation, evaluate the designated shrublands identified in the Merwin Wildlife Habitat Management Program Standard Operating Procedures (PacifiCorp 1998) and determine if and how these areas should continue to be managed as shrublands in the future. Within 8 years, revise management actions where necessary.

Emmerson responded that yes, we have plans such as in Unit 3 where red alder is present (see Table 4.1), proposed management actions calls for removal of red alder in 2012 in accordance with Objective a and this report will fulfill objective b.

**Table 4.1 Shrubland Management and Inspection Schedule**

Shrubland ID	Acres	Next Inspection Date	Proposed Management Actions			
			Shade Control	Vegetation Control	Heavy Pruning	Create Hiding Cover
3-2a	4.88	2012	Remove Red Alder	Treat Himalayan blackberry	Yes in the northern portion	
3-2b	1.01	2012	Remove Red Alder			

Nathan Reynolds (Cowlitz Indian Tribe) asked if there is some management required for those areas under an acre and will PacifiCorp do anything. Naylor said that the goal of this evaluation was to only identify those greater than an acre. The shrublands less than one acre would be absorbed into the surrounding cover type most similar. If, when laying out a proposed timber harvest area, and there is an opportunity to retain smaller shrublands for diversity, these areas may be retained (Naylor explained this is what occurred in the 2010 timber harvest in Management Unit 18). Additionally, Emmerson explained that the Unit 11 shrubland shown in the Appendix A maps was recently discovered as part of the continuing effort to field verify vegetation cover type mapping. PacifiCorp may also find more shrubland areas with the acquisition of more lands. In summary, the amount of shrubland acres may go up but only those greater than 1 acre will be managed under the prescriptions in the WHMP.

Miller asked if PacifiCorp has to maintain a certain amount of cover types in a given area to meet HEP criteria. Emmerson explained that HEP assesses the quality of one species habitat not the quantity, so losing poor quality habitat should not affect the HEP value.

Naylor further noted that within 5 years of acquiring additional lands PacifiCorp must update the existing HEP data. This requires mapping and cover-typing the newly acquired lands, but assumes that Habitat Suitability Index values from the current HEP are applicable. Emmerson also offered scheduling field trips for the TCC to view some of the shrublands.

Emmerson read the following comments from Mitch Wainwright (USFS) for TCC consideration:

**From:** Wainwright, Mitch -FS [<mailto:mwainwright@fs.fed.us>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 05, 2012 11:11 AM  
**To:** McCune, Kimberly; Emmerson, Kendel  
**Subject:** RE: Shrubland Initial Inspection DRAFT Report, April 2012 - ACTION REQUIRED

*Kendel, I reviewed the draft inspection report and the maps. It seems pretty obvious from the air photos that most of the polygons designated as shrublands are actually hardwood forest, and I agree that these sites would only be shrublands as an early-successional stage after some disturbance event. I also agree that maintaining these sites in that stage would be difficult, and probably would not meet the intent of the Shrubland objectives.*

**Mitch Wainwright**  
 South Zone Wildlife Biologist  
 Mount Adams RD  
 Mount St. Helens RD  
 360-449-7857

Reynolds informed the TCC that he will be submitting written comments by the due date and also expressed that he agreed only large shrublands should be managed.

**2012 proposed timber harvests**

Miller communicated that she would like to see PacifiCorp maintain leave areas when possible if not part of a shrubland. Naylor concurred that this action is just part of the diversity component.

Miller mentioned that during the field tour last month in Unit 15 the leave trees that were marked she was happy to see uneven spacing was left.

Naylor pointed out that on the timber management map of Unit 15 thinning has already taken place but there is another approximately 5 acre area that was omitted on the west side of the creek and a little more east of the orchard. He would like to include these subject areas in the next thinning.

Reynolds said that he does not have an issue with this additional thinning but would like to walk the area himself in advance. Miller also said that she does not have a problem with the additional thinning but should contact Eric Holman (WDFW) just in case.

<Break 10:15am>

<Reconvene 10:25am>

**WHMP 2012 Plan and WHMP 2011 Report**

Naylor expressed that comments were received from the Cowlitz Indian Tribe (see below), which will be included in the ACC/TCC 2011 Annual Report.

**ACC/TCC Comment Matrix**

ACC/TCC Member	Comment(s)	PacifiCorp Response
<p>Nathan Reynolds, Cowlitz Indian Tribe</p>	<p><b>Section 12, WHMP 2012 Annual Plan (Attachment M): Unique Area/ Habitat Management:</b></p> <p>I am unaware that white oaks clumps need crown-competition pruning.</p> <p>Most white oaks are self-pruning. Dead limbs and broken limbs are part of that natural process. One aspect that makes oak habitat valuable and unique in a conifer-dominated landscape is the structural opportunity for cavity-nesting birds; made possible by rot pockets originating from dead and broken limbs. I would rather see oak management efforts directed at reduction of interspecific competition: removal of mature Douglas-fir or Bigleaf Maple that are shading oaks, pulling of all Douglas-fir seedlings within oak stands and within 5m, and treatment of Scotch Broom within oak stands.</p> <p>However, the Unique Area/Habitat Budget page indicates most effort will be spent removing either topping (\$3,000) or falling (\$3,000) competing Douglas-fir. Maybe my concern is not an issue.</p> <p>Please advise, and thanks for this opportunity.</p>	<p>PacifiCorp appreciates the comment from the Cowlitz Indian Tribe. PacifiCorp is planning on removal of interspecific competition as indicated (2012 timber harvest in management Unit 6) as well as treatment of scotch broom in 2012.</p> <p>We will prioritize those actions pending further discussion with the TCC regarding need for crown-competition pruning.</p>

Miller requested information for the following clarifying questions about the WHMP 2011 Report:

Page 4 – Where is Crossroad pond, what kind of trout are in the pond and is the ACC aware that the trout were found?

Emmerson pointed out on the project map where the pond is located. She responded that the ACC is not aware that the trout were found. She explained that these trout were likely stocked in the creek by members of the public because of the pooling area. Fish have not been seen here before, are fairly large for the creek, and above a known fish barrier. Naylor provided a detailed explanation of potential fish streams and connectivity based on the forest practice regulations; this area has a natural physical barrier at the mouth of the stream. Naylor also stated that wetlands are not managed specifically for fish (noting draw-downs conducted to control bull frogs). He also provided visuals of wetlands in the habitat management maps for Millers review. He further explained that there is no anadromous fish movement because of the falls at the reservoir. Miller suggested that the ACC be informed of the presence of trout and that they should be reading the WHMP 2011 Report. [Note: the ACC and TCC reports are distributed together for anyone's review].

**ACC/TCC 2011 Annual Report**

Specific discussion took place regarding the Cowlitz PUD Wetland Restoration (see pages 84 & 85). Miller asked if a field trip is warranted to view the wetland restoration to determine the success of the project. Reynolds expressed that he had not heard any issues regarding its success. The TCC suggested Miller contact Diana MacDonald (Cowlitz PUD) for access and a tour of the restored area. The TCC does not have a level of concern that warrants a visit. Naylor said that this summer he had planned a tour for the TCC of PacifiCorp's recent management actions (timber harvest in Management Unit 28) as this drives past the Cowlitz PUD project, if the TCC wanted to contact Diana, she could add a Cowlitz PUD site visit to the same trip.

**BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project**

**\*\*\*\*\*CONFIDENTIAL SECTION BEGIN\*\*\*\*\***

**Public Comment Opportunity**

No public comment was provided.

*<11:50 a.m. meeting adjourned >*

**Agenda items for May 9, 2012**

- Review April 11, 2012 Meeting Notes
- Finalize Shrubland Report
- Land Transaction Status

**Next Scheduled Meetings**

May 9, 2012 (possible conference call)	June 13, 2012
TCC Meeting	TCC Meeting
Merwin Hydro Control Center	Merwin Hydro Control Center
Ariel, WA	Ariel, WA
9:00am – 3:00pm	9:00am – 3:00pm

**Attachments:**

- April 11, 2012 Meeting Agenda
- March 14, 2012 Meeting Notes
- Vegetation Cover Type Pre vs Post Initial Shrubland Inspection Table