

FINAL Meeting Notes
Lewis River License Implementation
Terrestrial Coordination Committee (TCC) Meeting
May 9, 2007
Longview, WA

TCC Participants Present: (12)

Brock Applegate, WDFW
Ray Croswell, RMEF
Kendel Emmerson, PacifiCorp Energy
Joe Hiss, USFWS (via teleconference)
Eric Holman, WDFW
Mike Iyall, Cowlitz Indian Tribe
Curt Leigh, WDFW (via teleconference)
Kimberly McCune, PacifiCorp Energy
Kirk Naylor, PacifiCorp Energy
Bob Nelson, RMEF
Todd Olson, PacifiCorp Energy
Mitch Wainwright, USDA Forest Service

Calendar:

May 10, 2007	ACC Meeting	Merwin Hydro
June 13, 2007	TCC Meeting	USFWS Lacey, WA

Assignments from May 9th Meeting:		
Naylor: Mail copies of the wildlife signs to Ray Croswell, RMEF.		Complete – 5/15/07
Emmerson: Review the protocol data to determine the best survey method for Goshawks and inform the TCC.		Pending
Naylor: Send email to the TCC suggesting a few dates in late June 2007 for the TCC to join in an intensive raptor nest survey following the protocol from the “Northern Goshawk Inventory and Monitoring Technical Guide.”		Pending
Naylor: Distribute maps to TCC with illustration of where roads are-will be located relating to the Unit 26 proposed forestry actions.		Complete – 5/10/07
Naylor/Olson: Provide Eric Holman (WDFW) with a clear picture from DNR regarding what is permissible on their lands relating to ATV use.		Complete – 6/13/07

Assignments from April 19th Meeting:		
PacifiCorp: Proposed timber harvest areas - Continue with planning (traverse the different road options) and acquire additional information on the entire Management Unit; provide to TCC for review.		Complete

Assignments from September 13th Meeting:	
McCune: Email the TCC and Columbia Land Trust with potential dates for a tour of certain lands of interest.	Pending

Parking lot items from February 10th Meeting:	
PacifiCorp Wildlife Habitat Management Plan (WHMP) Budget (annual)	
Conservation Agreement – what is wanted?	Ongoing – 4/28/06

Review of Agenda, Finalize Meeting Notes

Kirk Naylor (PacifiCorp Energy) called the meeting to order at 9:10am. Naylor conducted a review of the agenda for the day and requested a round-table introduction for the benefit of those participating via teleconference.

Naylor requested any additions to the agenda; Todd Olson (PacifiCorp Energy) requested the addition of providing an update to the TCC relating to the Swift Community Action Team (SCAT) and Cougar Area Trail Seekers (CATS).

Naylor requested comments and/or changes to the Draft TCC April 19, 2007, meeting notes. No changes were requested and meeting notes were approved at 9:15am.

Lands Update Discussion

Ray Crosswell (RMEF) provided a detailed update relating to interests in certain lands, however, this discussion is considered confidential and proprietary and not for public viewing.

Swift Community Action Team (SCAT) Update

Olson noted that SCAT's current interests are shoreline development around Swift reservoir, water rights, new docks and ATV trail access. At this time, PacifiCorp is denying approval for new dock development and postponing decisions on shoreline development activity as they are in the process of developing a Shoreline Management Plan. Development of the Plan will be through a public process, and the Plan will help define the issue of new docks and other shoreline area developments. PacifiCorp has issued requests for proposal (RFP) to qualified consultants for a shoreline management plan; proposals are due May 9, 2007.

Olson informed the TCC that PacifiCorp objected to a request for a temporary water right out of Swift Reservoir. Gifford Pinchot Task Force also provided comments indicating their objection to granting this water right. The developer wants to speak to PacifiCorp prior to resubmitting a water right application.

Cougar Area Trail Seekers (CATS) Update

Olson communicated to the TCC that he met with CATS last week to discuss their interests in ATV trail establishment or perhaps conducting periodic rides for trash clean-up on PacifiCorp lands. PacifiCorp will not consider ATV trail establishment on their lands managed for wildlife. Special note was given to ATVs not being allowed on such lands. Olson noted a willingness to

discuss, however, the proposal of a periodic ride, however, this would need to be presented to and approved by the TCC before any permission would be given. CATS has asked to participate in the June 13, 2007 TCC meeting to discuss options and ask for permission to cross PacifiCorp lands to access Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR) lands.

Olson informed CATS that PacifiCorp is posting new signs before the Memorial Day weekend by the gates and throughout the wildlife management lands that indicate "no motorized vehicles" and also informed CATS that additional law enforcement will be present.

Eric Holman (WDFW) asked that he be provided with a clear picture from DNR regarding what is permissible on their lands relating to ATV use.

Croswell would like copies of the wildlife signs PacifiCorp is posting.

Further Discussion of Proposed 2007 Forestry Work

Naylor provided an aerial map of Unit 26 Proposed Management Area (**Attachment A**) for TCC review and discussion.

Brock Applegate (WDFW) expressed his concern that the goshawk habitat is close enough to infer that the proposed timber area may be within a goshawk home range. He does not want impact to the home range and threaten the chance of goshawk returning (see Applegate's email below for further detail). Applegate further expressed that he wants to go site-by-site and evaluate each forestry project regarding the amount of surveys needed.

-----Original Message-----

From: Brock Applegate [<mailto:applebaa@DFW.WA.GOV>]

Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2007 4:40 PM

To: nelson338@aol.com; shedhunt@aol.com; woot@cascadenetworks.com; HML LRN (Hough, Jim); jmalinowski@clark.edu; joel.rupley@clark.wa.gov; lopossar@co.cowlitz.wa.us; pearce@co.skamania.wa.us; mikenjoan@comcast.net; biologist@cowlitz.org; taalvik@cowlitz.org; dmacdonald@cowlitzpud.org; applebaa@DFW.WA.GOV; holmaewh@DFW.WA.GOV; LEIGHCSL@DFW.WA.GOV; weinhjmw@DFW.WA.GOV; mariah_reese@excite.com; karenmthompson@fs.fed.us; mwainwright@fs.fed.us; rtracy@fs.fed.us; Joe_Hiss@fws.gov; louellyn_jones@fws.gov; JimE@IAC.WA.GOV; jmclapp@juno.com; michelle.day@noaa.gov; Susan_Rosebrough@nps.gov; Emmerson, Kendel; McCune, Kimberly; Naylor, Kirk; Olson, Todd; mmueller@rmef.org; cowlitztribe@tdn.com; casseseka@yakama.com; joannam@yakama.com

Cc: Steve Desimone

Subject: Possible impacts to Goshawk habitat from Harvest

Kendel,

I finally had that conversation with Steve. Trying to put the home range within a vegetation cover type will be a tricky thing because the home ranges often contain various different habitat types. "Research in western North America indicates that the home range of breeding goshawks can be divided into 3 functional parts: the nesting area, the post-fledging family area (PFA), and the foraging area (Reynolds et al. 1992). Twelve hectares (30 ac) is recommended as a minimum core nest area for goshawks (Reynolds 1983, Reynolds et al. 1992). The PFA is 170 ha (420 ac) and is based on the average core area

of 5 adult females and movement data of the fledglings within 1-8 weeks after leaving the nest (Reynolds et al. 1992, Kennedy et al. 1994). A similar range of fledgling movements before dispersal was observed by Kenward (1993). The 2,430 ha (6,000 ac) foraging area was largely determined using radio-telemetry on foraging, breeding male goshawks (Kennedy 1991, Reynolds et al. 1992)." The bottom line here is that the home ranges are big and the nest core area could be very easily on the LSR on adjacent Forest Service land. Therefore the structure in these harvest areas may be important no matter when you cut them.

The habitat attributes on the harvest area that may impact the home range :

Nests have not only been discovered in alders (although rarely), but "nests have been located in trees as small as 30 cm (12 in) dbh in Washington (Fleming 1987; J. Buchanan, unpubl. data [Table 1]; D. Pineo, unpubl. data; D. Varland, unpubl. data). Nest stands were categorized as either small sawtimber (23-51 cm [9-20 in]), large sawtimber (53-81 cm [21-32 in]) or old growth. Average diameters of dominant and co-dominant trees in nesting stands were 43-48 cm (19-12 in)." Therefore, any harvest of alders and smaller conifers may have a nest.

"As part of the nesting habitat (Kennedy et al. 1994), the PFA functions to provide foraging opportunities for the adult female and fledgling goshawks and provide hiding cover for goshawk fledglings (Reynolds et al. 1992). Size of the PFA varied from 121 to 243 ha (300-600 ac) (0=168 ha [415 ac]) and may have corresponded to the territory (defended area) of goshawk pairs (Kennedy et al. 1994). PFAs consisted of forests with dense trees and other habitat attributes (snags and down logs) that appear to be important in the breeding ecology of goshawks (Reynolds et al. 1992)." A reduction in stand density and hiding cover (as a harvest would do) would be a reduction of habitat within a goshawk home range.

"Goshawks utilize a variety of forest types for foraging, including stands with variable canopy closure, and to some degree, forest edges and openings. It is likely that mid-age to late successional closed canopy forests in Washington comprise a significant proportion of the total area over which goshawks forage, based upon radio-telemetry studies of goshawk habitat use (Widen 1989, Austin 1993, Bright-Smith and Mannan 1994, Hargis et al. 1994). Austin (1993) reported that goshawks in the Cascade Range of northern California selected closed canopy stands of mature and old growth habitat for foraging (stands >51 cm mean dbh, and with canopy closure greater than 40%)." Since the majority of foraging occurs in closed canopy forests, removing alder would remove foraging habitat if goshawks home range exists. Considering the surrounding LSR on the Forest Service areas, you can especially see our concern with the impact to a goshawk home range habitat.

I will send another E-mail addressing the survey protocol. If you would, please bring your survey data sheets from the dawn acoustical surveys to the meeting tomorrow and we can discuss them.

Thanks for taking our concerns into consideration, Brock

Brock Applegate
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife,
Habitat Program, Major Projects,
FERC Relicensing,
600 Capitol Way North,
Mailstop 43143

Olympia, WA 98501-1091

(360) 902-2615, (360) 902-2946 (FAX)

>>> "Emmerson, Kendel" <Kendel.Emmerson@PacifiCorp.com> 04/25/2007 4:52 PM >>>
Brock

When you speak to Steve please get confirmation on which vegetation cover types are considered nesting goshawk habitat. It is still unclear why goshawk surveys are needed in the proposed timber harvest area that are less than 13 acres in size, 95% red alder that is less than 20 inches in diameter breast height, conifer's greater the 21 inches dbh will not be harvested, and the areas will be logged between mid-august and the end of September.

Thanks

Kendel Emmerson
Environmental Resource Specialist
825 NE Multnomah Suite 1500
Portland, Oregon 97232
503-813-6040
kendel.emmerson@pacificorp.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Brock Applegate [<mailto:applebaa@DFW.WA.GOV>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2007 3:52 PM
To: Emmerson, Kendel; Naylor, Kirk
Cc: Steve Desimone
Subject: Fwd: gos survey article

Kendel and Kirk, From this article, It seems that you should use dawn acoustic surveys for known nest sites.

"We found dawn vocalization surveys to be an effective technique to determine the status of known goshawk nest areas during the courtship/pre-incubation periods, although the technique requires considerable effort when applied to remote, montane forest locations."

"Observers could conduct dawn vocalization surveys in areas where previous sightings have suggested occupancy, but where no nests have been found."

"We recommend that managers use dawn vocalization surveys to determine the status of known goshawk nest sites."

I think the 90% is measured from already occupied sites. It doesn't include sites that have no history of occupation or breeding, so the number is high.

With that being said, I see where you are coming from by reading the technical guide when reading the rationale piece, I will try to talk to Steve on the issue and have him explain the nuances on why or why not acoustical surveys can replace broadcast surveys.

Perhaps this method could be used in conjunction with other methods of survey.

I am seeing all sorts of evidence that one breeding season of survey does not indicate absence of goshawks. I will bring Boyce et al., 2005 article to Merwin Meeting since I only have a hard copy.

Sincerely, Brock

*Brock Applegate
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife,
Habitat Program, Major Projects,
FERC Relicensing,
600 Capitol Way North,
Mailstop 43143
Olympia, WA 98501-1091*

(360) 902-2615, (360) 902-2946 (FAX)

*>>> Steve Desimone 04/23/2007 3:23 PM >>>
Brock*

I haven't found the FS protocol yet. I am sending this along as requested. I found another good survey article by USFS's Sandy Boyce showing why one survey visit is not enough- will have to get a hard copy to you-

Boyce, D. A., Jr., P. L. Kennedy, P. Beier, M. F. Ingraldi, S. R. MacVean, M. S. Siders, J. R. Squires, B. Woodbridge. 2005. When are goshawks not there? Is a single visit enough to infer absence at occupied nest areas? J. Raptor Res. 39:296-302.

Naylor suggested contacting goshawk specialists, perhaps some of those cited in Applegate's email to resolve what possible goshawk suitable habitat should be surveyed and what the preferred protocol is going to be. Applegate agreed to this conference as long as WDFW had their goshawk specialist at the meeting. Kendel Emmerson (PacifiCorp) informed the TCC that dawn acoustical surveys were conducted in March and April 2007.

Naylor communicated the reasons for the Unit 26 forestry work that was requested by the TCC. They include converting alder stands to conifer addresses the establishment of conifer stands to meet the guidelines of the WHMP for managing at least 50% of the WHMP lands to provide/develop high quality nesting NSO habitat within the 2-mile buffer outside the Siouxon SOSEA, and actions would provide approximately 30 acres of temporary elk forage for 15 years. Emmerson stated that the current alder stands are in decline and will not be there long if left to its natural state. Naylor provided a handout titled, "Management Unit 26 Summary" (**Attachment B**), which provided greater detail for TCC review and consideration.

Naylor requested consensus from the TCC regarding how to proceed by the end of May in order to proceed with permitting needs.

Applegate expressed that he would like to see a broadcast survey conducted for goshawks. Emmerson suggested an alternative such as an intensive nest search/visual survey looking for stick

nests. Applegate recommended using any survey method that PacifiCorp would like to use within the “Northern Goshawk Inventory and Monitoring Technical Guide” as long as PacifiCorp follows the protocol. Emmerson will review the protocol data to determine the best survey method and inform the TCC.

After some discussion it was concluded that an intensive nest search would be scheduled. PacifiCorp could still file the permits then complete the visual survey in late June. **The TCC participants present approved proceeding with permitting prior to completing the surveys on the assumption that there are no nesting raptors. The TCC also indicated that they wanted the permanent forage areas to be included in permitting and plan for this year.**

Mike Iyall (Cowlitz Indian Tribe) said that after completing two independent methods of survey, he is confident about proceeding with the small scale timber harvest.

Naylor will suggest a few dates in late June 2007 for the TCC to select from relating to the participation in an intensive nest survey.

General discussion took place regarding maintenance of forage areas including the need for mowing or not mowing, stump removal, location of access roads, permanent and temporary forage areas to meet elk objectives, and maintaining flexibility relating to implementation of WHMP objectives.

Naylor communicated that he will distribute maps with an illustration of where roads are located in the Unit 26 Proposed Management area.

Next Meeting’s Agenda

- Cougar Area Trail Seekers (CATS) Proposal
- Review of WHMP Draft Chapters
- Lands Update Discussion

Meeting adjourned at 11:15am.

Next Scheduled Meetings

June 13, 2007	July 11, 2007
USFWS	Cowlitz PUD
Lacey, WA	Longview, WA
9:00am – 3:00pm	9:00am – 3:00pm

Handouts

1. Draft meeting notes from 4/19/07
2. Unit 26 Proposed Management aerial map, as provided by PacifiCorp Energy (**Attachment A**)
3. Management Unit 26 Summary, as provided by PacifiCorp Energy (**Attachment B**)



2007 Proposed Harvests and Roads

Swift Unit 26



Legend		
Management Unit	Proposed Road	Stream
Proposed Harvest Area	Existing Road	Fish
Existing Clear Cut	Forestry	Anadromous Fish
Existing Commercial Thinning	Utility	Non-fish Perennial
Future Buffer	Utility ROW	Non-fish Seasonal
No Management	Recreation	Other
Stream Buffer	Forestry, Utility	
Vegetation	Forestry, Recreation	
	Forestry, Recreation, Utility	
	Abandoned	
	Orphaned	
	Other	



Geographic Information Systems

Data is projected in UTM Zone 10, NAD83, meters.
PacifiCorp GIS collects data from a variety of government and private sources. PacifiCorp makes no warranty as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of this data for individual or aggregate use with other data. For complete validation, the source organization should be contacted or source documents consulted to verify the findings of this product.

Management Unit 26

Total Acres: 497.3

Vegetation Types Summary:

Upland Deciduous	276.6 acres	(56%)
Mid-Successional Conifer	109.0 “	(22%)
Pole Conifer thinned	53.2 “	(11%)
Mature Conifer	21.4 “	(4%)
Upland Mixed	17.5 “	(4%)
Riparian Mixed	10.2 “	(2%)
Meadow	4.0 “	(Actually less than 1 ac (shrubs))
Lodgepole Pine	3.2 “	
Developed	1.1 “	
Sparsely vegetated	1.0	

Riparian Buffers: 80.4 acres

Upland Deciduous	65.7 ac	(82%)
Riparian mixed	8.4 ac	(10%)
Upland Mixed	2.4 ac	(3%)
Shrub (ID'd as meadow)	2.1 ac	(3%)
Mid-successional conifer	0.3 ac	

NSO Suitable Habitat: 155 ac.

Mature	21.4 ac (this is the only vegetation type that qualifies as high quality nesting for NSO)
Mid-successional conifer	115.2 “
Upland Mixed	18.4 “

Unmanageable habitat: 61.0 ac

These are acres that are deemed too steep and unstable for logging. 93% of this is Upland Deciduous habitat.

PERTINANT GOALS & OBJECTIVES:

- 1) Forestry Goal: promote forestland composition and structures that benefit wildlife and provide an appropriate mosaic of big game hiding cover and forage.
 - a. Provide a range of alternatives for developing and maintaining a mix of cover and forage for developing and maintaining a mix of cover and forage for elk, considering adjacent land activities.

- b. Promote forest habitat diversity by increasing or maintaining native tree species.
- 2) Raptor Site Management Goal: provide and protect habitat for raptors and minimize/avoid disturbance.
 - a. Use protocol surveys to ID specific raptors and their nest/roost sites.
 - b. ID areas that could be enhanced to provide future nesting, perching or roost habitat for raptors.
 - c. Manage at least 50% of WHMP lands within a 2 mile buffer of SOSEA to provide/develop high quality nesting NSO habitat.

Discussion:

- The over-riding objective for this management unit is to manage 50% of the unit (248 acres) in high quality NSO nesting habitat. Currently this is only 4% of the management unit. There are 80 acres in stream buffers and an additional 61 ac (all unsuitable NSO habitat), that cannot be managed to meet this goal. This leaves 356 acres from which to manage to develop the high quality nesting habitat.
- The mid-successional conifer (109 acres) provides the bulk of the habitat that can be managed in the “short term” to develop high quality nesting habitat. The remainder would come from existing pole conifer (thinned) stands (53 acres) and developing upland deciduous stands into mature/old-growth conifer (65 acres). This along with the existing mature habitat would meet the 248 acres of NSO nesting habitat.
- If 248 acres are managed to meet NSO objectives, this leaves approximately 108 acres to manage for providing to meet long term forage for elk.

Proposed Management and Assumptions:

- Provide about 10% of the foraging habitat as permanent forage (meadows). This could come from converting existing upland deciduous stands into small well dispersed meadows. The remainder of the foraging habitat would come through short term conversions of upland deciduous to conifer and some from rotational forest management (approximately 60 year rotations) on about 70 acres (sites to be determined).
- The current harvest of upland deciduous stands provides much needed short term forage and begins the necessary conversion of UD stands to conifer for future OG.
- Adjacent habitat to the north is USFS and is matrix, so will not necessarily continue to provide late successional structure. Private property to the south will be aggressively managed for forest products and will have the most disturbance.
- Assume USFS will also not harvest remaining OG in their 60 acres that we surround.
- The real connectivity to existing NSO habitat is assumed to be to the north rather than the SOSEA to the SE because of the old growth habitat on the

USFS lands on the north as opposed to much younger forest on the DNR lands immediately south and SE.

Current proposed forest management;

- A total of 2000 feet of reconstructed road and an additional 3200 feet of “new” road would be built entirely on PacifiCorp ownership (total 1 mile). Costly easements and road stability on the private forest parcel preclude this as a preferred route. A road developed on PacifiCorp provides central access to managing the area and would be necessary to provide the continued access to manage meadows and future forestry management.
- Total Acres harvested in current proposal = 30.3 acres (8.2 ac; 11.9 ac; 10.2 ac)
- Expand existing meadow and rehabilitate to develop approximately 1 acre of improved permanent forage. Also include approximately 1 acre of permanent forage in Harvest Area 3.