

FINAL Meeting Notes
Lewis River License Implementation
Terrestrial Coordination Committee (TCC) Meeting
July 9, 2008
Via Teleconference

TCC Participants Present: (9)

Kendel Emmerson, PacifiCorp Energy
Eric Holman, WDFW
Kimberly McCune, PacifiCorp Energy
Todd Olson, PacifiCorp Energy
Kirk Naylor, PacifiCorp Energy
Diana Gritten-MacDonald, Cowlitz PUD
LouEllyn Jones, USFWS
Bob Nelson, RMEF
Nathan Reynolds, Cowlitz Indian Tribe (9:20am – 10:10am)

Calendar:

August 13, 2008	TCC Meeting	Woodland City Hall
August 14, 2008	ACC Meeting	Merwin Hydro Facility

Assignments from July 9th Meeting:	Status
Emmerson: The TCC would like further clarification from Curt Leigh (WDFW) regarding the addition of the following language to X.2.2.C in the Old Growth WHMP Chapter, “In accordance with the Forest Practices Act” .	Complete – 8/13/08 (clarification provided by David Geroux)
Emmerson: Submit the revised Section X.3 of the Old Growth WHMP Chapter at the August TCC meeting for review and approval.	Complete – 7/17/08

Assignments from June 11th Meeting:	Status
Naylor: Seek the approval of TNC prior to visiting the real estate site of interest.	Complete – 8/13/08
McCune: Schedule a combined ACC/TCC meeting to discuss land updates with only those participants who have signed a confidentiality agreement.	Complete – scheduled for 7/10/08
McCune: Email the accipiter survey details to the TCC to include dates, times, etc.	Complete – 6/12/08

Assignments from January 9th Meeting:	Status
Naylor/Emmerson: Incorporate the following into the Forest Management chapter: WHMP lands that are within the SOSEA should have greater spotted owl protection than what is provided in Forest Practices Act and timber management actions should increase or improve spotted owl habitat in the SOSEA.	

Assignments from September 12, 2007 Meeting:	Status
Naylor/Emmerson: Incorporate the following text into the Forest Management chapter of the WHMP, <i>“Prior to any harvest, the areas will be evaluated (ground truth) to determine whether or not the area qualifies as NSO habitat.”</i>	In process

Parking lot items from June 11, 2008 Meeting:	Status
Review and discussion of occupancy and productivity of Wood Duck Nest Box and Kestrel Nest Box Program. Should this program be discontinued?	

Parking lot items from February 10, 2006 Meeting:	Status
PacifiCorp Wildlife Habitat Management Plan (WHMP) Budget (annual)	
Conservation Agreement – what is wanted?	Ongoing – 4/28/06

Review of Agenda and Finalize Meeting Notes

Kirk Naylor (PacifiCorp Energy) called the meeting to order at 9:05am. Naylor conducted a review of the agenda for the day and requested if the TCC had any additions to the agenda. Diana Gritten-MacDonald (Cowlitz PUD) requested time to provide a quick overview of Part 1 of the Draft Cowlitz PUD Wildlife Habitat Management Plan.

Naylor reviewed the TCC Draft June 11, 2008 meeting notes and assignments with the TCC attendees and asked for any comments and/or additional changes. No changes were requested.

The meeting notes were approved at 9:10 a.m.

Overview of Old-Growth Chapter Edits

Kendel Emmerson (PacifiCorp Energy) reviewed the WDFW comments, dated June 27, 2008 (**Attachment A**) with the TCC attendees and provided further clarification where appropriate. The initial draft version of the Old-Growth Chapter without edits discussed below can be viewed on the Lewis River website at: <http://www.pacificorp.com/Article/Article79878.html>.

The following represents further clarification and/or modifications which will be made to the Old-Growth Chapter of the WHMP:

X.2.2. A & B: Q1 The initial evaluation will confirm the location and size of the “existing” old-growth stands Q2: Emmerson informed the TCC that the snags/acre determination will be made during the initial evaluation.

X.2.2.C: Unable to add the requested language to an approved objective. However, the TCC attendees consider this language to minimize the existing approved objective. The TCC would like further clarification from Curt Leigh (WDFW).

X.3: Emmerson will revise Section x.3 to provide further clarification regarding the difference between Merwin’s SOP old-growth habitat acres and the Lewis River WHMP old-growth acres. Also additional language will be added to the section to describe how some of the former Merwin

old-growth stands may be protected under the Lewis River WHMP through shoreline and riparian, or be managed as an area important to old-growth connectivity. She will also submit Section X.3 at the August TCC meeting for review and approval.

X.3, Paragraph 2: The proposed revisions listed above will address this concern.

X.4: Emmerson will add corrected text to address all the trees, not only those at 20” in the plot data. Down wood counts will be added to the initial evaluation. Emmerson noted that the down wood inventory goes above and beyond what was required to meet the objectives. The TCC agreed that the data could be easily collected during the initial evaluation and would be beneficial to determining old-growth development actions.

X.4.1: Text will remain unchanged; intent of text is to fulfill objective and not to seek ways to eliminate old growth.

X.4.1, Paragraph 6: Emmerson will revise the text regarding the plot placement to determining some pre-determined random method

X.4.1, Last Paragraph: Text will remain unchanged. Emmerson will provide different variations of plots per acre for TCC review at the August TCC meeting.

X.5.1, Paragraph 2: Fire is not a recommended method to be used for creating snags in old-growth areas and there are other more effective methods. Text will remain unchanged.

X.5.1, Final Sentence: Emmerson revise text to include snag creation to a list of old-growth enhancement activities.

X.5.2: Text will not change, however, WDFW request will be included in the regular updating in GIS. Emmerson will add text in X.3 regarding the license year 17 requirements. The “snag develop” text in the second bullet will be removed as requested.

X.5.3: Emmerson will modify the text as requested.

<Break 10:15 am>

<Reconvene 10:25 am>

License Issuance Update

Olson informed the TCC attendees that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) issued Orders for New Licenses for the Lewis River Projects on June 26, 2008. The Utilities have 30 days to review and respond to the FERC with an acceptance, rejection or request for re-hearing or clarification. The end of this week or early next week a meeting invitation will be emailed to the Settlement Agreement Parties to discuss the Utilities response to FERC. The meeting is presently planned for Monday, July 21, 2008 in the afternoon.

Gritten-MacDonald expressed that the PUD is not happy with their license and they plan to request a rehearing.

Lands Update Discussion

Naylor informed the TCC attendees that very little has changed relating to interests in certain lands, however, this discussion is considered confidential and proprietary and not for public viewing.

Naylor did visit the eastern portion of The Nature Conservancy (TNC) site and has photos. The ACC will be briefed on the Swift area acquisition opportunities, review of maps, boundaries, etc. on 7/10/08.

Discuss Results of Raptor Surveys Conducted in Unit 26

Emmerson informed the TCC attendees that two broadcast call surveys have been completed in Management Unit 26 and no accipiters or other raptors were detected. These surveys followed the same protocol as was conducted in the 2007 surveys.

Naylor then said that Management Unit 26 is ready for continuing the forest practices that were scheduled last year. The surveys are complete; permits are up to date; and as evidenced by the outcome of the surveys there are no raptor concerns. Naylor indicated that on or about August 1, 2008 the contractors will begin work. Expected duration is approximately one month followed by distributing grass seed by mid September 2008.

Emmerson indicated that Management Unit 17 has had one survey completed with no detections. The second survey will be late July to early August and she will email the dates to the TCC. All interested TCC participants are welcome to come, although Emmerson advised that Unit 17 is extremely brushy, and difficult to maneuver around in.

Next Meeting's Agenda

- Review of 7/09/08 Meeting Notes
- Review and discussion of The Nature Conservancy parcel
- License Issuance Update
- Cowlitz PUD WHMP
- WHMP Chapter Review

Other Topics

Gritten-MacDonald provided a cursory review of the Cowlitz PUD, Part 1 of the Draft WHMP which was sent to the TCC via email on July 6, 2008; comments are due on or before August 6, 2008. The document can be viewed on the Lewis River website as the link provided below:

<http://www.pacificorp.com/Article/Article79878.html>

The WHMP is divided into five sections as follows:

- Introduction
- How management area is divided

- Goals and Objectives
- Activities
- Standard Operating Procedures

Public Comment Opportunity

No public comment was provided.

Meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.

Next Scheduled Meetings

August 13, 2008	September 10, 2008
Woodland City Hall	USFWS
Woodland, WA	Lacey, WA
9:00am – 3:00pm	9:00am – 3:00pm

Handouts

1. Agenda
2. Draft meeting notes from 6/11/08
3. **Attachment A** – Comments on Old Growth Chapter of WHMP, dated June 27, 2008 as provided by Curt Leigh, WDFW



State of Washington
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

Mailing Address: 600 Capitol Way N, Olympia, WA 98501-1091 - (360) 902-2200; TDD (360) 902-2207
Main Office Location: Natural Resources Building, 1111 Washington Street SE, Olympia, WA

June 27, 2008

TO: Kim McCune
FROM: Curt Leigh
SUBJECT: Comments on Old Growth Chapter of WHMP

Thanks for the opportunity to review this material. WDFW comments follow. The comments are arranged by section number.

X.2.2.A & B: We anticipate that the accuracy of the PacifiCorp and Cowlitz County PUD “old-growth” maps will be verified during the inspection process identified in section X.4. Is that correct? Also, will the snags/acre determination be made by on the ground surveys or by mapping systems?

X.2.2.C: Please add this bolded language into the first sentence. **“In accordance with the Forest Practices Act, protect and manage forested buffers adjacent to...”**

X.3: This initial section describes in some detail how stands were identified as old growth and how these are a subset of those that were captured by the Merwin definition. Twice near the end of the section some pretty strong language is used that describes how, "Only stands that were vegetation cover typed as old-growth during relicensing . . . will be managed as an old growth stand in the Lewis River . . . ". The section closes with a statement saying the same thing in a different way.

These statements seem to be in conflict with Objective D (as well as C and E), which direct Pacificorp to increase the number, size and connectivity of the old forest stands. Later in the document (section X.5), describes how forests might be improved to have more old growth characteristics. Section X.3 should be edited to be consistent with the effort to improve or expand old forest.

X.3, paragraph 2: Going from classifying 926 total acres as old-growth under the old licenses to only 164 acres appears to be a lot to lose. The reference from the Merwin Plan that is included in the text stating that some of those sites were selected because they possess some old growth habitat characteristics increases the perception of loss. To address this perception of loss, the text should refer to the process of site evaluation that we will undertake to assess the potential of these stands for possible inclusion in the B, C or D objectives.

June 27, 2008

Page 2

X.4: Why isn't there an evaluation of dead/downed wood included in the effort? Similarly, why are only the trees greater than 20" included in the effort? It seems like including total trees per acre and % of dead/down wouldn't be much harder to gather and would give a much better idea of what we might do to enhance these forests.

X.4.1: The purpose of the initial evaluation should be to develop an accurate description of the habitat conditions in each stand, not to search for characteristics that will allow a determination to exclude the stands from the old growth category.

X.4.1, paragraph 6: Determining plot position using "aerial photos" to "find(ing) areas that appear to be representative of the old growth stand" seems to be an unusual sampling criteria. What is the source for using this method and how will this method address variability, bias, and random sampling?

X.4.1 Last paragraph: The sampling intensity (.74 plot per acre) seems extreme for moderate and larger sized stands. The TCC should have an option regarding the amount of staff time that will be invested in an evaluation especially when it will result in minimal or no management action.

X.5.1 paragraph 2: Include killing by fire as a possible method for snag creation.

X.5.1: Final sentence: Add "snag creation" to the list of anticipated enhancement activities.

X.5.2: The text should identify that additional stands added to the old growth category under objective C and D will be added to Table X.3.1 and/or Appendix X-1. Also, remove the statement excluding snag development from the second bullet. All management, including snag creation requires approval by the TCC.

X.5.3: In the second sentence, remove the words, "unable to be harvested" and replace with something like, "unsuitable for management as early successional habitat".

Good Day