

**Lewis River Hydroelectric Projects Settlement Agreement  
Terrestrial Coordination Committee (TCC)  
FINAL Meeting Agenda**

**Date & Time:**            **Wednesday, April 13, 2011  
9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.**

**Place:**                        **Merwin Hydro Facility  
105 Merwin Village Court  
Ariel, WA 98603**

**Contacts:**                 **Kirk Naylor: (503) 813-6619; cell (503) 866-8750  
Lore Boles (HCC): (360) 225-4412**

| <b>Time</b> | <b>Discussion Item</b>  |
|-------------|---|
| 9:00 a.m.   | Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Preview Agenda</li> <li>➤ Review and comment on notes of 3/9/11 meeting</li> <li>➤ Adopt 3/9/11 Meeting Notes</li> </ul>   |
| 9:15 a.m.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Lands Update from Columbia Land Trust</li> <li>➤ Discuss expectations, other opportunities at Swift.</li> </ul>  |
| 10:00 a.m.  | <b>Break</b>  |
| 10:10 a.m.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ USFS Road 90 bridge Repair Discussion</li> </ul>   |
| 10:30 a.m.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ PacifiCorp/ RMEF Field Tour</li> </ul>   |
| 10:45 a.m.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Discuss WDFW comments on 2010 Annual report and 2011 Annual Plan</li> </ul>  |
| 11:30 a.m.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ BPA Update</li> </ul>  |
| 12:00 p.m.. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ New topics/issues</li> <li>➤ Next Meeting's Agenda</li> <li>➤ Public Comment Opportunity</li> </ul> <p>Note: all meeting notes and the meeting schedule can be located at:<br/><a href="http://www.pacificorp.com/es/hydro/hl/lr.html#">http://www.pacificorp.com/es/hydro/hl/lr.html#</a></p> |
| 12:30 p.m.  | <b>Adjourn meeting</b>  |

**To attend a Voice Conference:** Call 503-813-5600 (toll free #800-503-3360), follow the instructions provided and enter Meeting ID: **661919** and password: **661919** when prompted.

**FINAL Meeting Notes**  
**Lewis River License Implementation**  
**Terrestrial Coordination Committee (TCC) Meeting**  
**April 13, 2011**  
**MEETING AT MERWIN HCC**

**TCC Participants Present: (15)**

Diana Gritten-MacDonald, Cowlitz County PUD  
 Ray Crosswell, RMEF  
 Bob Nelson, RMEF  
 Bill Richardson, RMEF  
 Peggy Miller, WDFW  
 Eric Holman, WDFW  
 Brandon Chamberlin, WDFW  
 Lou Ellyn Jones, USFWS (teleconference)  
 Kendel Emmerson, PacifiCorp Energy  
 Kirk Naylor, PacifiCorp Energy  
 Sabrina Hickerson, PacifiCorp Energy  
 Mitch Wainwright, U.S. Forest Service  
 Nathan Reynolds, Cowlitz Indian Tribe  
 Cherie Kearney, Columbia Land Trust  
 Tom Tuchmann, Columbia Land Trust

**Calendar:**

|              |                           |     |
|--------------|---------------------------|-----|
| May 11, 2011 | TCC Meeting at Merwin HCC | HCC |
|--------------|---------------------------|-----|

| <b>Assignments from January 13, 2010 Meeting:</b>  | <b>Status</b>  |
|--|----------------|
| Naylor: Create a land acquisition spreadsheet to include type designations for the TCC review and approval as necessary. | <b>Pending</b> |

| <b>Parking lot items from February 10, 2006 Meeting:</b> | <b>Status</b>            |
|--|--------------------------|
| Conservation Agreement – what is wanted?                 | <b>Ongoing – 4/28/06</b> |

| <b>Parking lot items from October 13, 2010 Meeting</b>  | <b>Status</b>                                   |
|---|---|
| Plan / discuss opportunities for future resource conference and field review of PacifiCorp WHMP implementation measures | <b>Scheduled for June 24<sup>th</sup>, 2011</b> |

| <b>Parking lot items from April 13, 2011 Meeting</b>  | <b>Status</b>  |
|---|----------------|
| Naylor: Provide TCC with Riparian Management Plan in May for review.  | <b>Pending</b> |
| Discuss the revising the Annual Plan and Report to meet TCC and FERC needs but reduce overall cost to write and produce | <b>Pending</b> |

**Review of Agenda and Finalize Meeting Notes**

Kirk Naylor (PacifiCorp Energy) called the meeting to order at 9:13 AM. He introduced Brandon Chamberlin from the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife who is a member of the law

enforcement on the project. He came to the meeting today to familiarize himself with the TCC and the issues facing the land.

Diana Gritten-MacDonald (Cowlitz PUD) apprised Chamberlin about the PUD's problem with vandalism on the portable toilets at the PUD designated fishing pier on the canal. This was briefly discussed and Chamberlin said he would note the area on his routine patrols.

Agenda was reviewed and accepted at 9:18 AM without changes or modifications. Gritten-MacDonald said she would have to leave a noon for another meeting.

Meeting notes were reviewed at 9:20 AM. Hickerson introduced Gritten-MacDonald's edits. Everyone reviewed the edits and had no comments or objections. At 9:20 AM, the meeting notes were accepted with Gritten-MacDonald's edits.

### **Lands Update with Columbia Land Trust (Confidential)**

*<Break 11:10 AM>*

*Cherie Kearney and Tom Tuchmann depart*

*<Reconvene 11:20 AM>*

### **USFS Forest Road 90**

Mitch Wainwright (US Forest Service) announced that that Forest Service will be doing some much needed repairs on the Canal Bridge that crosses Cowlitz PUD's power canal. Gritten-MacDonald will be meeting with the Forest Service at the bridge this afternoon to discuss the work to be done.

The Canal Bridge is a treated wood bridge an asphalt surface. The pavement is cracked and water is seeping through, so the pavement needs to be replaced. Additionally, the preservative in the wood is reacting with the asphalt creating "black goo" that leaks down into the canal. Lastly, the shims under the bridge are broken and rotating and must be replaced to stabilize the bridge.

There is a bat colony underneath the bridge. Originally the Forest Service proposed doing the work on the shims under the bridge during July and August, which would be the worst time for the bats. Wainwright worked with the engineers to reschedule to early- to mid-June.

June 14 -15 the Forest Service will need to remove the old pavement and lay down sand to soak up the preservative. The bridge will be closed during those two days. Afterwards, it will be re-opened with the sand on top, over which cars can be driven. The sand will need to stay down for a period of time, exposed to light and heat. Old sand may need to be removed and replaced periodically. Once the process is complete, the bridge will need to be closed again to lay down an impervious membrane over the wood, followed by the new pavement.

Naylor asked if the sand layer would change the weight limitations of the bridge? Gritten-MacDonald will ask at her meeting this afternoon with Shay.

During the times the bridge is closed, the alternate route would be Red Rock pass via Forest Road 81. This would add a number of miles to the trip and take about 45 minutes or longer.

The group asked Wainwright what mitigations have to be taken for endangered species during this work. Wainwright stated that the Forest Service has a contract that can be sent out that details the requirements of the work. The contractor is responsible for determining how this work will be done within the bounds of the contract and ensuring all requirements are met. Bull trout are under the ESA, but Wainwright states that the Forest Service has a programmatic, which means that they do not have to do additional consultation before starting work. Instead, they just communicate with the USFWS to advise what is being done. Programmatic consultation describes the kind of projects that could be done over the next five years and establishes baseline requirements based on the potential of impact.

The Forest Service will not know exact dates for the work to be done or the bridge to be closed until after the contract is awarded. Even then, final closure date will remain variable depending on how the absorption rate with the sand goes.

Naylor advised the group that PacifiCorp has an agreement with the Forest Service where the Utility pays a fee for the maintenance of Forest Service Road 90. He then asked about the budget for the bridge, and expressed concern that the budget may be exceeded. Wainwright assured him that there is other funding that is being used for the bridge, but he will discuss this with the project manager.

There is a fishing pier by the bridge that the Forest Service would like to use for contractor storage and lay down area. However, this pier is a SA requirement and mitigation. Gritten-MacDonald will show them another area that is inside the gate and may be adequate. The FS would need to sign an agreement to use that area that has an indemnification provision and that they would leave the fishing pier alone. The agreement also suggests the Forest Service discuss safety with PacifiCorp and coordinate.

Gritten-MacDonald advised Wainwright that watercraft are not allowed in the canal. Workers being in the canal would require an outage on the project or possibly draining the canal, and mean significant coordination with the Utilities. Lowering the canal is another possibility, but this would significantly impact the Utilities. These are all things for the Forest Service to consider.

PacifiCorp has no responsibility for the bats under the bridge, and Cowlitz PUD has no prescriptions for them, either. The Forest Service has an easement on the PUD's land to build and maintain the bridge, so the bats are the Forest Service's responsibility and no one has been monitoring them.

### **Columbia Land Trust Discussion continued ... (Confidential)**

*LouEllyn Jones departed 12:08 PM*

### **RMEF Professional's Day**

Bill Richardson (RMEF) reviewed the logistical plan for Professional's Day, as well as guest speakers and topics to be discussed.

The guests will be broken up into five different groups and shuttled to and from each location in vans. Naylor agreed with Richardson that there should be TCC representation in each group. Additionally, Naylor would like to designate the following people to be facilitators for each group (In addition to Richardson):

- Kendel Emmerson (PacifiCorp Energy)
- Nathan Reynolds (Cowlitz Indian Tribe)
- Eric Holman (WDFW)
- Kirk Naylor (PacifiCorp Energy)

There will be a script for each facilitator to use at each site. Not all five vans will be at one site at one time; they will rotate. The script can be handed out to the groups and will include information on harvest area, scarification, history, and so on. The facilitator would be responsible for going over the script, answering questions, and managing the group.

RMEF will provide lunch and there will be restrooms at each stop.

The target audience for this workshop is primarily the individuals that have attended previous forestry workshops. From there the scope broadens to other land management managers and people from other SAs or licenses. There will be a mix of foresters and biologists, agency and private landowners. Richardson estimates there should be around 100 people. The meeting will begin at Heritage Park (approximately five miles above Merwin Dam) to start the day and will include Naylor presenting a PowerPoint that gives big picture overview and TCC involvement.

Kirk putting together a PowerPoint to give at the beginning of the day that gives big picture overview of how the TCC manages the lands, buffers, harvests, etc.

Sites will be finalized during the “dress rehearsal” to be held April 29, 2011. Naylor requested that a separate rehearsal be held with the facilitators on May 5, 2011 (this date later changed to May 4, 2011). He advised them to prepare for a full day.

Kendel agreed to get six working radios so the groups can communicate with one another while in the field.

Cut-off date June 14, 2011 to RSVP for the event. Naylor and Richardson will provide an electronic final copy of invite for members of the TCC to share (See [Attachment A](#)).

## **Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) Update (Confidential)**

### **Department of Fish and Wildlife Comments**

Miller had sent out comments on behalf of WDFW regarding the WHMP report submitted to the TCC for review on March 1, 2011 (see [Attachment B](#)). In her letter to Naylor, she requested the following comments be addressed at the next TCC meeting:

Page 30, Pre-Commercial Thinning: *The total number of plantations and acres planned for pre-commercial thinning in 2010 were altered based on inspections and priorities. Please elaborate on these changes. Did thinning occur inside the new riparian buffers?*

Naylor stated that clarification was added to the final report. The primary reason for the change in pre-commercial thinning (PCT) proposed in 2010 was driven by the inspection of the Hamm Meadow property (purchased in 2009). Upon inspection in early 2010, a 12-acre portion of the property that had been clear-cut by the previous land owner was identified as a high priority area to remove alder, blackberry and big leaf maple in order to retain the Douglas-fir seedlings and restore forage. The work on this area was given higher priority than some of the areas identified in the 2010 plan. The work cost approximately \$30,000.00 and as a result, some of the areas originally scheduled were deferred until 2011.

Regarding thinning of riparian buffers, Naylor explained that the effect of the larger riparian buffers on previously harvested stands is an evolving process. Several aerial photos with the new buffers overlaying the THA's were shown. Naylor has a plan he has drafted that he will be bringing to the TCC in May for review. In short, yes, some thinning has been occurring in riparian buffers that were established over previous timber harvest areas. For background, the plan uses the TCC approved goals and objectives and species associations for riparian management to provide some of the guidance:

- Develop a minimum of 20 conifer/acre > 20" dbh
- For conifer in excess of 20/acre and 20" dbh; develop a minimum 1 snag per 6 acres.
- Black-capped chickadee; prefer deciduous and mixed forests with optimum canopy cover of 50-75%.
- Mink; Extensive woody and persistent herbaceous vegetation within 600 feet of surface water.
- Pileated woodpecker; large snags (> 20")
- Yellow warbler; 60-80 % hydrophytic shrubs

Naylor is proposing a maximum 70% crown closure for riparian buffers comprising 60% conifer and 40% hardwood, but there needs to be some flexibility. Holman pointed out that this was intended in the WHMP. Naylor noted that because some areas of existing riparian buffer (outside the THA's) are all hardwood and need increased amounts of conifer. Habitat criteria for various species, riparian goals, and overall objectives all play a role when determining the best management actions to meet the needs and account for variation in each buffer. Some areas are best handled on a case-by-case basis in order to allow for responsiveness to the physical location.

Additionally, the GIS maps that are used to determine the riparian buffers are not entirely accurate because the streams (derived from DNR database) are mis-located. These streams need to be re-surveyed for accuracy. There's about 35 acres of existing plantation that are in riparian areas that will be managed this year according to the GIS maps. However, there's not what's actually on the ground. Cost is significant because of the re-mapping and surveying requirements, in addition to work on the ground.

Peggy suggested NHD USGS layers; that is the state standard or will be soon. Naylor is taking a few acres in different units to try different management techniques to use as examples for the TCC to review and make a determination of the most effective techniques moving forward.

Section 3.0 Land Acquisition: Page 2: Please discuss how funding in land acquisition accounts relate to section 7.0 Funding in the main body of the report (page 99).

These numbers have been reviewed and corrected. They now match and are accurate.

*Please elaborate and provide discussion at the TCC meeting on the interpretation of “north” in “...purchase of sale or conservation easement agreement proposal for lands north of Swift Reservoir.”*

This was explained earlier in the meeting. A conservation easement has been acquired by the CLT and DNR for the south side of the reservoir. This was in reference to the Pope lands north of the reservoir that the TCC was working with CLT to acquire in a conservation easement.

Section 7.0 Riparian Habitat Management: Page 5, Subsection 7.2 Management Actions: This subsection identifies precommercial thinning in riparian areas that overlap previously existing THA's. Please provide maps illustrating the proposed thinning areas and/or reference the map location in this section. Will these pre-commercial thins be discussed with the TCC on a case by case basis?

This has been completed in the final version of the report. Additional description and discussion was related to the discussion provided for the first WDFW question.

Section 10.0 Orchard Management: Page 7, Subsection 10.2 Management Actions: Please confirm the location of the four additional trees.

This was done and is now documented in the final version of the report. The trees were planted in the open area between Upper and Lower Winter Creek meadows.

Section 13.0 Forestland Habitat Management: Page 8, Subsection 13.2 Management Actions, 2011 Proposed Forestland Practices: The Management Unit 28 stand is comprised of mixed conifer and the management plan identifies cutting small diameter trees along with pole age and mid-successional age classes. WDFW would like to suggest retaining the pines in the harvest unit.

Naylor advised that the intention is to save the western white pine, but not the lodge pole pine. The goal is to get more light to the forest floor. The TCC agreed. The size of the trees does not exceed 12 inches dbh in general. These are mostly younger trees. There might be some thinning of older trees, but mostly the goal is to thin out 12-inches and under.

*Page 9, Subsection 13.2 Management Actions, 2011 Proposed Forestland Practices: The plan identifies evaluation of Swift Creek (Management Unit 33) property. Please consider also evaluating the feasibility of embellishing the cover and buffers around the central meadow complex and smaller meadow complexes on the property.*

Soon as the snow leaves, Naylor agreed to spend some more time in the land that was just purchased to go through and discuss burning and planting. The goal is to have a plan for next year based on this year's actions and surveys.

*Page 9, Subsection 13.2 Management Actions, 2011 Proposed Forestland Practices: Will there be an opportunity to conduct a similar review of the new Yale parcel?*

Yes and no. The majority of time and money will go into Swift. A lot of money was put into Yale (Saddle Mountain) to get roads cleared for evaluation. Additionally, the BPA line will be going through the new Yale parcel and it would be best to learn where that path may be before making any plans for the area.

Appendix A: 2011 Lewis River Wildlife Habitat Management Plan Schedule: *No page number: Please provide clarification between baseline and scheduled as discussed at the March 9th, 2011 TCC meeting.*

There is a comment on this in the final schedule. A definition for baseline and scheduled was included in the footer of each Plan Schedule page.

Appendix B: 2011 Budget: *No page number, Administration Budget table: Please provide a TCC discussion on potential alternative formats for the annual plan.*

This is a parking lot item that will likely be discussed come December. PacifiCorp has had internal discussion and is open to ideas. There are things that FERC needs to see. They are a good record for us, scaling back is good.

*No page number, Forestland Budget table: The Forestland Budget table identifies 400 hours and \$30,000 for Invasive Plant Species – Competing Vegetation, in addition to \$14,000 for chemicals. WDFW would like a TCC discussion on these budget items and the breakdown of estimated amounts between competing and invasive vegetation.*

Naylor described that competing vegetation and invasive vegetation management is difficult to separate out but competing vegetation is generally that work conducted to prevent vegetation within 18-inches around the seedlings in their first two growing years (pre-emergent treatments etc.) Other invasive species treatments include the costs of controlling blackberry, scotch broom or alder. All of this is competing vegetation but technically these are not the same items but they occupy the same budget line. How much of that is making the resources available for vegetation that is necessary about and how much is not worthwhile effort? That is a good question. Naylor admits that early on a lot of money was spent on protecting seedlings from browsing and vegetation control attempts to determine the best fits and most cost effective strategies. To some extent this is still occurring. The average cost for cedar establishment is \$10.50 per seedling just to get them through the first three years. Various efforts have not stopped the elk from destroying the cedars. In some cases this has been true for fir as well. Fewer cedars will be planted in the future and more aggressive work can then be done to keep them. PacifiCorp believes that these vegetation and seedling protection measures are all contributing to retaining high quality forage, including native shrubs while establishing future hiding and thermal cover.



An example was provided as Unit 26 where forest harvests of approximately 30-acres a couple of years back has yet to sustain a full plantation because the elk are eating the tree seedlings, despite the meadows and grass seedling conducted simultaneously.

Naylor agreed that too much money is being spent to get trees established, but will do a better job of breaking that down in the future.

What about spending the money for older trees? Peggy suggests that this would save money in the long run. Naylor replied that right now they are planting the biggest tree money can buy with root mass and in the quantity needed. PacifiCorp is paying for the Douglas-fir and this doesn't cost the WHMP budget anything. The TCC is paying for cedar, hemlock and pine.

What about a weed mat? This may be labor intensive but Naylor will consider it.

*No page number, Forestland Budget: Please explain the funding attributed to the Saddle Mt and Swift Creek properties. Is the \$31,000 included in the current budget?*

No, it is not included in the overall budget but will be used. When everything was budgeted out, it was not used for anything else so it has been allocated for forestry in the Saddle Mountain and Swift Creek properties.

*No page number, Raptor Budget: Please initiate a discussion at the TCC meeting on the goshawk surveys. Can this be accomplished with less funding allocation?*

Yes, goshawk surveys are expensive. Some areas require two people due to safety concerns, such steep slopes, remote location (other side of Yale Road), and/or illegal trespass. Emmerson will be taking another person with her to complete Unit 28 and 23 this year. There was a lot of discussion when the WHMP was being put together on how and what to survey for goshawks. A goshawk specialist, Steve Desimone, determined a survey area of the timber harvest area plus a 500-meter area surrounding, excluding private land and non-habitat.

This can be reviewed, but if it going to be any changes , it should be before June.

Peggy clarified that PacifiCorp is doing goshawk surveys before timber harvests. She will communicate this to Brock Applegate.

\$10,000 of the budget is for the helicopter surveys.

Emmerson suggested reviewing the June and July TCC notes from 2007 or 2008 for more information on this topic.

## **Unit 22**

Timber harvest in Unit 22 was proposed in the 2011 Plan but due to new information in regards to DNR access there is not enough in the budget to afford it this year. Additionally, this year is the evaluation year for the IP road trail to determine feasibility and cost.. Naylor proposed to the TCC that we defer a timber harvest in management Unit 22 in 2011 and instead focus the available budget on the rehabilitation of the new Swift property purchase and proceed with the forestry

habitat enhancement in Unit 28. Additionally, Naylor described the hazard tree situation adjacent to the Speeylei Bay Day Use Area and wanted to include raptor surveys for this stand in 2011 so that tree harvest could occur in 2012.

Miller has concerns of the timing of trail development and thinning efforts in Unit 22. She suggested delaying the thinning and road decommission beyond one year until more is known about the trail. PacifiCorp pointed out that the TCC will have input in the process. One of the issues on the final design of the trail is law enforcement and emergency services access. This may determine how access across the stream segments in the road are handled (culverts vs. pedestrian bridges etc.). While there was considerable discussion on the trail and the road history, Naylor was pointing out that it is another factor that he concluded was important to defer forest management in this area at this time. The TCC asked if raptor surveys could be pushed out more than one year to combine the management actions in 2013? Protocol needs to be two years of consecutive goshawk surveys.

Taking care of the hazard issue at Speeylei makes more sense to Wainwright.

There was a question regarding how many acres are planned for harvest each year and if we were meeting that. Per the BiOp, PacifiCorp used 65-acres per year as the average; that is the cut we need to maintain the coverage::forage ratios but there is no way we can cut that many acres with our budget. Best we have done is 45 acres per year, but it's not sustainable at the present time. Naylor says that we need to complete the re-mapping of the vegetation types so we really know what we got, and then he can put together a harvest schedule. The budget during the first 5-years of implementation requires a significant amount of funding for old-growth surveys and mapping, shrubland mapping and riparian surveys. These surveys and plans are necessary but have taken significant budget that otherwise could be available for direct habitat implementation.

Maybe the after-harvest management is not sustainable, either, according to Wainwright. This is an item of discussion.

*<Adjourn 4:00PM>*

#### **Next Meeting's Agenda**

- Review of 4/13/11 Meeting Notes
- Bonneville Power Administration Transmission Line Corridor Presentation
- Riparian Buffer Management Plan
- Updates on land transactions

#### **Public Comment Opportunity**

No public comment was provided.

### Next Scheduled Meetings

|                             |                             |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| May 11, 2011                | June 8, 2011                |
| Merwin Hydro Control Center | Merwin Hydro Control Center |
| Ariel, WA                   | Ariel, WA                   |
| 9:00am – 3:00pm             | 9:00am – 3:00pm             |

### Attachments

- **Attachment A:** RMEF Professional's Day Invitation
- **Attachment B:** WDFW Comments the 2010 WHMP



*You are cordially invited!*



**PacifiCorp/RMEF  
Founders' Field Day  
Tour & Habitat Partner Reception  
Saturday June 25, 2011  
Lewis River Basin, SW Washington**

**Headquarters:**  
Heritage Park Events Center  
7982 Lewis River Rd, Ariel, WA 98603

Contact Wayne Marion for more information at  
360.943.5672 or [wmarion@rmef.org](mailto:wmarion@rmef.org)  
RSVP by June 14, 2011





## **PacifiCorp/RMEF Founders' Field Day Tour & Habitat Partner Reception Saturday June 25, 2011**

Please join us for this unique opportunity to celebrate RMEF's partnership with PacifiCorp along with Elk Foundation Founders, Charlie Decker and Bob Munson.

### **The Tour**

Participants should meet at the Heritage Park Events Center at 9 a.m. Tour begins at 10 a.m. The primary focus of the tour will be on the lands RMEF has helped PacifiCorp acquire for wildlife habitat with a smaller emphasis on forest management. The tour will pass by the Hamm viewing meadow, travel through and look at the Saddle Dam Property, and visit the Swift property with an opportunity to look over the meadow and snag habitat found there. We will also discuss RMEF's role in guiding habitat management through the Terrestrial Coordinating Committee (TCC). Ample opportunity will exist to contrast PacifiCorp's management style with that of other landowners in the area.

Lunch stations with sandwiches and beverages will be provided along the tour route.

### **Habitat Partner Reception**

The Habitat Partner Reception is the perfect way to top off the day's activities. Visit with Charlie Decker and Bob Munson about RMEF's past and what the future brings.

Reception begins at 4 p.m. at the Heritage Park Events Center.  
Dinner and drinks will be provided.

### **Hotel Accommodations**

For those who need hotel accommodations the Lewis River Inn at Woodland, Washington, is offering a special RMEF rate. Please call 360.225.6257 for reservations and mention RMEF to receive the rate. For more information on the Lewis River Inn please visit [www.lewisriverinn.com](http://www.lewisriverinn.com).

### **Contact and RSVP Information**

For further information or to reserve your spot contact:  
Wayne Marion at 360.943.5672 or [wmarion@rmef.org](mailto:wmarion@rmef.org).

*RSVP by June 14, 2011*



*You are cordially invited!*



**PacifiCorp/RMEF Field Day**  
**Lewis River Basin, SW Washington**

**June 24, 2011**

**Tour Headquarters:**

Heritage Park Events Center  
7982 Lewis River Rd, Ariel, WA 98603

**Facilitators:**

Mike Wisdom  
Marty Vavra  
Mark Swanson  
Matt Betts  
Cheryl Friesen  
Cindy McCain

Pacific Northwest Research Station  
Starkey Ungulate Ecology Team Leader  
Landscape Ecology - Washington State University  
Landscape Ecology - Oregon State University  
U.S. Forest Service  
U.S. Forest Service

Contact Bill Richardson to RSVP or for more information  
at 541.929.3011 or [brichardson@rmef.org](mailto:brichardson@rmef.org)





# Early Seral Habitat in Managed Forests

## Tour: June 24, 2011

Who should attend?

Wildlife professionals, forest managers, landowners, scientists, and others interested in early seral wildlife habitat

- Meet at the Heritage Park Events Center at 8 a.m.
- Presentation begins at 8:30 a.m. Vans leave shortly thereafter
- Lunch and water will be provided in the field
- Vans return to the Events Center in mid to late afternoon for wrap up discussion, hamburgers, brats, and fixings

*RMEF is dedicated to addressing habitat needs for Roosevelt elk and other wildlife. One way we do this is by participating in Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) re-licensing efforts.*

*The Lewis River Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement calls for PacifiCorp to acquire and manage habitat in the Lewis River Basin. PacifiCorp is leading the way in developing and maintaining early seral habitat in their managed forests. RMEF recently helped PacifiCorp acquire two parcels totaling nearly 1,000 acres in the Lewis River Basin, bringing the total land base they manage for wildlife to over 11,000 acres.*

*This tour offers a chance to see examples of early seral habitat development and maintenance. It will be a great opportunity to discuss habitat quality, components, and cost. You will see examples of PacifiCorp land adjacent to state-owned industrial forest lands providing a comparison of management goals. There are also numerous habitat types on PacifiCorp land including early, mid, and late successional habitat.*

*All of the terrestrial habitat management is guided by the Terrestrial Coordinating Committee (TCC) as part of the FERC settlement agreement. Participants in the TCC include WDFW, USFS, USFWS, tribes, other NGOs, community members, and RMEF.*

*The Elk Foundation is pleased to collaborate with these partners. Guiding management on land we have protected is a rare and wonderful opportunity. We look forward to seeing you in June.*

Contact Bill Richardson to RSVP or for more information  
at 541.929.3011 or [brichardson@rmef.org](mailto:brichardson@rmef.org)







**State of Washington  
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE**

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

March 31, 2011

Mr. Kirk Naylor  
Environmental Supervisor  
PacifiCorp Energy  
825 NE Multnomah, Suite 1500  
Portland, Oregon 97232

**RE: Lewis River Hydroelectric Projects 2010 Annual Report**

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft Lewis River Hydroelectric Projects (FERC Project Nos. 935, 2071, 2111, 2213) 2010 Annual Report (report/plan). WDFW received the combination draft report/plan in electronic form on March 1, 2011. A hard copy was supplied by PacifiCorp during the March 9, 2011 Terrestrial Coordination Committee (TCC) meeting. The purpose of this letter is to facilitate report/plan discussion at the April 13, 2011 TCC meeting.

WDFW has reviewed the plan and looks forward to participating in the discussion of the report/plan. WDFW may have additional questions and/or comments at that time. Comments herein are limited to terrestrial resources and TCC responsibilities.

As presented, WDFW believes the draft 2010 annual report and 2011 annual plan are fundamentally sound. The following list contains topics WDFW would like to discuss at the TCC meeting.

**Appendix K**

**Lewis River Wildlife Habitat Plan Annual Progress Report Operation Phase 2010**

- **Section 8.0 Orchard Management**
  - Page 10, subsection 8.2 Management Actions: This section is Orchard Management but refers to riparian habitat management areas.
- **Section 11.0 Forestland Habitat Management**
  - Page 30, Pre-Commercial Thinning: The total number of plantations and acres planned for pre-commercial thinning in 2010 were altered based on inspections and priorities. Please elaborate on these changes. Did thinning occur inside the new riparian buffers?



## **Appendix L**

### **Lewis River Wildlife Habitat Management Plan: Annual Plan of Operation Phase 2011**

- **Section 3.0 Land Acquisition**
  - Page 2: Please discuss how funding in land acquisition accounts relate to section 7.0 Funding in the main body of the report (page 99).
  - Page 2: Please elaborate and provide discussion at the TCC meeting on the interpretation of “north” in “...purchase of sale or conservation easement agreement proposal for lands north of Swift Reservoir.”
- **Section 7.0 Riparian Habitat Management**
  - Page 5, Subsection 7.2 Management Actions: This subsection identifies pre-commercial thinning in riparian areas that overlap previously existing THA’s. Please provide maps illustrating the proposed thinning areas and/or reference the map location in this section. Will these pre-commercial thins be discussed with the TCC on a case by case basis?
- **Section 10.0 Orchard Management**
  - Page 7, Subsection 10.2 Management Actions: Please confirm the location of the four additional trees.
- **Section 13.0 Forestland Habitat Management**
  - Page 8, Subsection 13.2 Management Actions, 2011 Proposed Forestland Practices: The Management Unit 28 stand is comprised of mixed conifer and the management plan identifies cutting small diameter trees along with pole age and mid-successional age classes. WDFW would like to suggest retaining the pines in the harvest unit.
  - Page 9, Subsection 13.2 Management Actions, 2011 Proposed Forestland Practices: The plan identifies evaluation of Swift Creek (Management Unit 33) property. Please consider also evaluating the feasibility of embellishing the cover and buffers around the central meadow complex and smaller meadow complexes on the property.
  - Page 9, Subsection 13.2 Management Actions, 2011 Proposed Forestland Practices: Will there be an opportunity to conduct a similar review of the new Yale parcel?
- **Appendix A: 2011 Lewis River Wildlife Habitat Management Plan Schedule**
  - No page number: Please provide clarification between baseline and scheduled as discussed at the March 9<sup>th</sup>, 2011 TCC meeting.
- **Appendix B: 2011 Budget**
  - No page number, Administration Budget table: Please provide a TCC discussion on potential alternative formats for the annual plan.
  - No page number, Forestland Budget table: The Forestland Budget table identifies 400 hours and \$30,000 for Invasive Plant Species – Competing Vegetation, in addition to \$14,000 for chemicals. WDFW would like a TCC discussion on these

Mr. Kirk Naylor  
PacifiCorp Energy  
March 31, 2011

budget items and the breakdown of estimated amounts between competing and invasive vegetation.

- No page number, Forestland Budget: Please explain the funding attributed to the Saddle Mt and Swift Creek properties. Is the \$31,000 included in the current budget?
- No page number, Raptor Budget: Please initiate a discussion at the TCC meeting on the goshawk surveys. Can this be accomplished with less funding allocation?

WDFW's mission is to protect, restore and enhance fish and wildlife and their habitats, while providing sustainable fish and wildlife-related recreational and commercial opportunities. WDFW looks forward to continuing to work with PacifiCorp in enhancing, improving, and protecting fish, wildlife and their habitat within the Lewis River Watershed.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact Peggy Miller and/or Eric Holman using the information below.

Regards,



Peggy Miller, Biologist  
Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife  
(360) 902-2593  
[peggy.miller@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:peggy.miller@dfw.wa.gov)

Eric Holman, Biologist  
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife  
(360) 696-6211 ex 6755  
[eric.holman@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:eric.holman@dfw.wa.gov)