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

Date & Time: Wednesday, July 13, 2011

9:00 a.m. – 3:30 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

Time	Discussion Item
9:00 a.m.	Welcome
	Preview Agenda
	➤ Review and comment on notes of 06/08/11 meeting
	➤ Adopt 06/08/11 Meeting Notes
9:15 a.m.	Updates:
	o Management Unit 28
	 Canal Bridge
9:30 a.m.	Professional's Day Review
9:45 a.m.	➤ BPA update
	 Goshawk Surveys
	o USFWS BiOp
	 Naylor phone conversation w/ Nancy Wittpenn
10:15 a.m.	Swift Shoreline Dock Permit Request
10:45 a.m.	Lands Update
	 Photos - discussion
	 GIS review (if received)
11:30 a.m.	TCC travel to Unit 33 (Swift 1 Purchase)
	 Look at proposed broadcast burn
	 Look at Meadow
3:30 p.m.	Return to Merwin; Adjourn meeting

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.

NOTE: Voice conference will only be available for morning discussion prior to field visit.

FINAL Meeting Notes

Lewis River License Implementation Terrestrial Coordination Committee (TCC) Meeting July 13, 2011 MEETING AT MERWIN HCC

TCC Participants Present: (12)

Diana Gritten-MacDonald, Cowlitz County PUD (teleconference)

Bob Nelson, RMEF

Ray Croswell, RMEF

Bill Richardson, RMEF

Eric Holman, WDFW

Peggy Miller, WDFW

LouEllyn Jones, USFWS

Lindsy Wright, USFWS (teleconference)

Nathan Reynolds, Cowlitz Indian Tribe

Kirk Naylor, PacifiCorp Energy

Sabrina Hickerson, PacifiCorp Energy

Kendel Emmerson, PacifiCorp Energy

Calendar:

August 10, 2011	TCC Meeting at Merwin HCC	HCC
September 13, 2011	TCC Meeting at Merwin HCC	HCC

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

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

Parking lot items from April 13, 2011 Meeting	Status
Naylor: Provide TCC with Riparian Management Plan in August/September	Pending
for review.	
Discuss revising the Annual Plan and Report to meet TCC and FERC needs	Pending
while reducing overall cost to write and produce - To discuss in at	
September / October meetings.	

Review of Agenda and Finalize Meeting Notes

Kirk Naylor (PacifiCorp Energy) called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. LouEllyn Jones (USFWS) introduced Lindsy Wright with the U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife who will be working with LouEllyn and will join on TCC meetings occasionally and working with the group. Everyone went around the table and introduced themselves to Lindsy.

The agenda was reviewed at 9:13 a.m. Naylor indicated he wanted to provide the TCC an update on the management plan for Unit 28. The TCC agreed and this was added to the agenda. Diana Gritten-McDonald (Cowlitz PUD) requested that an update on the Canal Bridge also be added. The agenda was accepted at 9:14 a.m.

< Bill Richardson (RMEF) arrived at 9:14 a.m. >

The TCC reviewed last month's meeting notes at 9:15 a.m. Peggy Miller (WDFW) and Jones said they read them and had no comments. No other comments were provided and meeting notes were accepted at 9:17 a.m.

Professionals Day Review

Naylor gave a big "Thank you" to everyone that participated in Professional's Day on June 24th and 25th. Special accolades were due to Bill Richardson (RMEF). Richardson said he received 100% positive feedback from those who participated in the event, and many people wanted more. RMEF is already planning on holding another Professional's Day again next year to be held at Starkey Experimental Forest in NE Oregon.

Over 90 people attended on Friday, June 24th. Jones said it was well coordinated, especially considering the large number of participants. The group discussed what went well and how things could be done differently next year, particularly in regards to what audiences to target and other groups that could be invited. Suggestions such as congressional aides, politicians, and small woodland owners were made. The main goal was to make people think about what was happening in managed forestlands and how to apply new and effective techniques on the ground. Naylor stated that he would be willing to do similar tours on smaller scales to other interested parties.

Canal Bridge Update

Naylor received an update from the Forest Service earlier in the week regarding the Canal Bridge. He reported that they are still planning on moving forward with maintenance on the bridge, though a little differently than originally proposed. The bids for the original package came back much too expensive, so they are dividing the work up between this year and next year. This year they will resurface the bridge, and next year the work under the bridge will be done under a separate contract. Gritten-MacDonald voiced her appreciation of the Forest Service's willingness to listen and work with other agencies involved.

BPA Update (Confidential)

< 10:05 a.m. Gritten-MacDonald departed >

Swift Shoreline Dock Permit Request

PacifiCorp has a Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) that has a provision for people to request a waiver under the plan. A landowner adjacent to PacifiCorp property at Swift has sent in a large file to the company requesting such a waiver in order to build a single-family dock on Swift reservoir and have a pathway from his property, through our resource management lands, to the shoreline

where his dock would be located. PacifiCorp's property department took the large file and synthesized down the pertinent points for the TCC's review. PacifiCorp is approaching the TCC and requesting feedback, comments, and recommendations.

Section 7.4 of the Shoreline Management Plan states:

An Applicant for a shoreline use within the Resource Management classification may ask PacifiCorp to waive the Resource Management classification standards and requirements for the Applicant's use. If PacifiCorp agrees to grant the waiver, PacifiCorp will review the application under Integrated Use classification standards. PacifiCorp will consider granting a waiver only if the Applicant can:

- demonstrate to PacifiCorp that no other feasible alternative to the proposed use would have less impact on the Project,
- provide convincing evidence that the proposed use would have minimal impact to environmental or cultural resources (e.g. conduct resource surveys and show no detriment to resources) or Project Operations, and
- execute specific protection, mitigation and/or environmental enhancements (PM&E measures) as may be prescribed by PacifiCorp or through any consultation with Jurisdictional Entities or the appropriate coordinating committee.

Miller asked if PacifiCorp has issued these waivers before. Naylor advised that this would be the first of its kind and would set a precedent for issuing waivers through resource management lands.

Naylor drew a schematic of the area on the white board (See Attachments for more detail). PacifiCorp owns more of the land than indicated on Kemper's drawing. Naylor also advised there was an osprey nest that used to be in the vicinity (west of the proposal area), but had blown down.

Emmerson asked if the land owner was likely to have more development around them (based on other private ownership). The maps indicate that he has owned and developed a couple of lots next to him. Emmerson suggested that a community dock would be a potential answer, in order to prevent multiple families on the reservoir from developing multiple single-family docks. PacifiCorp has tried to promote that in the past.

Naylor pointed out that the person requesting the dock permit has a mooring in the reservoir now that was installed before the SMP, and he has been using it.

In looking at the summary provided to the TCC of the proposed path, several comments were made. It was suggested (if approved) that he make the path gravel in order to prevent erosion, and that he shrink the width down from six feet. Additionally, the TCC would require that nothing be stored on the resource management land, especially fuel. Lastly, there could be a mitigation fund that would be for repairing any damage done to the land.

Holman brought the conversation back to the bullets listed in the plan, specifically that there are other feasible options for the individual to access and store his boat which would be the existing mooring and the ladder leading down to the mooring. Miller asked if the ladder was causing any erosion. Naylor said if so, it was probably negligible compared to wave action on the shore.

After more discussion, the TCC came to the consensus that because the individual already has an existing mooring at this location, he has failed to prove that "no other feasible alternative to the proposed use would have less impact on the Project," and thus there is no reason to issue a waiver

for him to build the proposed dock on Swift reservoir and have an access trail through PacifiCorp resource management lands. If he wanted to resubmit a separate request for the trail to access his ladder and mooring, the TCC would consider and review the request.

Unit 28 Proposed Forest Management

Naylor has looked at the land in Unit 28 where the harvest is proposed to occur, and acting in accordance with the Lewis River Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP), Historical Research Associates, Inc. (HRA) completed a desktop and pedestrian cultural review on June 2, 2011. Additionally, there has been collaboration with Cowlitz Indian Tribe and Forest Service. The cultural survey is not out yet, but there are some Forest Service maps indicating a trail that existed in the vicinity. Naylor will communicate to the TCC as appropriate after the survey has been reviewed.

Lands Update (Confidential)

Management Unit 33 Tour

Today the TCC is going to be looking at the property purchased last year at Swift and discussing a proposal by Naylor for a broadcast burn on about 40 acres of previously logged land to release nutrients and allow shrubs to grow back as permanent forage for elk. In other areas that were logged by the prior landowner he is suggesting tractor scarification and replanting conifer (noble fir [Abies procera], western hemlock [Tsuga heterophylla] and perhaps western white pine [Pinus monticola]). All are dependent on availability.

The intention of the broadcast burn would be to release the huckleberry (*Vaccinium* spp.) and other shrubs. The broadcast burn will not work well in all the areas of the unit, so others will be scarified and replanted.

PacifiCorp is currently coordinating with DNR or the Forest Service to conduct the burn. Following the burn, replanting would occur with a grass and legume mix (species to be determined) at approximating 10-12 pounds per acre. Naylor believes that being conservative with the grass seeding will help ease the moisture burden and competition with shrubs.

The land is primarily summer/fall range for the elk herds. The elk are following the green up into the higher elevations from May through October until the snow pushes them back down. Developing shrubs will allow greater availability of forage for elk in moderate winters or the transition seasons.

These are not "normal" forest practices, so the Forest Practice Application with DNR will have an alternate plan designating the area to be burned and unplanted with trees. DNR will be putting together an identification team to review, but most of the parties on this team were also in on the

Settlement Agreement so they will likely be familiar with the WHMP and have background and understanding of the intentions behind these practices.

The burn would likely take place in September or October. The road will act as a fire barrier.

Peggy Miller (WDFW) said that Eric Holman (WDFW) suggested planting true firs to create deep buffers around meadow areas to provide protection for the deer and elk. Naylor agreed.

Although unvisited by the TCC due to the weather, there is a failed road in the upper end of Management Unit 33 that must be stabilized to prevent further erosion. The question is how much effort should go into repairing the road. Because of the remoteness, it will be difficult to get equipment in to fix the road, but without the road, it will be even harder to get equipment in to manage the land. Naylor is evaluating between limiting the repairs to allow ATV access or doing full repairs so large equipment can come in to manage the land. Working with engineers now to determine the most effective and feasible solution.

Several members of the TCC commented that the land is only at 2800 feet but is acting like it's at 5000 feet based on the vegetation. Reynolds noticed thistle in the area and asked Naylor how he planned to manage for it. Naylor said he could manage this with a light mist of herbicide and that it is one of the easier invasive species to manage for. Reynolds also pointed out there is elk browsing on the black raspberries.

Looking at the trees in the plantations, it was noted that they are very densely planted, perhaps 400 - 600 trees per acre, and that the areas could use some pre-commercial thinning. This would be proposed in future years.

Naylor took the group over to the 7-acre wetland/meadow and discussed the plan for the meadow and the land next to it. The timber harvest area from the previous landowner will be scarified and replanted as discussed above. There is already willow, black-cap, and huckleberry growing in the 4 year old harvest area across the road.

Miller asked if rotational logging will be used to maintain forage in the management unit. Naylor affirmed that it would. The intention is to keep about 25% of the land available in forage, and the remainder would be forestland. At these higher elevation lands, management likely will be different than what has been practiced around Merwin and Yale. The group discussed various management techniques and ratios that have been used in the past when managing land for elk, and everything from 60/40 to 75/25% (cover to forage) has been used depending on local conditions and objectives. Ratios aren't the objective in our management but the intent is to develop more forage in an area that is clearly lacking early successional habitat.

Naylor also discussed the current science regarding elk nutrition. Elk must enter winter in prime shape in order to survive harsh winters. This has been the primary message from current research and deemphasizes the significance of thermal cover – especially on summer ranges. Elk can find cover (thermal cover) in topography and do not depend on canopy closure for survival as much as biologists once believed. Emphasizing forage and therefore the nutritional condition of the herd is likely a more strategic management for these lands but a mosaic with denser cover also plays a role providing cover for both snow interception and security cover from predators.

In the wetland/meadow area, Miller asked how much buffer would be maintained. Naylor advised the WHMP calls for 150 feet for a "wetland" of this size. The area will be GPS and mapped, and over the years PacifiCorp will additionally monitor to ensure there is no conifer encroachment into the wetland/meadow area.

At the very top of the road in the unit, the team discussed concerns about ATV trails and hunting camp sites. RMEF said they would assist PacifiCorp in managing these issues.

< *Return to HCC 2:20* >

< Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m. >

Next Meeting's Agenda

- Review of 7/13/11 Meeting Notes
- Updates on land transactions
- Review of Old Growth Stands Initial Inspections
- Goshawk final tally from Kendel Emmerson.
- Potentially invite BPA for further discussion

Public Comment Opportunity

No public comment was provided.

Next Scheduled Meetings

July 13, 2011	August 10, 2011
Merwin Hydro Control Center	Merwin Hydro Control Center
Ariel, WA	Ariel, WA
9:00am – 3:00pm	9:00am – 3:00pm

Handouts

- 6/8/11 Meeting Notes
- 7/13/11 Agenda
- SMP Waiver Request Documentation