

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

Date & Time: **Wednesday, September 14, 2011
9:00 a.m. – 2:15 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Preview Agenda ➤ Review, comment and adopt notes of 08/10/11 meeting
9:15 a.m.	➤ Lands Update
9:30 a.m.	➤ Elk/equestrian study and Saddle Dam Park
10:15 a.m.	➤ Old-growth Initial Evaluation Report Discussion
10:45 a.m.	➤ BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project
12:00 p.m.	➤ Working Lunch: BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project (<u>as necessary</u>)
12:30 p.m.	➤ BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project Continued (<u>as necessary</u>)
2:00 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Next Meeting's Agenda ➤ Public Comment Opportunity ➤ Note: all meeting notes and the meeting schedule can be located at: http://www.pacificorp.com/es/hydro/hl/lr.html#
2:15 p.m.	<i>Adjourn</i>

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
September 13, 2011
MEETING AT MERWIN HCC

TCC Participants Present: (11)

Diana Gritten-MacDonald, Cowlitz County PUD
 Bob Nelson, RMEF
 Ray Croswell, RMEF
 Bill Richardson, RMEF
 Eric Holman, WDFW
 Peggy Miller, WDFW
 Nathan Reynolds, Cowlitz Indian Tribe
 Kirk Naylor, PacifiCorp Energy
 Sabrina Hickerson, PacifiCorp Energy
 Kendel Emmerson, PacifiCorp Energy
 David Moore, PacifiCorp Energy

Calendar:

October 12, 2011	TCC Meeting at Merwin HCC	HCC
November	TCC Meeting at Merwin HCC	HCC

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

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 for review.	Pending
Discuss the revising the Annual Plan and Report to meet TCC and FERC needs while reducing overall cost to write and produce – <i>To discuss at September / October meetings.</i>	Pending

Assignments from August 10, 2011 Meeting:	Status
PacifiCorp: Develop buffers and layers for BPA transmission alternatives and prepare assessment per mitigation strategy.	In Progress

Review of Agenda and Finalize Meeting Notes

Kirk Naylor (PacifiCorp Energy) called the meeting called to order 9:10 a.m.

Agenda reviewed at 9:12 a.m. The team added an Annual Meeting Report Discussion to the end, and the agenda was accepted at 9:13 a.m.

Last month's meeting notes were reviewed at 9:13 a.m. Peggy Miller (WDFW) asked that her request for a copy of the cultural report for the Unit 28 Proposed Timber Harvest be removed. She did not really need a copy of the report, but was merely interested in knowing that it was available. No other comments were made and the notes were approved at 9:21 a.m.

Lands Update (Confidential)

Elk-Equestrian Study

Naylor introduced David Moore, PacifiCorp Energy, Recreation Program Manager. David and Kendel Emmerson (PacifiCorp Energy) led the discussion regarding the following Settlement Agreement Article:

SA 11.2.2.5.d:

PacifiCorp and WDFW shall work cooperatively to develop a mutually agreeable strategy to evaluate the potential impacts of equestrian use on elk during the elk wintering season at Saddle Dam Farm and to minimize any impacts through signage and education, vegetation buffers, or relocating trails. If these methods are not feasible or successful and if equestrian use warrants, PacifiCorp shall, at the direction of WDFW, seasonally close the trail(s) via appropriate signage and gates.

This has to be done by the fifth license year.

Emmerson handed out a map of the farm that shows the current trails used (red) and historic or potential trail (yellow). The intent of the SA is to evaluate the effects, if any, of winter equestrian recreation has on the elk in the Saddle Dam Farm. Depending on what is determined from the study, then some actions may be implemented to reduce disturbance such as screen, daily closures, or trail reroutes, but it would be unfair to implement these strategy until we know the impact, if any, recreation has on the elk. Naylor advised that horse users are still using the historic trail as well as many other access points that are not shown on the map.

Emmerson contacted Eric Holman of WDFW to see what, if any, disturbance studies are being done in the area and really the Starkey study was the only one known in the northwest. One of the options they looked at was trail cameras, but because the elk use is throughout the farm and the camera's field of view so limited they figured they would need about 20 or more cameras to document the elk and then they wouldn't necessarily be able to determine the source of disturbance (cougar vs. horse walking on the dam). Another option was to set up a video camera on the dam of the farm, but cameras run about \$10,000 and would require a post that would not shake and be installed on the dam. This was just not practical and cost prohibitive.

Instead, they have settled on setting up blinds (the stars on the map) and watching the horse or other potential disturbances and the elk interaction. The goal will be to determine how and where elk use is concentrated, how quickly the elk flush from a disturbance and where they flush to. Based on observations and anecdotal evidence from the equestrian people, the elk always flush to the south. The study is intended to run from December 16th through April 15th.

Ray Crosswell (RMEF) said that the amount of sitting and watching would be substantial. Emmerson's literature search did not yield any designated amount of time that would provide an idea. Her best estimate was three hours.

She referenced the Starkey study, which is the 2008 paper by L. Naylor, M. Wisdom, and R. Anthony on the behavioral response of elk to various recreation users. This study found horses to cause the least disturbance to elk. Crosswell said if the information is already available then why do we need to do more research.

The SA says to "develop an agreeable strategy," and it indicates that meeting the SA requirement was for WDFW to assess and determine. Holman said the overall goal is to maintain safe and secure habitat for elk.

Nathan Reynolds (Cowlitz Indian Tribe) expressed concerned about dog walking, which is on the rise on all property. He questioned that since horses were considered the least amount of impact to elk, should not the study be assessing dog interaction instead? Or perhaps overall recreation?

Moore (PacifiCorp Energy) is looking to WDFW for a management direction as to how best to handle the trail, but he is not willing to just close it entirely. He is willing to look at managing dogs if the need warrants, but needs direction with evidence before making any changes. His goal is to satisfy the TCC's needs (specifically the WDFW) and fulfill PacifiCorp's obligation under the SA.

Reynolds asked how many winter days do the equestrians actually utilize the trail. Moore said he can collect that information. The equestrians in the area have been extraordinarily supportive and cooperative with this effort. Richardson asked if Moore could incorporate their observations into this study. Moore agreed and said that he and Emmerson have already discussed doing exactly that.

Naylor suggested riding with the users to see how the elk react and to educate the users at the same time.

Miller asked to know more about the study. When are the elk in the area? How much usage is there by dog and equestrians? Can the time that the trail is used be limited? Based on elk-sign, Emmerson estimates that the elk bed in the area most every night. Crosswell said the trail cameras could answer a number of these questions.

Holman said that Starkey's study said that different recreation usage will disturb elk differently, but specific to this area it is necessary to study exactly what that disturbance looks like and how severe it impacts the elk.

Moore said that he needs to know where the trail should go, what limitations (if any) should be applied and what management should look like going forward. He needs justification for any changes made.

The plan calls for study to be done next year, but the budgeting has been set up to do it this year. Reynolds suggested getting a data set this winter with the blinds and observations to determine the basis of any further information needs. It would indicate if there is interaction, if the elk are

flushing, and then enable the group to determine the appropriate next steps. Moore agreed that was a great idea and what he and Emerson had intended to do.

Opening Cresap Bay Early

Moore advised that he had to leave shortly, so the equestrian-elk study conversation would have to continue without him. Before he left, he wanted to ask the TCC how they felt about changing the opening date for the Cresap Bay boat launch to earlier in the spring. Currently it opens Memorial Day weekend. He was looking at opening it as early as April 1st to relieve the pressure Speelyai Park is experiencing due to the Kokanee fishing. So many people are lining up to use the boat ramp and parking all the way out to the highway that this is presenting a public safety hazard.

The current opening date for Cresap Bay as specified in the recreation plan states that it was based on bald eagle roosting dates in the USFWS BiOp. Naylor advised that the intent behind the May opening date was elk, not bald eagles. There is some elk usage at the park during the early spring and winter.

If proper mitigation could be implemented, then opening the park early might not be an issue. There is a septic drain field for the park that amounts to about four acres of land. This field is up from the park and by PacifiCorp's property line. Right now it is bracken fern and scotch broom, but could possibly be developed into elk winter forage.

Additionally, Naylor pointed out that the park does not have extensive elk use, but the overflow parking area was intended as elk forage during the closed season, This area could be enhanced with annual fall fertilization to provide an additional offsetting enhancement.

ACTION Moore agreed to research how the drain field can be prepared for elk forage, including find out if it can (or needs to be) fertilized, can equipment be brought upon the land, and if a soil test is necessary. Fertilizing the overflow parking area at Cresap should also be conducted each fall to enhance more forage as a partial mitigation to opening the park earlier.

Moore advised that these efforts would come out of recreation's budget.

Lastly, Naylor also stated that the forage enhancement which has occurred in the last 18-20 years on WHMP lands has been substantial, and this was not the case when Cresap Park was originally developed. The lack of forage in the overall area prior to the Merwin WHMP is what had led to the concerns for elk being displaced from Cresap Bay during the winter; this is no longer the case.

< Moore departed 10:25 a.m. >

Reynolds said, whatever we decide for mitigation, it should happen now (where possible) so the forage is available in the early winter and spring. The group agreed, and discussed mowing of the drain field if necessary. NOTE [Since the TCC meeting, fertilizer has been applied to the grass areas at Cresap Park and spraying of scotch broom is schedule soon (K. Naylor 9/26/11)].

Reynolds also asked if this has been done on other drain fields, to which no one had an answer.

Also, could the public possibly access this field? Naylor did not think so because it is rather isolated and far from the park and next to an adjacent homeowner's property. It should be sufficiently protected from an earlier opening of the park because it is behind a locked gate.

Reynolds asked if the current May 31st opening date for Cresap Bay was properly recorded. Naylor didn't know how this was recorded but believed that this was determined prior to the current license, but sometime after the previous license because the park wasn't developed until 1991. It was never part of the Merwin plan. Moore is requesting the opening of the boat launch now be April 1st.

ACTION The TCC has recommended and agreed that further operation of the park should include fall fertilization of the overflow parking lot and looking into further vegetation enhancements and mowing of the drain field.

Saddle Dam Equestrian Study *continued...*

Naylor brought the conversation back to the elk-equestrian study.

TCC recommended:

- Look more at Starkey study.
- Enlist user observations & talk to equestrian group and ride with them. Give direction on how observations should be recorded & a map for them to use.
- Trail cameras to observe recreation usage. We could put this where the public are accessing the area (four spots that we know they are using).

Croswell wants to go with Emmerson to look at Saddle Dam. He reiterated that using cameras would be effective.

Emmerson suggested using trail counters, but this would miss the elk's reaction and would only work for people that go through the counter.

Naylor pointed out that the most crucial time for elk is May, prior to calf-drop. The more they can feed on high-quality forage before calf drop, the better. He asked that the study time include May.

Richardson agrees with camera use and monitoring the period prior to calving.

Reynolds believes that the blinds, would be effective. It will help narrow the idea of what is going on and where to put the camera. Emmerson proposed sitting in the blind three hours at a time, every two weeks from December through April, including some weekend days. Naylor suggested that volunteers from RMEF may be interested in the monitoring from the blinds; this would relieve some of the staff time if they were trained.

ACTION Emmerson will write-up her study proposal based on the TCC's feedback. This will include using the blind to study the elk's reaction and trail cameras to document recreational use. She will distribute this to the TCC prior to the next meeting so it can be discussed at the October meeting.

Reynolds and Miller were interested in what the Starkey study covered. The methodology included collaring the elk and tracking their movements via GPS. The study looked at hikers, horseback riders, and other forms of recreation activity.

Old-Growth Initial Evaluation Report - WDFW Comments

Peggy Miller (WDFW) developed comments on the Old-Growth Initial Evaluation report sent out last month. See **Attachment A**. These were the only comments received.

Holman advised eliminating English holly. Emmerson advised they are currently using a “hack and squirt” policy when English holly is found. Naylor said that right now would be the best time of year to get it, but the contractor has no time to do it this year. Reynolds advised the female trees are the ones with the berries, those female are the higher priority to eliminate. Without the females, pollination and reproduction cannot occur. Emmerson said that it is not as invasive here as other areas, but she can get that on the plan for next year. **ACTION** Emmerson will add to the invasive weed plan to eliminate the English holly found for 2012.

WDFW would like something to capture the ongoing reclassification of stands in some kind of table. Can this be added to the annual report? As these stands are refined, can they be documented in some way to indicate that x-number of acres is no longer considered old-growth, but it being reclassified as mature? The table that Emmerson put in the old-growth report would be perfect for using in the annual report. Emmerson agrees, and pointed out that this could be discussed further during the annual report discussion.

When there is a portion of an acre that is being classified, how is that accounted for? Emmerson said she tries to remain cognizant of this and lumps the smaller fractions with a larger whole usually. For instance, if 6/10 of an acre is left outstanding, she will include it with one of the larger adjacent polygons. This addressed WDFW’s concern.

Miller questioned the old-growth definition criteria for snags as compared to the pileated woodpecker guide to creating snags. She requested that there be some indication in the documentation that addresses what criteria is being referenced. **ACTION** The method Emmerson used to reference snag-criteria in the old-growth report should be utilized in future reports in order to identify snags.

Emmerson advised that there is an area along the IP road in which some snags could be created and it would add to the habitat. There is good wood duck activity down in that area. Other areas may not have enough snags, but the adjacent lands do, so creating snags is not really necessary. Additionally, the activity involved to create the snags could actually damage the habitat. It is important to properly assess what is best for the land and not rely just on criteria alone.

There were no other comments, and no one requested any changes to the recommendations made in the report.

BPA Discussion (Confidential)

Annual Report Streamlining

See Attachment B. Hickerson handed out a summary of the SA and WHMP stating what is required in the annual report. Because the statements are rather vague, there is room for interpretation. What does the TCC want to see in the annual report/plan? When they refer to the annual report or plan what do they usually go to versus stuff they never use. ?

Miller wants to see more tables, less text. Nelson wants less text as well. Emmerson asked the group to think about what is useful and what does not need to be included. If people have examples of other reports that they would like to see, please send them to Sabrina Hickerson.

Unit 28 Timber Harvest

Naylor reported that the harvest is coming along well. The only issues so far have been the FR 90 Swift Canal bridge closure which caused transportation delays and the burn ban which prevented the operation of chainsaws for a few days.

Naylor authorized the contractor to put a minimal amount of rock on the access road to discourage unauthorized usage and facilitate the current need for dust control near the FS 90 road.

Going forward, Western white pine will be planted next year. The guide is to plant at approximately 11 feet or greater between trees, it won't be uniform.

As for the grass seed, Naylor is trying to determine whether to go with a new mix or the old. He is estimating 20 pounds per acre would be appropriate. The understory will grow on its own since the root structure is already there. The grass seed will not interfere with the shrubs. Seeding for vaccinium would be difficult because it is slow growing and needs supplemental water.

Miller asked if the trees could be planted more randomly to look more natural. Naylor advised that the 11-foot guideline was provided to the forester as a guideline only, and not a mandate. They try to be as random as possible.

Nothing is being done with the meadow in this area right now, but it needs scotch broom treatment next year. Naylor requested that Reynolds assist with herbicide cost and Reynolds agreed.

The wood being harvested is very defective (rot) and has very little value. It will mostly be going to pulp. The tribe will be provided spreadsheets on all costs, revenues and volumes related to their property.

Unit 33 Seed Mixes

Naylor is looking at various sources for seeds and researching different grasses and legumes to mix together.

He is also still trying to get a contractor for the broadcast burn but has not made much progress. It is very likely that next year the area designated for the broadcast burn will be scarified instead. As for the rest of the unit, everything has already been scarified. There are hundreds of piles of slash that have been covered with plastic waiting to be burned later this fall.

The tree mix for replanting next spring will consist of Noble fir, white pine, and hemlock.

The western portion of the property had a failed road but this has been patched and repaired.

Getting better germination of legumes is something which Naylor has been researching. One issue, he believes that has led to lower germination in the past is that inoculation requires the seed be planted within 24 – 36 hours of inoculating. This timing may not be feasible. Additionally, some literature indicates the seeds should be sown in the spring but the literature is mainly dealing with pasture seeding. Freezing ground temperatures at the elevations we are dealing with prevent this from happening.

Currently the mix Naylor is working with consists of red clover (*Trifolium pratense* var dynamite), alsike clover (*Trifolium hybridum*), white clover (*Trifolium repens* var winter), grazing chicory (*Chicorium intybus* var six point), small burnet (*Sanguisorba minor*), perennial rye grass (*Lolium perenne* var Averdart) and Sheep fescue (*Festuca ovina* var Covar). He would spread about 17 pounds per acre, which amounts to approximately 130 seeds per square foot. Normally his mix costs about \$3 to \$3.50 per pound. This mix is running about \$8 per pound, which is much too expensive. He needs to “weed out” what is driving the cost up.

There have been no comments on the seed mix as proposed so far, but Naylor requests that the TCC provide feedback, thoughts, or questions.

Miller expressed concern about how the seeds planted will impact the natural shrubs in the area. She was under the impression that the seed mix would be limited to annuals so they would die off when the shrubs start to come in. Naylor said that the intent was to limit competing forage in regards to moisture uptake. He feels that limiting the spread to 17 pounds per acre accomplishes this.

Perennial ryegrass is included. Orchard grass gets rank and dry in the summer and does not provide good forage during that time. However, ryegrass is available quickly in the spring and lasts June through September. Also, orchard grass can be invasive and Richardson agreed.

Richardson suggested Idaho fescue as a good alternative to sheep fescue, but that is expensive and hard to get, which is why Naylor was looking at sheep fescue. Richardson says he may have a source for Idaho fescue and will follow-up to see if this would fit PacifiCorp’s needs. Also, Gifford Pinchot’s nursery could be another good source for seed. Naylor’s intention is to place the order tomorrow, September 14, 2011, and requested information by then.

Next Meeting’s Agenda

- Review of 9/13/11 Meeting Notes
- Updates on land transactions
- BPA Mitigation
- Elk / Equestrian Study
- Update on Unit 28
- Grass seed Unit 33

- Annual Report Streamlining

Public Comment Opportunity

No public comment was provided.

Next Scheduled Meetings

October 12, 2011	November 9, 2011
Port of Woodland	Merwin Hydro Control Center
141 Davidson Ave., Woodland	Ariel, WA
9:00am – 2:00pm	9:00am – 3:00pm

Attachments:

- Attachment A: ODFW Old-Growth Initial Evaluation Comments
- Attachment B: Annual Report Requirements

From: [Miller, Peggy A \(DFW\)](#)
To: [Hickerson, Sabrina](#)
Subject: RE: Old-Growth Initial Evaluation Report
Date: Thursday, September 15, 2011 2:17:17 PM
Attachments: [20110917_OldGrowthR_WDFW_comments.doc](#)

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Old-growth Evaluation of WHMP Lands.
Attached is the comment letter from WDFW.

Peggy Miller - Renewable Energy Biologist, Habitat

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
600 Captol Way North - Olympia WA 98501
360-902-2593

From: Hickerson, Sabrina [mailto:Sabrina.Hickerson@PacifiCorp.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2011 8:43 AM
To: '(brichardson@RMEF.org)'; Bob Nelson; Diana MacDonald; Emmerson, Kendel; Holman, Eric W (DFW); J. Malinowski; Eychaner, Jim (RCO); Joanna Meninick; Joel Rupley; John Clapp; Weinheimer, John (DFW); lindsay_wright@fws.gov; LouEllyn Jones; Mariah Stoll-Smith Reese; Michelle Day; Mitch Wainwright; Nathan Reynolds; Naylor, Kirk; Olson, Todd; Paul Pearce; Miller, Peggy A (DFW); Ray Croswell; Shannon E. Wills (biologist@cowlitz.org)
Subject: TCC: Old-Growth Initial Evaluation Report

Attention Lewis River TCC Participants:

Attached is PacifiCorp Energy's Initial Old-Growth Evaluation of the WHMP Lands. Please review and respond with comments by September 17, 2011.

Best regards,
Sabrina Hickerson
Project Coordinator
(503) 813-6078





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

September 16, 2011

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

RE: Initial Evaluation of Old-Growth on the Wildlife Habitat Management Plan Lands

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Initial Evaluation of Old-Growth on the Wildlife Habitat Management Plan Lands for Lewis River Hydroelectric Projects (FERC Project Nos. 935, 2071, 2111, 2213). WDFW would like to commend PacifiCorps for quality of this report. The evaluation is succinct, easy to read and is based on repeatable methods.

WDFW has reviewed the evaluation and has the following suggestions for the report.

- English holly (*Ilex aquifolium*) were observed in Old-Growth Stands 6-1, 7-1, and 23-1. WDFW encourages Pacificorps to eliminate the holly trees from the old-growth stands where holly is the only invasive plant and the stand is safely accessible. The holly trees could be eliminated by using a chainsaw to cut the tree down, leaving it where it falls and then spraying Garlon on the stump.
- WDFW would like to see in the annual report a table, similar to the one found in the conclusion of this evaluation, which updates the number of acres classified as old-growth, mature, etc. This annual table could capture changes in classification as the stands age and acquire old-growth characteristics as well as those reclassified as ground truthing occurs.
- In many cases the old-growth stands were divided and reclassified to more appropriate cover types. Some of the reclassifications resulted in polygons less than one acre. It is WDFW's understanding that, with the exception of unique habitats, the minimum size cover type polygon is one acre and polygons less than one acre would be added into the larger polygon of the dominant adjacent stand. What is the fate of the polygons less than one acre in size?
- The Lewis River Wildlife Habitat Management Plan (WHMP) defines one of the old-growth criteria as at least 4 snags/ac (10 snags/ha) greater than or equal to 20 in. (51 cm) dbh and 20 feet (ft) (6 meters [m]) tall. It also states the number and size of snags created will be consistent with the intent of Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitats and Species guidelines for nesting and roosting (2 snags/10 acre [2 snags/4 ha]

Mr. Kirk Naylor
PacifiCorp Energy
September 16, 2011

greater than or equal to 30 in. [76 cm] dbh; 12 to 18 in. [30 to 45 cm] diameter at the top of the created snag). The number and size of snags varies between the old-growth criteria and guidelines for creating snags. PacifiCorps chose to evaluate the stands for meeting both the old-growth criteria and the guidelines for creating snags. The report does a good job of presenting the data to support whether the stand meets the old-growth snag criteria or not. WDFW would like to see similar data presented to support the guidelines for snag creation (the number of snags greater or equal to 30 inch dbh).

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

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

Annual Report Requirements

From the Lewis River Settlement Agreement:

14.2.6 TCC and ACC Reports. The Committee Coordinators for the TCC and the Committee Coordinators for the ACC shall prepare and file with the Commission detailed annual reports on the TCC and ACC activities, monitoring and evaluations under the M&E Plan, and implementation of the terrestrial and aquatics PM&E Measures occurring during the prior year, as well as plans for the coming year as required in this Agreement. The annual reports may also include plans and reports required pursuant to Sections 4.9.1, 7.7.1, 8.2.3, 8.2.4, 10.5, and 10.8.3. Copies of such reports will be made available to each Party. The annual reports shall be prepared in Consultation with the TCC and ACC committee members and shall be submitted to the committees for review each year, commencing after the Effective Date. Committee members shall have a minimum of 30 days to review and provide comment on a draft report before a final report is prepared and filed with the Commission. The Licensees shall submit the final report to the Commission not later than 30 days after the close of the ACC and TCC comment periods. To the extent that comments are not incorporated into the final report, an explanation will be provided in writing, and such explanation shall be included in the report.

From the Lewis River Wildlife Habitat Management Plan:

3.3 Annual Report. Settlement Agreement Section 14.2.6 directs PacifiCorp and Cowlitz PUD to prepare and file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission detailed Annual Reports on the TCC activities; implementation of the terrestrial protection, mitigation, and enhancement measures occurring during the prior year; and plans for the coming year. The Annual Report will include a detailed budget summary to enable the TCC to evaluate the cost effectiveness of the past year's activities. The Annual Reports are to be prepared in consultation with the TCC members and submitted to the TCC for review each year. Committee members will have a minimum of 30 days to review and provide comment on a draft report before a final report is prepared and filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. The Licensees are to submit the final report to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission no later than 30 days after the close of the TCC comment period. To the extent that comments are not incorporated into the final report, an explanation will be provided in writing, and such explanation included in the report.

3.4 Annual Plans. Implementation of the WHMP will be accomplished by an Annual Plan, which will be developed by PacifiCorp in conjunction with and incorporated into the Annual Report and approved by the rest of the TCC. The Annual Plan will include a detailed budget estimate for activities planned for the upcoming year, WHMP and land acquisition funds, and updated harvest sheet. As provided by Settlement Agreement Section 14.2.6, the Annual Plan will be submitted, and an associated meeting held, prior to implementing any projects for that year. During this time, PacifiCorp should update the Annual Plan to reflect any changes to federal and state-listed species, species of concern, and sensitive species, including plants.