

Teanaway Community Forest



Teanaway Community Forest Advisory Committee

Meeting Summary

March 12, 2015

2:00 – 8:00 PM

Advisory Committee Attendees:

Andrea Imler	Mark Charlton	Urban Eberhart
Deborah Essman	JJ Collins	Tom Ring (for Phil Rigdon)
Tom Tebb	Wayne Mohler	Doug Schindler
Gary Berndt	Mike Reimer	Kitty Craig
Reagan Dunn	Jim Halstrom	Derek Sandison
Jeri Downs	Dale Bambrick	

Advisory Committee Members Absent:

Brian Crowley
Martha Wyckoff
Gregg Bafundo
Jason Ridlon

Agency and Consultant Staff:

Lisa Dally Wilson – Dally Environmental (DE)	Doug McClelland – DNR
Eric Winford – DNR/WDFW	Rick Roeder – DNR
Michael Livingston – WDFW	Bruce Botka - WDFW
Sarah Brace – DE Team	
Larry Leach – DNR	

Staff Action Items		Date Due
DNR/DFW	Develop new draft of Plan per input from this meeting. Provide to AC no later than Monday, March 23.	3-23-2015
Advisory Committee Action Items		Date Due
TCF Advisory Committee	Review March 23 draft plan prior to meeting on March 26	3-26-2015

1) Welcome, Review the Day

- a) February 26 meeting summary is approved.

2) Prioritize Plan Items for Discussion

- a) Tom Ring:
 - i) Restoration work needs to be front and center in the plan.
 - ii) Grazing – what are we going to do about grazing where harm has been done?
 - iii) Traditional and cultural uses are not recreation; should not be affected by the plan. Tribal use will continue. This plan does not alter the tribal rights.

- b) Jeri Downs
 - i) Chapter 2: Pg. 14 add Pine Beetles
 - ii) Chapter 3: Pg. 23: What is an emergency access plan?

- c) Deborah Essman
 - i) Forestry, Pg. 15: Add recreation? Objectives and redundancy
 - ii) Grazing, Pg. 17: Grazing clarification (regarding fish recovery). As it's written, it sounds like a conflict
 - iii) Working forest, Pg. 14: Add air quality issues from forest fires – a component of a working forest.

- d) Jim Halstrom
 - i) Forest Health: Accelerate development of forest health in the timeline
 - ii) Recreation, Pg. 22: more emphasis on water access

- e) Gary Berndt
 - i) No mention about isolated community trust parcels east of HW 97 and south of Easton.
 - ii) Missing: inholdings in Trust Lands scheduled for transfer. Is it or is it not planned? Imminent?
 - iii) Missing: Economics of Kittitas County with regards to impacts and opportunities from Community Forest
 - iv) Aggressive dates for deliverables in the plan; somewhere it should show that if that work is not funded, these deliverables will not happen. Needs to be clearer that without funding mechanism, this isn't happening!

- f) Wayne Mohler
 - i) Setting the stage preamble – as written now, it sets the expectations high. Reality is that the land hasn't been managed well. There is a lot of potential.
 - ii) Recreation: confusing. He'd describe it as a top-down approach now. Organization of the rec chapter doesn't work. Inconsistencies.

- g) JJ. Collins
 - i) Readability is improved! One exception to that: need graphics, charts, photos, etc.
 - ii) Leasing of water rights section: distinctively different in its structure and format and how it reads.
 - iii) Pg. 37-38: Blue ribbon trout water, wild and scenic river, wilderness areas --- these are new to him. Are these going to be pursued? If so, the context and definition around them.
[Comment – ties to the Yakima Basin Integrated Plan]

- h) Reagan Dunn
 - i) Compliments on the draft!
 - ii) Not enough about fire protection strategies. Big threat is forest fires
 - iii) Missing Water access
 - iv) User groups – be over-inclusive to include hunters and fishermen

- i) Mike Reimer
 - i) Overview: no mention of recreation at all. Historical perspective should refer to how important recreational use has been. Past context
 - ii) Working forests, Pg. 16; Forestry and grazing –where are consequences for bad behavior on water quality and habitat
 - iii) Missing: How this committee came to the decision on motorized access and two wheeled motorcycle versus other motorized uses.

- j) Kitty Craig
 - i) Missing: what makes the Teanaway a special place. What makes the place worth restoring, saving, etc. Connective tissue missing.
 - ii) Ch 4/ Pg. 28: (Fish and Wildlife): Setting in the context of the region. [Comment: a map will be in the plan]
 - iii) Recreation – text says only members of AC will be on the Rec Committee. Thought we were leaving it more open.

- k) Andrea Imler
 - i) Introductions of each chapter are good – but document intro (overall) is duplicative of the legislation action language. Needs work.
 - ii) Pg. 24: Cross country travel – all other motorized vehicles...missing a sentence which causes it to lose context. (Motorcycle language left out from what appeared in a previous version)
 - iii) Consistency needed throughout document in terms: recreation sections were confusing: “forest service trails”, “Community trails”, “trailheads”, etc. Consistency of terminology.

- l) Dale Bambrick
 - i) Overarching comment: Acquisition of Teanaway was part of the integrated plan; need introduction why the Teanaway was acquired (landscape level integration piece of the YBIP). Not purchased just for the purpose of a community forest. Need to clarify this.
 - ii) Grazing, Pg. 17: slight word-smithing needed around fish conservation and forest health. Not quite right how it’s stated.
 - iii) Spawning and habitat damage, Pg. 30. We should say “we are going to avoid damage to...” or something like this vs. “minimizing damage”. Low bar.

- m) Mark Charlton
 - i) Grazing: Pg. 17: Proposed 3rd paragraph language change in the introduction
 - ii) Objectives for grazing measures and triggers – encourage grazing in locations other than meadows and riparian areas. (replace the last bullet)
 - iii) Strategies for grazing, Pg. 18: add one bullet with suggested language. Timing/duration/frequency

- n) Urban Eberhart
 - i) PASS

- o) Tom Tebb
 - i) Permitting requirements – this forest project needs to meet WQ standards
 - ii) Water quality objectives for Protecting fish and habitat – missing linkage to WQ and WQ standards.
 - iii) Special place – need to underscore this.

- p) Doug Schindler
 - i) Timeframe is missing – not just in the introduction. In 5 years from now, it's unclear what the time reference is. Look 5-years out and read the document and is this still relevant? Consider the planning horizon of the plan when writing
 - ii) Grazing – where is the piece we discussed about revenue neutral?
 - iii) Rec – has tons of issues. Agencies are doing a better job in balancing but in some places the legislation says what will happen vs. what biologically is acceptable.
 - iv) Overview on rec could include some more positive benefits on social, economic and other benefits (for us!). [See RCO report]

3) Plan review – working session [FROM POSTERS]

a) MISSING

- i) More explicit about habitat restoration occurring.
 - (1) Dale: Acquired to actively restore habitat and protect water quality.
 - (2) JJ: Restore to what? We've struggled with this.
 - (3) Tom: Not "IF" we're going to do restoration but "WHERE" we're going to do it. Long complex process. Say that "habitat restoration is going to occur", upfront in the introduction.
- ii) Tribal language – will be covered. Traditional practices will NOT be affected by the plan. Expand in introduction that nothing in this plan will alter rights.
- iii) Pieces that were acquired that are NOT in the Teanaway: In the intro: mention these other parcels. Easton and HW 97 – this should be included. [Comment: Maps will be reflective of this.]
- iv) Inholding and trust lands – looking to get logs out of Indian Creek. Once trust lands transfer, can be restored. Is this trust land transfer in the future plans? This can be addressed in this plan.
- v) Generally missing content about the economic value of the TCF to the community. Specific economic opportunities comments:
 - (1) in the recreation intro (and in other intros), we should talk about WHY recreation is of value economically (socially and culturally too) to the surrounding communities.
 - (2) Goal 5, Pg. 37 – revenue generation. Language is not clear. Missing non-forest activities of economic importance to Kittitas County (eg., rec). "Economics as lynchpin" language was offered.
 - (3) Pg. 20 – Discuss how critical recreation is to the surrounding community, both economically and socially.
- vi) Objectives on Pg. 36: add bullet about partnership with Cle Elum, Roslyn and Kittitas County. These partnerships have to gel – otherwise there's no point. Consider County Economic study that was done as part of YBIP that addressed the recreation economy.
- vii) Add sidebar on Pg. 39 that addresses YBIP storage requirement and how it impacts the future of the TCF: When the legislature approved this project, it was contingent upon 214,000 AF of new water accessed via YBIP projects (eg., Lake Cle Elum dam raise, Keechelus to Kachess pipeline, etc). If we don't have this water storage, it will jeopardize the status of the community forest. Need to include this language – explain this. Need to include that IF the

water targets are not met, that the forest may still remain a community forest. Correct way to define this: If water targets are not met, forest status could become DNR school trust OR be sold OR can remain community forest. Also a request to clarify that the new water will not come out of the Teanaway watershed.

viii) Bolster entire discussion of fire risk reduction

- (1) Conserving and preservation of fire access routes
- (2) Pg. 16: Fire reduction strategies – define what it means to do this.
- (3) Pg. 10/Chapter 1: add another bullet addressing fire under “minimize runoff”
- (4) Chapter 2/Pg. 15: add an objective under working forest that relates to fire.
- (5) Pg. 22/Recreation: Something in there about sensitivity to starting fires (related to rec activities)

ix) Motorized use

- (1) State owned land and motorized users saw opportunity to gain access. Would be helpful to give some perspective on how we came to our conclusions on two-wheel versus other motorized access. Add to background in the plan or side bar[Comment: Mike agreed that we need to include the group’s thinking on this. Needs to be documented.]
- (2) Sidebar needed to explain the motorized vehicle reasoning – explain why – address snowmobiles, motorcycles, 4-wheelers and legislative intent
- (3) *March 26th*: Wait to see words that are proposed and we’ll agree on the language then.

x) Consistency in trail terminology. Could be confusing. This can be resolved without having to step into the issue of ownership. USFS trails.

xi) Permitting – Activities where ground disturbance or other implementation activities would require a permit – this should be mentioned in the plan. Mention that state and federal laws will be followed in the implementation chapter.

Also, the term “permitted” was mentioned a few times and the term “Permit” used to mean “Allow”. Check on the use throughout the document.

Bruce/Eric: Use “Allow” rather than “Permit” when not regulatory. [Glossary needed in document]

xii) Consider timeframe throughout the plan – consider uses: past, present, future. Will language still be relevant 5 years from now when the plan is still actively guiding the management of the forest?

xiii) Grazing has harmed the forest ecosystem: we’ve got a mess and it will take time to get there. Baseline is not at a good place right now. Make that clear.

b) INTRODUCTION

i) Preamble: “mecca for hikes and recreation”. Yes there’s the potential but it’s not there now. Tone down the fancy language in both the introduction and the transmittal letter. Talk about potential.

ii) Historical Recreation – add this to introduction.

iii) What makes the Teanaway special – have this all in one place.

iv) Also need to include solid description about the condition of the landscape NOW. This helps create the vision of where we want to go.

v) Mention that the Legislative goals were what were used to frame our goals. [End of the intro has a sidebar called “What’s inside this document” where we reference the legislative language and organization].

vi) Pg. 6: side bar: Description of Community forest falls pretty flat. Last sentence should be first.

vii) Pg. 5: Budget numbers mentioned – need more clarity on the numbers provided. Need to also mention that all that follows is based on securing funding. If it doesn’t get funded the actions won’t happen.

- viii) We need to set the stage that this is a new approach and unique planning effort by DNR. Different management regime. Add to side bar on pg. 6. First ever, this is a model for the state. Very, very different, unique planning effort, co-management by two agencies, etc.
- ix) Introduction Pg. 3. Purpose for which the land was acquired, provide context. YBIP, to be managed for resource outcomes. Community Forest is a vehicle for YBIP outcomes.
- x) Move Wild and Scenic to Goal 1

c) **GOAL 1: WATERSHED**

- i) Context will be described.
- ii) Wording is a bit vague.
- iii) Pg. 11: Has DNR made up its' mind on leasing water rights? [response; no decision has been made on this at this time]. Change wording from "will lease".
- iv) Water rights section– doesn't fit. Needs additional work. Is it really a strategy? Context. Request for quantity, use types, seasonality and history for background.
- v) Pg. 10 Objectives: Watershed Values of Community Forest. 4th bullet from top – What are these values? How is this defined?
- vi) Pg. 12, 3rd bullet: Discussion about late-season vs. early season water use. Late-season is stressful for fish. Water rights discussion. Late season flows will be declining for decades.
- vii) Pg. 11, Gary Berndt – Kittitas County objects to TCF water leases outside of Kittitas County. Should not be used for the entire Yakima Basin. Some concern expressed by others that this may devalue the water. Decision to say that Kittitas County has priority over the rest of the Basin with respect to water rights. Add introduction about the Teanaway historic water rights. Provide context. Clarify the term "proposal" what does it mean, is it a lease?
- viii) Pg. 12: Clarification on the term "development"
(1) Limit development – what type? Let's clarify: Non-agricultural development.
- ix) Performance measures: number of redds that would be monitored on an annual basis. [it's captured in Ch. 4]

d) **GOAL 2 FORESTRY AND GRAZING**

- i) Request to add strategy about experimental forestry. Agency reply that it is not necessary to seek out NEW research opportunities
- ii) Pine Beetle – WILL ADD
- iii) Pg. 15 objectives redundancy: recreation and forest management activities do not need to be mutual exclusive. Add rec under objectives.
- iv) Pg. 17 - Grazing language is conflicting – implies that people who support grazing DON'T care about fish. Fix this. People who support community benefit from working forests still want healthy fishery.
- v) Pg. 14 Working forests – forest fires contribute to air quality. Add air quality.
- vi) Experimental forestry; studies leading to improved forest management practices. [It is included under community partnerships]
- vii) Request for 'bad behavior' consequences for forestry and grazing as there are in Recreation. Add new bullet on p 18 -Grazing exclusion: have utilization triggers for moving livestock out of sensitive areas. DNR can spell out more BMPs and details. Need to address consequences in forestry as well.
- viii) Pg. 18: Bullet under first Strategy – Tom Ring requesting language "Complete avoidance of areas where fish are spawning".
- ix) Be able to monitor when redds are destroyed. Add performance measure such as number of redds trampled in grazing section.
- x) Pg. 17: Clarify/revise the first paragraph. Go back to the legislation for language. Always qualify

with “protecting”. [Will go back to the legislation]

- xi) Pg. 17: Intro, 3rd paragraph: Drop second half of first sentence: ...“when livestock are allowed to tread”... Also address third paragraph, last sentence.
- xii) In introduction – acknowledge harm done on landscape. The landscape is not properly functioning at this time. Change “can harm” to “has harmed”.
- xiii) Pg. 37: Revenue neutral: agreed on some metric of regular analysis on the cost of program etc. Not there – where did it go? Doug Schindler said he requested that grazing is revenue neutral to the agency, need accounting for private enterprise on public land. Others said to also address community benefits of grazing such as weed control and forest fire fuel reduction. [Will add community benefits/public \$ discussion under grazing].

e) **GOAL 3 RECREATION**

- i) Pg. 22; bullet 3: Provide recreation opportunities...parking facilities. Provide language for “Horse trailers” Wordsmithing...captured by agencies.
- ii) Pg. 21, bottom bullet change “which” to “where”.
- iii) Higher in the overview we should state that hiking, mtn biking, camping etc. will happen. State explicitly which activities will occur and that habitat restoration will occur.
- iv) Missing River access piece - will get put back into the doc.
- v) Missing general water access and water recreation activities in the document
- vi) Reorganization of rec chapter: Pg. 22: recreation plan will guide efforts – where did this come from? Need to develop recreation plan then identify the goals of this plan. Advisory Committee can make recommendations for the recreation planning group [Doug: We had recommendations for the rec committee that we can share. We have a list of these.]
- vii) Permits/Discover passes OK for hunting and fishing use.
- viii) Pg. 26 – define emergency access plan (defined on Pg. 23 – cross reference).
- ix) Catch and release will not be covered in this plan.
- x) Pg. 29: Establish a viable sport fishery.
- xi) Performance measures under trails – need performance for trail use.
- xii) Missing Fishing and hunting - Fishing and hunting needs to be recognized under rec [this has been acknowledged]
- xiii) Rec Advisory Committee – Pg. 21: Rec Committee will be composed of members of the current Advisory Committee. If agencies feel they don’t have the right mix on the AC, they can add/bring on specialists – add this caveat.
- xiv) Pg. 24: First Paragraph under motorcycle use: Cross country travel – closed road and cross-country travel language implies that motorcycles can ride off-road and cross-country. Replace sentence that was omitted from last version.
- xv) Pg. 21: One of the goals is to provide high-quality recreation. There are three bullets about watershed protection. Revise so recreation doesn’t sound secondary. Add:
 - (1) Why will recreation planning be different in the Teanaway?
 - (2) Why high quality recreation is of benefit to the community (address economic benefit too)
 - (3) Details about recreation opportunities.
- xvi) Pg. 25: currently says map will identify. Add “not limited” Other factors may be considered –

f) **GOAL 4 WILDLIFE**

- i) Pg. 28: Context – add more to introduction about why this forest is important. Identify significant wildlife species, role of forest, etc.
- ii) Pg. 30: Replace minimize with prevent damage to spawning areas
- iii) Replace all “Cattle” with “Livestock”
- iv) Pg. 29: add fishery – sport fishing

g) **GOAL 5 COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP**

- i) Wild and Scenic River, wilderness area designation sidebar, Pg. 38– what about other designations? Are we assuming any of designations? Suggestion: take out NRCA and Wilderness designation; leave as “Wild and Scenic River”.
- ii) Suggestion: move this piece up to Goal 1, add context – discuss YBIP and say this will be a future AC conversation.
- iii) Missing commitment to partnership
- iv) Least developed section/chapter. Identify who will be working on strategies and tools listed?
- v) Pg. 37/ second section/ first bullet: income from Teanaway Community Forest (not Community). Revenue?
- vi) Terminology check: **Watershed** and **Teanaway Community Forest**. If same thing, need to be consistent.
- vii) Correction: re: Discover Pass and Forest Access Pass requirement. Pg. 37 – Discover pass revenue does not stay in forest – clarify
- viii) Pg. 24: omit WDFW vehicle access
- ix) Pg. 35: AC input – YBIP and beyond
- x) Pg. 23: enforcement comes up in several different places. It is a key part on what we need to do. It is minimized throughout this document and we need people to understand that enforcement is key. Have a stand-alone section on this? Should it be a high-level issue that should be brought up in the intro? Yes. Also leave it in the Goals where it exists. Pgs. 23, 37, 38. Emphasize in introduction and discuss balance of education AND enforcement. Ok to be redundant.

h) **IMPLEMENTATION**

- i) Function of Advisory Committee needs to be better defined. For example: agency run grant process – how will the committee be involved? What’s its role?
- ii) Suggestion that the Advisory Committee remain in the advisory role. Local staff from agencies will make those decisions.
- iii) Pg. 41: Is closure an option in adaptive management? If so it’s unclear.
- iv) Pg. 40: 15-25 Advisory membership and terms: Better to go with a shorter term? General discussion about staggering and size and term.
- v) Agency relationship -- mention Ecology and how they would be involved? [ECY is part of the Advisory Committee, that’s adequate].
- vi) Pg. 40: Most performance data will be reviewed. Schedule of review needed. First bullet at bottom – revise. Establish a schedule.

i) **PARKING LOT**

- i) Missing: if it doesn’t get funding, the action doesn’t happen. [Dealt with in previous section]
- ii) Intro statement on fish [Dealt with]
- iii) Water lease – Kittitas County [Dealt with]
- iv) Enforcement [Dealt with]
- v) Trails and roads language. Request that trails and roads be separated when measuring progress (Pgs. 10 -11) [Agency finds that difficult, leave as is]
- vi) Adaptive management [Dealt with]

j) **LAST ITEMS**

- i) Private landowners – need to mention how will they be impacted. Missing larger statement.

Consider personal inholdings and how they will be dealt with. Acknowledge them in the plan. Consider addressing in Pg. 35 overview.

- ii) Handicapped provisions – what is required? Need more than just parking lot access? [This is going to be happened in the rec planning process. They will mentioned that handicapped information will be addressed]
- iii) Accessibility and Access – This section is missing. Address emergency access, fire access, Sunday driver, connections to community, etc. Currently – there’s one way in, one way out. How about expanding to working with adjacent landowners (e.g. USFS, TNC) about access. [There will be language about access – see bottom of Pg. 21. Will there be more added?]
- iv) Pg. 22, half way down: a lot on rec strategies but nothing there about the potential of NEW trails. Will Add.
- v) Performance measures:
 - (1) Pg. 26: Upgrades to existing facilities such as campgrounds; new trail miles built; these are things we’d like to track and measure.
 - (2) Pg. 27: Add river access points.
 - (3) Nothing mentioning trailheads under performance measures
 - (4) Count the reds

4) Public Comment

No comments

5) Next Steps

- a) Staff will get another Word draft out in a week (by Friday March 20, or at the latest, Monday March 23)
- b) Next meeting of AC will be March 26, 3:00-8:00, Senior Center
- c) Last final version before it goes to public comment on April 6
- d) Public Meeting on April 9 - Grange
- e) Following AC meeting will be May (2nd Thurs)

6) Handouts

- a) Agenda, March 12, 2015
- b) TCF Management Plan – Third Draft – March 5, 2015