

# Teanaway Community Forest



Washington  
Department of  
**FISH and  
WILDLIFE**



WASHINGTON STATE  
**Natural Resources**

## Teanaway Community Forest Advisory Committee

### Meeting Summary

December 11, 2014

2:30 – 8:00 PM

#### Advisory Committee Attendees:

Deborah Essman	Martha Wyckoff	Jeri Downs
Gregg Bafundo	Mike Reimer	Reagan Dunn
Jason Ridlon	Urban Eberhart	Dale Bambrick
Jim Halstrom	Doug Schindler	
JJ Collins	Phil Rigdon	
Kitty Craig	Mark Charlton	
Andrea Imler	Tom Ring	
Derek Sandison	Gary Berndt	

#### Advisory Committee Members Absent:

Wayne Mohler	Brian Crowley
--------------	---------------

#### Agency and Consultant Staff:

Lisa Dally Wilson – Dally Environmental (DE)	Larry Leach – DNR
Eric Winford – DNR/WDFW	Doug McClelland – DNR
Michael Livingston – WDFW	Rick Roeder – DNR
Diedra Petrina – DE Team	

Staff Action Items		Date Due
Eric Winford (DNR)	Eric will send out information about the new January and February meeting location; Senior Center in Cle Elum	1-5-2014
Eric, Mike, Rick	New draft of Roads Section – “Roads and Access Management” - address comments on safety, egress/ingress, other	1-15-2014
Advisory Committee Action Items		Date Due
TCF Advisory Committee	Give comments or edits on the roads, grazing, forestry draft objectives and strategies, email them to Eric and Lisa	12-19-2014

## I. Welcome, Review the Day (Lisa Dally Wilson)

- a) Lisa reviewed the agenda and provided an overview of the public comment process for today's meeting. Reminder that this is a committee working meeting so the public comment period will be limited. For those who would like to speak during the public comment period there is a sign-up form at the entrance. Those wishing to speak need to sign in. Time will be limited to 2 minutes per speaker; the number of comments will be limited to the amount of time allotted for public comments. There are comment forms at the entrance table or there is a public comment section available on-line through the DNR website if a speaker is unable to comment during the Advisory Committee meeting.
- b) The November 13<sup>th</sup> summary minutes were approved upon the spelling correction on page 6 last sentence, "Bard" changed to "Barred"
- c) Eric Winford gave a recap on the December 4<sup>th</sup> Public Open House. There was a good turn out with 80 members of the public. All of their comments are posted on the website and a summary provided by email to the Advisory Committee members.
- d) The location for January and February TCFAC meeting has moved to the Senior Center in Cle Elum. There are two meetings scheduled in both January and February; 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Thursday.
- e) The AC will not take time at this meeting to review the new drafts of Roads, Forestry, Grazing objectives and strategies. If there are additional comments, AC members are instructed to email them to Eric and Lisa by December 19<sup>th</sup>. If no comments are provided then the agencies assume that those individuals who did not comment are comfortable with the language in the current draft of each document.
  - i. Roads Comments: There were concerns about roads being open for safety reasons (ingress/egress) and for connectivity. These considerations will be added to the roads evaluation process. Suggestion to address this in the Roads section and to change the Roads Section to "Roads and Access Management". Agencies will draft strategies for the roads section to address these concerns which will be reviewed by the AC in late January or early February when a full first draft is considered.
  - ii. Scenic Driving: Request to call out scenic driving in Recreation Section. Evaluation of routes for scenic driving to be addressed in Roads Section. AC had concerns about roads being open near riparian areas. General consensus that the decision to open and/or close roads needs to be based on a number of layers of data which include but are not limited to watershed, habitat, wildlife range, and recreation.

## II. Recreation

- a) Ground rules (Lisa Dally Wilson)
- b) Context (Michael Livingston)
- c) Michael Livingston discussed building the framework for the Recreation Criteria. This is a tool to evaluate recreational uses to make sure recreation uses fit with other goals. A map will be produced to show possible locations for recreation use types based on a number of physical and biological criteria. Once the physical parameters are established the next

dialogue will focus on social factors and the compatibility between uses. Performance measures will also be included.

- d) Larry Leach gave a presentation on a previous project, Naneum Ridge to Columbia River, to provide the AC foresight to what the final product might look like.
  - i. AC would like to see more refinement in the final product than what was presented in this example. It was requested that the suitability of trails in an area be evaluated differently for different uses (rather than one category that says trails, there would be a number of trail categories reflecting different recreational use types). The agencies confirmed that refinement is a possibility, and that is what occurs in Recreation Planning. Some AC members suggested that ecological and roads/trails baseline assessments be performed prior to the application of suitability criteria and prior to recreation planning; agencies said there will be baseline assessments. One AC member pointed out that there is no area on the map shown as unsuitable for all uses and that he expected there would be because suitability is not a value judgment but a legislative judgment to protect fish and wildlife. He would expect to see areas on the map that are unsuitable for all recreation; agencies stated they are looking for guidance from the AC to set the parameters for what is suitable and unsuitable.
  - ii. Agencies are looking for input from the AC that provides sideboards within the objectives and strategies that would address suitability and help in evaluating recreational uses based on suitability and criteria. The AC needs to be comfortable with the criteria/sideboards in order to trust the next group working on recreation planning and trail citing.
- e) Draft Recreation Criteria Discussion
  - i. These criteria are going to be used as a guiding document for the next level of decision making; these are the sideboards for recreation planning.
  - ii. Performance measures will help determine how the criteria are applied and what level of impact is acceptable.
  - iii. AC request that Wa Dept of Ecology review the criteria to see if they have additional suggestions regarding water resource protections.
  - iv. There were some comments that the document is too vague; agencies will add detail after AC provides comments at this meeting and bring back to AC. There was some concern about trails built on steep slopes. Most AC members agreed that the determination of what recreation uses were allowable and where those uses occur should follow a “Do no harm rule” with regards to trail building and future use. There was a suggestion that the Recreational Criteria reflect that there is not a one size fits all solution, and that they allow for evaluation of different user types.
  - v. There were suggestions about some of the language in the document. The agencies will make those edits and bring it back to the AC.

- vi. Agencies are going to perform an analysis of all trails and roads as part of a baseline assessment – this will help with future decisions about which trails and roads to keep open or close.
  - Agencies will provide the AC with a clear distinction between trails and roads.
  - AC suggestions to account for existing trails and roads first, and then decide if the TCF needs more. Use suitability criteria to evaluate existing roads and trails first.
- vii. AC made suggestions about what needs to be added to the three categories of Suitability Criteria (physical, biological, social) and item #4 which addresses management strategies and BMPs; agencies will make changes and bring back to the AC. AC also suggested that Cultural and Archaeological resources be its own category.
- viii. Considerations when applying the criteria: note, the physical criteria are just physical properties of the landscape. How they are applied in Recreation Planning is a concern for some AC members. In applying Physical criteria, some AC members suggested that “do no harm (to the watershed and ecosystem values)” be the goal when applying the criteria, not “balance recreation use and other goals”.
  - Physical
    - ◆ Add meteorological considerations (e.g. soil moisture)
    - ◆ Add sedimentation potential
    - ◆ Remove the word “avoid” and let this be a list of physical attributes of the landscape.
  - Biological
    - ◆ Add - maintain habitat
  - Social
    - ◆ Add - avoid sound and view-shed conflicts with other user groups
    - ◆ Add separate bullet for forest similar to the one for grazing (consider avoiding conflict with special management areas, working lands, sensitive areas, all potential conflicts).
    - ◆ Add - specifics around noise sources (e.g. motorized vehicles, music, yelling, campgrounds) – clarify buffer criteria
    - ◆ Add – avoiding displacement of other user groups as part of addressing conflicts with criteria
    - ◆ Add - safety
    - ◆ Add - conflicts with hunting; agencies come up with language
  - #4 - needs a title; agencies will make this correction. This is not criteria, but a separate section that address Education, Enforcement, Management,

Stewardship. Suggestion to add these to the objectives and strategies for Goal 3.

- ◆ Educational signage needs to be about more than just noxious weeds
- ◆ Under “enforcement” address creative, new ways to get information to law enforcement (how can residents report illegal activities – eg., hotline)
- ◆ Under monitoring – add regular evaluation to ensure recreation taking place in the TCF is meeting legislative goals.
- ◆ Add management strategy – follow-up on closing trails if the evaluation shows the goals aren’t being met, or if a recreation use is not consistent with the goals, or if a recreation use is other than what is authorized.

- III.** Public comment at 5 pm was extended to accommodate all of the members of the public who had signed in to speak. 18 people signed up to speak during the public comment period. There was a wide range of interest groups who wanted to speak about recreational use of the TCF – horseback riders, anglers, ORV users, and homeowners.
- IV.** Strawdog for Motorcycle Use
- a) This is a DRAFT of one potential scenario for ORV use in the Teanaway; this is just a starting point and the agencies are looking for ideas and feedback; or new proposals. Agency intent was to get the conversation started, and they are open to feedback and revision.
- b) Comments from the AC
- i. The majority of the AC felt that the decisions made about recreational use in the Teanaway needs to be based on baseline and suitability map data.
  - ii. If there is serious environmental degradation from ORV’s then NO ORV use will be allowed.
  - iii. Ecological integrity of the forest takes is a priority over all recreation user groups.
  - iv. Many felt that it is premature for this committee to decide who gets to use the forest; this will come after there is more information and criteria are applied.
  - v. The AC needs to have open communication with The Nature Conservancy (TNC) about what TNC plans on doing about specific recreational use at the border of the forest.
  - vi. It is important to have areas to hike without noise.
  - vii. There can be access to forest service trails under the condition of do no harm; if harm is done then close trails/roads to ORV use.
  - viii. Enforcement is needed.
  - ix. There are concerns about too high of ORV concentration if use is limited to one USFS trailhead access.

- c) Each Committee member was asked to articulate their position on ORV use in the forest as it relates to:
  - i. The three existing USFS trailheads and trails within the TCF
  - ii. A possible new area for ORV use in the TCF.
  - iii. Timing for determining recreation use and implementing recreation planning
  - iv. Criteria to be applied to determine new uses
- d) The Advisory Committee was then polled. Polling Results:
  - i. There are a small number of AC members who feel the TCF should be fully non-motorized forest.
  - ii. USFS Trails: There are a significant number of AC members who can agree that some form of motorized access from the TCF to the USFS motorized trails via the existing USFS trailheads be maintained. General agreement that the three multi-use USFS trailheads and trails that lie within the TCF should be evaluated per the suitability criteria, with the intent that one or more be retained for access to the USFS motorized trails. There was not clear agreement for the potential case where all three trails need to be restored per watershed protection goals. In summary, most committee members at this time are comfortable with maintaining authorized motorcycle use on one, two or three of the USFS trails, pending the evaluation of the impacts of trail use to the watershed.
  - iii. New Area: The Advisory Committee was also polled regarding their opinion on opening a new area in the forest to motorcycle use. There are a number of views on this issue and there is no clear consensus. There are two general positions: (1) those who are opposed to opening a new area to motorcycle use, and (2) those who are open to applying suitability criteria during the recreation planning process to determine if, and if so, where, a new motorcycle area could be cited. In this case, the decision would be based on suitability maps and user group compatibility. Everyone agreed that no more trails will be added until further analysis of the criteria. Several AC members did not participate in the poll and requested more detail on when and how the suitability criteria would be applied as well as a new version of the criteria.
  - iv. The agencies will provide a new version of the proposal clarifying some of the concerns and request for detail.
- V. "Parking Lot" items
  - a) Consider erodible surfaces when evaluating roads/trails
- VI. The AC did not have time to address the agenda item on Goal 5
- VII. Public Comment
 

The Advisory Committee heard comment from 18 members of the public. Public Comment summaries are included in the public comment summary prepared for the AC and posted on DNR's website for the Teanaway Community Forest.

## **Handouts**

1. Agenda, December 11, 2014
2. TCFAC Meeting Summary from November 13, 2014 for approval
3. Teanaway Recreation Criteria (Draft of 11/20/2014)
4. Motorcycle use in the Teanaway Community Forest Discussion (draft 12/11/2014)
5. TCFAC Goal 5 Breakout Groups (draft 11/12/2014)
6. TCF Road Management Process (draft 11/20/2014)
7. Objectives and Strategies for Goal 2a: Forestry (draft)
8. Objectives and Strategies for Goal 2b: Grazing (draft)
9. Teanaway Management Plan Timeline