Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee
Votes for November 3, 2016 Conference Call
v.10-27-16

1. TFW Policy Committee agrees that the permanent water typing rule deliberations represents our best collective guidance to date and any further deliberation would be futile, and would not result in any further consensus.
➔ Vote on this

2. Explain the report to the Board on the new habitat assessment protocol survey vetting process: the language (see below) was sent out 10/20, no dissent by COB 10/21.

Extend a timeline until the draft rule is completed in order for Policy to work on Board Manual Section 23, in the following tasks:
1. *Develop a recommendation for considering a new Habitat Assessment Methodology for determining the Type F/N break in unmapped streams or in streams where the new map/model has not been applied.*
   a. *Policy will take the three proposals that came out of the F/N Technical Group and include up to 3 additional proposals from caucuses (limited to 1 proposal per caucus) on a new fish habitat protocol survey methodology.*
   b. *Policy will send proposals to the AMPA for evaluation. The AMPA will work with an independent scientific review group or contractor(s) to review the proposals, provide an assessment of each, and provide Policy a recommended best method (which could be one proposal, a combination of several, or an entirely new proposal). This review will incorporate the general objectives for the water typing system (highly accurate, minimize error, and reduce bias), while also developing as consistently implementable method as possible.*
   c. *Policy will use this science reviewed recommendation to inform its recommendation to the Board for Board Manual Section 23 development, following the development of the draft rule.*
2. *Policy discussion and consensus recommendations for additional content (based upon DNR/Services recommendations) for consideration in the DNR Board Manual development process.*

3. Do you support the need for science (see below)?
➔ Vote on this

Science Needed
1. *OCH: Implementation of the first and second phases recommended by the technical group's report. Phase 1 of the study would determine the frequency and extend of OCH across the landscape and how common the OCH rule is implemented. Phase 2 would include a more detailed research to determine whether BFE is adequate in defining the extent of OCH or what elevation would be more appropriate to capture OCH as intended by the rule.*

2. *Physicals and LiDAR based Fish Habitat Water Typing Model: Implement research to develop default physical criteria and water typing models that are spatially explicit (e.g., WRIA, eco-region, or other unit) and consider the distribution of fishes across forested lands in Washington. By combining the research at the appropriate spatial scale, costs will be reduced and water typing (utilizing both methods) will be more accurate and precise. A necessary part of this research would include defining permanent natural barriers.*