Forest Practices Board
Water Typing Rule Committee
October 18, 2021, 8:00 – 10:00 a.m.
Meeting conducted via Zoom

Committee Members Present:
Bob Guenther, Committee Chair and General Public Member
Cody Desautel, General Public Member
David Herrera, General Public Member
Jeff Davis, Director's designee, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Tom Nelson, General Public Member

Staff
Marc Engel and Marc Ratcliff, DNR
Phil Ferester, ATG

Welcome and Introductions
Bob Guenther, Committee chair, called the meeting to order at 8 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

MOTION: Jeff Davis moved to approve the August 3, 2021 Committee meeting minutes.
SECONDED: Tom Nelson
ACTION: Motion passed. (4 Support / 1 Abstention (Desautel))

MOTION: Cody Desautel moved to approve the September 24, 2021 Committee meeting minutes.
SECONDED: Jeff Davis
ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

Overview of the Preliminary Anadromous Fish Floor Workgroup Report
Ash Roorbach, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, presented an overview of the preliminary report from the Anadromous Fish Floor (AFF) project team, which contains the analysis work by Terrainworks and the AFF project team. He said earlier versions of the report were provided to both project team and workgroup members, but to meet the timeline for today's meeting, this latest draft may not have been fully reviewed by all members. He said the recommendations had initially been agreed upon by the project team during their meeting discussions.

He shared how the higher stream gradients within some of the AFF alternatives (alternatives A) pushed the AFF higher into the watershed as compared to Alternative D, which extend the shortest distance upstream. Part of this is because most of the fish points used where located in streams lower down in the watersheds. He noted that the AFF alternatives with steeper gradients also pushed the AFF above concurred Type F/N points.
Roorbach shared the report's recommendations:

1. Consider using alternatives A3 and A4 as an AFF alternatives by the Water Typing Committee (Committee).

He said they recognized that implementation of Alternative A could be greatly facilitated if its stopping criteria (10% sustained gradient or permanent natural barrier) is identified upstream from known anadromy, as represented in the Statewide Integrated Fish Distribution (SWIFD), instead of from salt water.

2. If adopted into rule, include the AFF as part of the Fish Habitat Assessment Methodology (FHAM) currently under rule consideration, with implementation covered in Board Manual Section 23.

Roorbach highlighted the three questions of interest and briefly discussed the different data sets the AFF project team evaluated SWIFD, Skagit-LFA, US Forest Service data, Squaxin Island Tribal data and Water Type Modification Forms (WTMF)). He shared how the synthetic stream layer developed by Terrainworks was used to calculate sustained gradients, stream width, barriers and potential habitat break locations. Sustained gradients would be 20X bankfull width, not an average.

He said the AFF project team felt that four categories – true positives, false negatives, uncertain interpretations and false positives – would be useful for the spatial analysis. This was used to compare each AFF alternatives to known anadromy and existing Type F/N points. He said the team also wanted to determine the steepest downstream gradient that fish needed to access for the AFF.

Board member Nelson said he felt that the bulk of material/graphs in the report failed to meet the goal of reducing electrofishing, but in actuality attempts to establish a new set of default physical stream criteria above known anadromy.

Roorbach confirmed that the goal is to identify the beginning of FHAM. He said Type F/N points were used help compare each AFF alternative and shows implementation form adopting one AFF from another.

Gus Seixas, Skagit River System Cooperative, walked the Committee through several graphs contained in the draft report – the graphs helped compare the fish data to each AFF alternative. He said figure 6 provided the best overall picture of the AFF alternatives. He highlighted the different graphs outcomes and results including the overlap of modeled AFF and all anadromy, overlap of modeled AFF other anadromy, distance modeled AFF ends downstream of other anadromy, distance modeled AFF ends downstream/upstream of SWIFD, and distance modeled AFF ends upstream from concurred F/N points.

Committee Nelson asked what the difference was between the AFF project team and the AFF workgroup and who had reviewed the draft report.

Roorbach said the AFF project team is comprised of technical members and the workgroup has a mix of technical members and those involved in policy. Each meeting has been inclusive of both groups, but not all technical or policy folks attend each meeting. He wasn't sure who all had reviewed the October 14, 2021 draft.

Public Comment on the Preliminary Anadromous Fish Floor Workgroup Report

Chris Mendoza, Conservation Caucus, clarified that figures 3 and 4 are intended to address potential implementation and eliminate the need to survey anything downstream of, or where fish have been

documented. He said he just wanted to underscore the importance of this as they do allow for a more direct comparison of alternatives.

Steve Barnowe-Meyer, small landowner caucus, said while there has been a lot of robust conversations within the project team, he feels they are not at the point of having a final report for the Committee. He said the overshoot for anadromy between Alternative D and A is a significant issue from a landowner perspective.

Committee member Davis said he thought that even with these potential over shoots, there is still the opportunity to have an interdisciplinary (ID) team meeting. He asked if that was part of the conversation in the workgroup.

Barnowe-Meyer said there has been some discussion regarding ID teams, but this issue is related to earlier comments regarding the need to have implementation issues resolved.

Darin Cramer, Washington Forest Protection Association, said he is hoping the workgroup can have a little more time to refine the report. He said there are some technical issues that need additional clarification and the Committee may be able to help since the objective for the AFF is still needed.

Jim Peters, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, said the tribe's proposal is twofold: (1) the intent of the HCP was to limit the use of electrofishing and (2) try to get a system in place where fish are presumed to be any time of the year or based on the likelihood of fish using that habitat into the future. He encouraged everyone to continue to participate in the workgroup and to get their comments in so the report can be finalized.

Paula Swedeen, conservation caucus, expressed her appreciation for all the hard work the workgroup has done to increase the Committee's and the Board's ability to make a good decision. Regarding the potential overshoot between AFF alternatives and concurred Type F/N breaks, she said using Type F/N breaks attempts to correct the current system. She recalled the eDNA report showed about 50% of the points found fish presence higher than using electrofishing.

Committee Discussion

Committee member Nelson said that he does not want to move forward with presenting this report to the Board and suggested that there is no need to have a meeting tomorrow.

Committee member Desautel said perhaps the Committee needs to revisit the AFF objectives, which will help inform the decision before them. He questioned at what point the report would be final enough to make a recommendation to the Board.

Committee member Herrera voiced support for having the meeting tomorrow in order to hear Committee questions and provide further direction to the work group.

Committee Chair Guenther said the goal should be to present a report to the Board that is complete and accurate.

Meeting adjourned at 9:57 a.m.