

**FOREST PRACTICES BOARD  
COMMITTEE ON WATER TYPING RULE**

July 17, 2019  
Natural Resources Building  
Olympia, Washington

**Committee Members Present:**

Bob Guenther, General Public Member/Small Forest Landowner  
David Herrera, General Public Member  
Jeff Davis, Designee for Director, Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Paula Swedeen, General Public Member  
Tom Nelson, General Public Member

**Staff**

Marc Engel, Marc Ratcliff, Patricia Anderson, Phil Ferester

*Meeting materials are available on the Forest Practices Board's website at  
<https://www.dnr.wa.gov/about/boards-and-councils/forest-practices-board>.*

Welcome and Introductions

Bob Guenther, Committee chair, called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. The Committee approved the July 9, 2019 meeting summary with a clarification from Tom Nelson. The clarification changed the first sentence on the second page to read “WFPA always intended that all of the size PHBs be associated with tributary junctions.”

Width Based Potential Habitat Breaks (continuation)

This was a placeholder in the event additional discussion was needed. However, more information would be presented today and discussion will be held at a future meeting.

TFW Policy Decisions on Board's June 4 motion

Marc Engel reported that TFW Policy recommended that an anadromous fish floor be considered for inclusion as a component of the water typing system rule. Policy did not recommend additional water-crossing structure language be included at this time.

Anadromous Fish Floor Presentations

Gus Seixas, Skagit River System Cooperative, presented the initial analysis performed by the western Washington tribes for determining stream gradient thresholds for an anadromous fish floor. The analysis was performed in the Skagit and Samish River basins. The goal is to provide a gradient-based threshold below which streams are presumed to contain fish. Seixas discussed the data set they used, the methodology used for the assessment and the stream gradient results from the analysis. Seixas said applying this methodology to the entire westside would require substantial effort and analysis and said that performing this analysis using width-based criteria would create additional bias.

Committee member Nelson requested DNR work with the tribes to overlay the Skagit watershed analysis presented by Seixas with the current DNR hydro-layer. This would provide a comparison of a conceptual anadromous fish floor layer with the current F/N breaks to understand how many streams would be affected by this rule concept.

Brian Fransen, Washington Forest Protection Association (WFPA), presented the results of the industrial landowner, small forest landowner and county caucus (landowner proposal) anadromous fish floor proposal. Their proposal was developed to provide an extension to Type F waters including main stem and lateral stream systems. The presentation included a comparison between where the upper limit of the anadromous fish floor would be located on stream systems based on their initial proposal, a 5, 7, and 10 percent gradient metric. Fransen said the presentation today is consistent with the proposal provided at the February 2018 Board meeting.

Doug Martin, presented an overview of a habitat intrinsic potential model for evaluating the suitability of salmonid habitat. Intrinsic potential models use persistent geomorphological stream characteristics to assess essential salmonid habitat. The intrinsic value, or presence and abundance of a particular fish species, is calculated based on channel gradient, mean annual flow and valley constraint. Martin said these models have been applied by state of Oregon, NOAA and University of Washington to assess the historic distribution of salmon. Martin shared his results after comparing an intrinsic habitat model assessment to the landowner proposal and the 5, 7 and 10 percent gradient thresholds.

#### Public Comment

Jim Peters, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission (NWIFC), clarified when in their proposal an ID team can be called when below the anadromous floor--water quality, blockage, PHB, etc. He said the goal with their proposal was to eliminate electrofishing within the anadromous fish floor.

Jaime Glasgow, conservation caucus, said they are concerned with gathering more data which could further delay this rule making. He said he would like the Board to continue on the current path with the current proposals rather gathering and trying to answer all the questions before moving forward.

Darin Cramer, WFPA, noted the last meeting summary was posted without the label of draft. He stated that there has not been any science/effectiveness work done on water typing rule since the abandonment of the model. He said the Board adopted a PHB landowner proposal that included a width change and an anadromous floor and that have not been analyzed correctly.

Ash Rhoorbach, NWIFC, commented on the difference on intrinsic potential that Doug Martin presented and how their methodology was used. He believes they are not that different rather different perspectives.

#### Anadromous Fish Floor Process Going Forward & Timeline

Jim Peters and Ash Roorbach, NWIFC, presented their proposal to arrive at an anadromous fish floor. Peters said they drafted a charter to provide a process for working with technical folks to arrive at the process to further discussions and assist with an analysis for an anadromous fish

floor. Peters said they plan to provide the draft charter through either consensus or not, at the July 30 Board committee meeting.

Roorbach said they are proposing to work with technical folks to expedite the process to arrive at an anadromous fish floor. Roorbach provided an overview of the draft charter. They recognize that before the anadromous fish floor becomes rule, it needs to include an adaptive management process. The goal is to have technical folks perform an analysis and work with an oversight group provide direction similar to how the technical group arrived at the fish habitat assessment method framework. Roorbach said they recognize others may have different approaches, but the group needs to agree on the appropriate data to use for arriving at the best outcome.

#### Committee Discussion Anadromous Fish Floor

Board committee members expressed the need to ensure that any anadromous fish floor adhere to the adaptive management process. They agreed that the Board committee provide oversight to the western Washington tribe's anadromous fish floor analysis.

The Committee members noted that it appears that the tribes and landowners used a different method to measure their gradient threshold and in order to have a comparison that needs to be recognized.

Board committee members agreed that the July 30 meeting will be used to (1) refine the committee's recommendations to the full Board on the additional analysis for the anadromous fish floor and (2) clarify the intent of the landowner's width-based potential habitat break (PHB) proposal.

Marc Engel, DNR, provided a brief summary on how the Board accepted the three PHB and anadromous fish floor rule proposals. Engel said the Board requested DNR staff work with the individual caucuses who submitted proposals to clarify their specific metrics and intent. DNR had performed the spatial analysis prior to the time in which requests were made to adjust the PHB Option C proposal. Engel said DNR could perform further spatial analyses once the PHBs metrics and processes are clear.

#### Prep For Next Meeting – July 30, 2019

The next meeting will include discussions on the anadromous fish floor process and what the committee will report to the Board and recommendations on width.

Meeting adjourned at 5 p.m.