

Teanaway Community Forest



Teanaway Community Forest Advisory Committee Meeting Summary February 26, 2015 3:00 – 8:00 PM

Advisory Committee Attendees:

Andrea Imler	Reagan Dunn	Martha Wyckoff
Deborah Essman	Gregg Bafundo	Tom Ring (for Phil Rigdon)
Tom Tebb (for Derek Sandison)	Jason Ridlon	JJ Collins
Gary Berndt	Jeri Downs	Wayne Mohler
	Mark Charlton	Mike Reimer

Advisory Committee Members Absent:

Brian Crowley	Doug Schindler	Kitty Craig
Dale Bambrick	Jim Halstrom	Urban Eberhart

Agency and Consultant Staff:

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

Staff Action Items		Date Due
Eric Winford	Email Draft Plan to AC	3-5-2015
Advisory Committee Action Items		Date Due
TCF Advisory Committee	Review Draft Plan prior to TCF meeting on March 12 th working session, prepare to comment on March 12 th	3-12-2015

1) Welcome, Review the Day

- a) January 8, 2015 meeting summary was approved with one clarification to item 1a; access to USFS trail heads via the Middle Fork Road only.
- b) Gary Berndt announced a public input meeting hosted by the Nature Conservancy and the County Commissioners. The goal is to receive public input about the recently purchased Plum Creek land by the Nature Conservancy. Three meetings are scheduled in March: March 5 in Cle Elum at the Senior Center, March 17 in Ellensburg at the Armory, and March 27 in Yakima at the Arboretum.
- c) AC Business – MEETING SCHEDULE; there are two meetings in March. Next meetings: March 12th and March 26th. The two March meetings will be work sessions to review Draft Plan. The meeting location on March 12th is the Teanaway Grange starting at 2pm and ending at 8pm. The March 26th meeting will be held at the Senior Center.
 - i) This version of the Draft Plan is intended as a working product for the Advisory Committee. It will be available to view on-line but the agencies will not be accepting comments from the public at this time; public comments will be accepted on the Draft Plan that comes out in April.
- d) The AC is requested to schedule time to review the DRAFT plan between March 5th when it will be distributed by the agencies and the March 12th work session.
- e) Gary Berndt provided an update on the \$5 million grant that needs to be spent by June 30th; County Commissioners made a decision to have repair work done on the Teanaway County Road and West Fork Road.

2) Water Rights – Goal 1

- a) Agencies clarified that the water rights cannot be removed (sold) from this land but they can be leased.
- b) Overall, the content is similar to the previous document but the format has been changed; #9-11 in the document are additions based on comments from the AC.
- c) Agencies are looking for big picture feedback from the AC.
- d) Overall the AC was comfortable with the language and content with the exception of wanting some language guiding prioritization of water uses within the forest ((1) forest/habitat, (2) back mitigation, (3) agriculture, and (4) new growth/development mitigation). Several AC members took exception with using any TCF water to mitigate for new growth and felt there should be no new consumptive use inside the forest with the exception of water for short-term restoration over the early season.
- e) Some other suggestions included:
 - i) Tighten up language and be clear that the water stays in the Forest
 - ii) Ensure best conservation practices when using water
 - iii) Clarify the intent on #8
 - iv) #9 – Add some specific measures such as irrigating early and cutting off water use in critical months. Suggestion to quantify flows (or use a range) or to specify critical months where specific measures would be taken. Change “impact” to “reduce”.
 - v) Have a third party/expert look at the wording around water rights
 - vi) Include some language about the water rights leaving the forest, use of water in campgrounds, and seasonal use.

3) Performance Measures (Goal by Goal)

- a) General Comments
 - i) Will there be specific quantifications, detailed targets, or measurable improvements added? Some AC members felt this would be helpful. Example – measurable improvement in water temperature. Agencies responded that they will provide measurement at the project level as

- they implement projects.
 - ii) Note that all projects are dependent on funding; for this reason priority actions appear very conservative in the document.
 - iii) Adjust language to reflect a more positive tone regarding recreation and recreation opportunities throughout the document.
 - iv) Language about interdisciplinary partnerships and coordination is lacking throughout the document; this may need to be brought up in multiple goals so it isn't overlooked.
 - v) Suggestion to discuss funding partners and other resources in a coordinated fashion – “coordinated strategic investments”.
 - vi) Highlight habitat protection in each goal where it is relevant. Request nexus in the document, and refer back to goal 1 as appropriate.
- b) Watershed Protection
- i) Suggestion to treat roads and trails differently in the analysis. Concern that treating trails as roads will result in reduced access for some forms of recreation. Does it make more sense to have roads and trails separated in the document? Some AC members felt it did. (eg., performance measure under Interruption of Natural Stream Migration and Wetlands. . . .). Suggestion to “unlump” trails and roads throughout the document.
 - ii) Suggestion to consider funding partners for wetlands/floodplain related projects (eg., Floodplains by Design may be a resource). Coordinate with USFS on watershed related projects.
- c) Working Forests
- i) Add some language around experimental forestry practices (consider research and non-conventional forestry projects), as well as prioritizing fire risk management near adjacent landowners.
- d) Grazing
- i) Missing performance measures regarding recovery from historic riparian damage.
 - ii) Add some language about economic cost and community benefits to performance measures (Agencies replied this may be addressed in separate economic analysis)
 - iii) Performance measures in general need to be clearer with more specific language.
 - iv) Are grazing economics viable while meeting the environmental goals of the project?
 - v) Request for outcome stating “minimized degradation due to grazing”.
- e) Recreation
- i) Education and Enforcement: add some language or reference where to find language about law enforcement, missing law enforcement.
 - ii) Trail Network: agencies will correct the inconsistencies with the dates and priority actions relative to estimated completion of the Recreation Plan; move the 1st bullet under Trail Network Priority Actions to goal 1; add some language about priority actions and performance measures in the interim before the recreation plan comes out.
 - iii) Change the title “Recreation Infrastructure” to “Infrastructure and Trails in the Interim” – Add improvements to user built trails, campgrounds, etc. in the interim.
 - iv) Request for a global change: “sediment” impacts to “water quality” impacts.
- f) Aquatic Habitat
- i) List the priority streams or provide a map.
 - ii) Under performance measures remove the word “positively” when discussing beaver influence on streams.
- g) Wildlife Habitat
- i) Forest Habitat: the way that this section is currently written it appears that the land is being managed for only one species, language is needed to show that the land is being managed for habitat health not just one species

- ii) Suggestion to discuss Landowner Option Plan
- iii) Mature fir forest habitat, first performance measure: define “treated”.
- h) Community Partnerships
 - i) In general, the AC felt that this section needs quite a bit more work, this is an important section because this is the community piece and the AC wants the community to embrace the Teanaway “Community” Forest and this management plan. Agencies will work on this section and would like help with the language from the AC.
 - ii) Suggestion to add “Form Recreation Committee” as a priority action.
 - iii) Visitors as a performance measures
 - iv) Some concern about “track costs and revenues” under grazing. Why isn’t that stated under Forestry? Could it be couched like it is couched under Forestry?
 - v) ADD OUTCOMES (or add reference that this will be in another section of the plan). Outcomes to include: engage community, Identify Opportunities, Measure of cross-boundary coordination (on fire management, trail and road work, rec use, access, etc.), volunteerism, open door policy to other entities.
 - vi) Concern that this is a template for other community forests, for all community forests. How will it be received by the community?
 - vii) Conversation regarding the purpose of the plan. Strategic Management Plan for the agencies. AC question, why can’t there be more in the plan about the community as well, with the understanding that the agencies aren’t committing themselves to the community portion. Could flag things that are community responsibilities and priorities, versus agency.

4) Implementation Topics

- a) General Comments
 - i) Agencies were asked to double check the legislation language and apply that to this document.
 - ii) Winter recreation activities are missing
 - iii) The language under 1st paragraph of Prioritization is vague and confusing; agencies will clarify
 - iv) Add “community input” bullet under Adaptive Management
 - v) Question regarding funding cuts, will agencies re-prioritize priority actions. Rick said they would prioritize immediate threats and dates would be pushed back on other priority actions. Somewhat depends on what type of funding is available.
 - vi) Clarify if the Rec Committee is a subcommittee of the AC

5) Requested Language for Goal 3 – Recreation Planning Criteria

- a) Note: this is not the full document; it is just the section that was requested to be reviewed. The AC will get a chance to see the whole document in the Draft Plan.
- b) Agencies to clarify what the criteria are to be used for or not used for. Provide context.
- c) There was a suggestion to use geomorphic floodplain instead of 100-year flood plain as a physical factor.
- d) Any additional comments from the AC need to be sent to Eric and Lisa the following morning (2/27).

6) Next Steps

- a) First full draft of plan to be provided to AC on March 5th for discussion at March 12th work session.
- b) On March 26th the AC will continue working through the draft plan
- c) April 6th a public draft goes out and comments from the public will be accepted, Commence SEPA

7) Handouts

- a) Agenda, February 26, 2015
- b) TCFAC Meeting Summary from February 12, 2015 for approval
- c) DRAFT TCF Water Right
- d) DRAFT Priority Actions and Performance Measures
- e) DRAFT Chapter on Implementation
- f) DRAFT Recreation Language