

Forest Practices Board
Water Typing Rule Committee
April 17, 2020
Meeting conducted via GoToWebinar

Committee Members Present:

Bob Guenther, Committee Chair and General Public Member
David Herrera, General Public Member
Jeff Davis, Director's designee, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Paula Swedeen, General Public Member
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 9:31 a.m.

Approval of Minutes

The Water Typing Rule Committee (Committee) approved the February 11, 2020, meeting minutes with no changes.

Status on Eastern Washington Data Technical Group

Marc Ratcliff, DNR, provided an update on the work being done to gather additional fish data for eastern Washington. He said the group has not arrived at recommendations at this point, but will modify the work moving forward given the Committee's feedback today. He reminded the Committee that this effort is to assess the feasibility of gathering additional data to supplement the small data set used in the initial potential habitat break (PHB) spatial analysis.

He said the technical group has been pursuing a proposal to evaluate the CMER data collected in the early to mid-2000s for the development of the water typing model and seasonal variability studies. This exercise is based on the efforts of the initial model development analysis which evaluated the end of habitat at locations similar to how fish surveys are conducted under the current rule. The data technical group formed a quality assurance/quality control (Qa/Qc) subgroup to screen the data sets and screened out stream data where end of fish points were influenced by deformable barriers, culvert blockages or located outside the protocol season. He added that the Qa/Qc group is still screening the data sets.

DNR has been unable to locate the spatial data for the CMER studies. DNR has been in contact with one of the companies who collected the data to determine if they may be able to replicate the fish points spatially for the spatial analysis. If this is possible, a cost will be involved. Ratcliff added that DNR is currently confirming the lidar ability for the watersheds where the fish points are located.

Ratcliff said that the effort within the Qa/Qc subgroup to screen out fish data from the data collected in 2001 data or using some of the mid-2000s data is not supported by all of the technical members. Some technical group members have proposed that the 2001 data should be evaluated as a complete set. Ratcliff mentioned that this proposal could be another option, but the majority of the

technical group believe screening data to coincide with the most reliable end of fish habitat is a valid exercise.

Members of the Eastern Washington fish data technical group then provided feedback to the Committee members regarding the CMER data including who initially developed the screening criteria for each study, consistency with the screening and use of the data by the technical group for the PHB spatial analysis versus how data was collected for the initial PHB spatial analysis, alternatives to addressing data performance without separating data from the CMER specific study designs, the need to clarify objectives for eastern Washington PHBs and the need to continue discussions to work through this issue.

Chris Mendoza, Conservation Caucus, said that the screening criteria the group is using came from DNR and that it was not up for any discussion or selection from the work group.

Darin Cramer, WFPA, said in his opinion, the screening criteria got discussed in a work group meeting and that DNR did not object to those. Brian Fransen was not available for that meeting and the group went ahead with those criteria. Since the original data was collected under an experimental design, he said the industrial landowners do not believe it is appropriate to screen out selected points.

Ratcliff clarified that DNR provided the technical group the basis for evaluating data – any data considered needs to be covered with high-quality lidar and spatially replicated to streams. He said the group discussed and tentatively arrived at the additional criteria the Qa/Qc group would be using for the data evaluation and screening exercise.

Committee members expressed that they don't fully understand the technical issue or the points of disagreement. They discussed the need to capture the best representation of fish habitat, questioned the need to retain past data if it does not match the need for this exercise, the need to retain scientific credibility, and concerns that spatial data acquisition would involve a cost. They agreed that today's meeting may not be the forum to finalize or resolve this issue.

All Committee members agreed that the technical group should continue their current efforts and encouraged the group to continue to engage to address and attempt to resolve the outstanding questions and seek to arrive at a proposal for the Committee to make as a recommendation to the Board at their May 2020 meeting.

No formal action was taken by the Committee.

Public Comment on Scope of Work for the Anadromous Fish Floor

Darin Cramer, Washington Forest Protection Association (WFPA), said they support the scope of work. However, they are very concerned about the uncertainty of the DNR and adaptive management program budgets and their potential impact of this work. He said WFPAs two priorities are ensuring DNR has the capacity to continue to process Forest Practices Applications and are ready and able to meet the wildfire challenges this year. WFPA would like to see how the budget works out before supporting the move forward to a contract for the anadromous fish floor (AFF).

Jaime Glasgow, Conservation Caucus, said they support the scope of work and moving forward quickly. He said the sooner that the work gets started then there is a better chance of the work

getting finished. He also encouraged that a timeline and deliverables be included in the AFF GIS scope of work for the contractor.

Steve Barnowe-Meyer, Washington Farm Forestry Association, said they are supportive of the scope of work and deliverables.

Committee members acknowledged the hard work that went into the AFF GIS contract scope of work. There was general agreement to move the scope of work forward, but Committee members did voice concerns regarding the uncertainty in the budget and the need for the addition of timelines for completion to the AFF GIS scope of work and the contract.

Anadromous Fish Floor Scope of Work

Motion: Tom Nelson moved the Committee propose to the Board to accept the final scope of work for the Anadromous Fish Floor.

Seconded: Jeff Davis

Committee Discussion:

Marc Engel, DNR, clarified that the Committee has the authority to approve the scope of work and move it forward. The Board approved the funding for the work to be completed and the AFF workgroup is working under the guidance of the Committee.

Action: Motion withdrawn

Motion: Tom Nelson moved the Committee accept the final scope of work for the Anadromous Fish Floor.

Seconded: Jeff Davis

Committee Discussion:

Committee member Swedeen questioned the absence of timelines for deliverables in the scope of work and asked the workgroup to provide regular updates to the Committee.

Ash Roorbach, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission provided an overview of the work products and sequencing included in the scope of work. He agreed that the AFF workgroup could work with the contractor to ensure a timeline and deliverables be prioritized in the contract.

Action: Motion passed unanimously. (Tom Nelson not available for vote.)

Motion: Paula Swedeen moved the Committee will receive regular updates on the progress on the implementation of the Anadromous Fish Floor GIS contract and will provide guidance if the work is extending beyond the Board's approved timeline.

Seconded: Jeff Davis

Committee Discussion:

None.

Action: Motion passed unanimously. (Tom Nelson not available for vote.)

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.