



**Timber, Fish and Wildlife Policy Committee  
Forest Practices Board**

**PO BOX 47012, Olympia, WA 98504-4712**

**Policy Co-Chairs:**

Terra Rentz, WA Department of Fish & Wildlife  
Curt Veldhuisen, Skagit River System Cooperative

June 26, 2018

TO: Forest Practices Board  
FROM: Terra Rentz, TFW Co-chair  
SUBJECT: Water Typing Board Motion

---

**Background**

During the 4 June 2019 Special Board Meeting, the Board passed the following motion along with additional interpretation directed towards the TFW co-chairs for communication to TFW Policy:

*The Board directs TFW Policy to address first the anadromous floor and then road water crossing structures to recommend whether these items should be part of the water typing system rule. TFW Policy will report back to the Board committee as quickly as possible on each item.*

More specifically, the Board described to co-chairs the intent to have Policy discuss whether or not an (1) anadromous floor element and/or (2) addressing water crossing structure implications should be considered in for inclusion in the water typing strategy. The Board also informed Policy that they are not looking to have Policy define metrics or specific language for inclusion, but that the responsibility for those tasks would be that of the Board Committee formed 4 June 2019 and chaired by Board member Guenther. The Board directed that a determination of Policy's historical discussions was not the intent of this motion and, instead, to ensure clear direction and consideration moving forward. (*Co-Chair interpretation*)

**Policy Preparation**

During the 6 June 2019 Policy Meeting an ad hoc workgroup was formed to:

1. Understand the intent and direction of the Board;
2. Assess and clarify any necessary elements for Policy discussion;
3. Draft example motion language to help inform Policy's discussion; and
4. Identify any necessary background or support material for Policy's pre-meeting mailing to ensure an effective and efficient discussion at policy.

Ad hoc workgroup members included Jim Peters, Steve Barnowe-Meyer, Alec Brown, Marc Engel, Darin Cramer, and Terra Rentz

The outcomes of the ad hoc workgroup's discussion resulted in a clarification of the goals of an anadromous floor and over water crossing structures, defining terms, example motion language, and an assessment of background materials. Example motions have been provided for the sole purpose of helping Policy understand the sideboards of the decision space. Variations of the example motions or different motions can be proposed.

## Discussion Support Materials

### TASK 1: Should the anadromous floor be part of the water typing system rule?

Goal: To find a point across the landscape with presumed fish so that we minimize electrofishing *and* know where to start a protocol survey.

Definition(s): An anadromous floor is the point across the landscape below which fish are presumed. IF a clear permanent natural barrier or justification exists, a Fish ID Team can validate the stream as “Non-fish”.

Material(s): FHAM recommendation – May 2017 Board meeting

Ex Motion: Policy recommends that an anadromous floor, as previously defined, **should/should not** be considered for inclusion as a component of the water typing system rule.

### TASK 2: Should “water-crossing structures” be addressed in the water typing system rule?

Goal: To honor water-crossing structures (i.e., bridges & culverts) constructed under a valid HPA or FPHP application and fully functioning for the life of the structure.

Definition(s): To qualify, a water crossing structure must be (1) permitted and (2) fully functioning.

A permitted structure is one constructed under a valid Hydraulic Project Approval (HPA) or Forest Practices Hydraulic Project (FPHP).

A fully functioning structure is able to (1) meet a 100-year flood, (2) allow passage of debris, and (3) provides a substrate that allows for fish passage in Type F waters.

Material(s): Any existing rule language that speaks to assurances for landowners; Pertinent language from the culvert case; and example(s) of a theoretically situation in which this consideration would be applied.

#### Ex Motion(s):

*If background material provides sufficient assurances...*

Policy recognizes that existing rule language and actions provide adequate considerations for landowners and recommends that additional water-crossing structure language **not be** included in the water typing system rule.

*If no evidence exists around assurances...*

Policy recommends that the water typing system rule **should/should not** honor qualified water-crossing structures permitted as “non-fish” under the interim water typing rule through the life of the structure.