

**Forest Practices Board  
Committee on Water Typing Rule**

January 8, 2020  
Natural Resources Building  
Olympia, Washington

**Committee Members Present:**

Bob Guenther, Committee Chair and General Public Member  
David Herrera, General Public Member  
Paula Swedeen, General Public Member  
Tom Nelson, General Public Member

**Committee Members Absent:**

Jeff Davis, Director's designee, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

**Staff**

Marc Engel and Marc Ratcliff, DNR  
Steve Renaud, ATG

**Welcome and Introductions**

Bob Guenther, Committee chair, called the meeting to order at 10 a.m.

**Approval of Minutes**

This committee approved the November 5, 2019, meeting minutes with no changes.

**Review Water Typing System Rule Committee recommendations, dated 5 November, 2019, to the Board; and November 13, 2019 Board Motion**

**Committee Discussion and Potential Recommendations for the Board**

Anadromous Fish Floor (AFF) Workgroup

Ash Roorbach provided an update from the AFF workgroup. In December, Dan Miller from TerrainWorks presented a model to the workgroup that could potentially be used to generate a synthetic hydrologic layer from which to perform an analysis to determine the AFF. He said most folks agree that a sensitivity analysis is needed to test the potential models. He stated the work plan is being sent out for review by the workgroup. There are different perspectives, but he felt confident the workgroup can reach concurrence on a work plan. A meeting is scheduled for the AFF principle investigators for January 16 to finalize the work plan and a meeting is scheduled for January 28 for the full AFF workgroup to discuss the scope of GIS work and the work plan.

Roorbach proposed funding options for performing the AFF GIS analysis. He anticipates a completed scope of work by the February Board meeting. He said two recommendations coming from the GIS meeting held in December include: (1) perform further AFF analyses in additional watersheds; and, (2) analyze additional criteria for stream barriers (based on scale, stream size) and consider stream reaches as it relates to potential barriers.

He said the workgroup will have a funding request to hire a contractor to perform the analysis. The contractor(s) would not only perform the analysis, but also be considered one of the principal investigators to work closely with the workgroup and technical members.

Roorbach said that incorporating additional watersheds into the analysis would make a more robust analysis and acknowledged it may take some time, but said two months is a reasonable timeline to develop the framework for the analysis. He added that the contracting work through DNR needs to follow the legal bidding process and as a result, may extend the timelines.

Marc Engel, DNR, clarified that DNR can begin the cost-benefit analysis (CBA) and SEPA analysis when the Board accepts the AFF analysis.

Roorbach said they plan to present the Board with a comparison analysis from known fish distribution populations and barriers related to the range of gradient thresholds being considered. He acknowledged that the two-month projected time to complete the analysis may be pushed back if additional watersheds are necessary.

Engel said the Committee will need to inform the Board on the AFF work and request Board approval of funding based on the scope of work. DNR will implement the contract and the type of contract (open competitive, sole source, or cooperative research) may change the timing for completion. He did not think May would be a feasible timeline to establish the contract and complete the analysis.

Engel said the work being done by the AFF workgroup does not necessarily change DNR's current draft rule proposals for the AFF alternatives being considered by the Board.

Board member Swedeen suggested DNR does not need to wait until the AFF workgroup completes its analysis to begin the AFF spatial analysis for the CBA or SEPA analyses. She said she assumes the work performed by the AFF workgroup will not change the current Board approved AFF alternatives. She asked if the AFF workgroup could provide an understanding to the Committee if the new work changes or modifies the current AFF proposals.

Board member Nelson said he would like to see more information than just arbitrary numbers. He said the impacts of an anadromous fish floor in the water typing rule could affect completed RMAP work. He questioned how DNR could start the CBA until DNR has the final AFF outputs to project a change.

Roorbach said they anticipate the GIS funding request to not exceed \$65,000 for the analysis and not exceed \$10,000 for the contractor to attend meetings/travel expenses and coordination with the workgroup. He felt the workgroup could provide a more accurate funding request by the Board's February 12 meeting. Most of the GIS costs will be to develop synthetic hydrologic layers for additional watersheds in order to provide more robust data.

#### Eastern Washington Data Workgroup

Marc Engel, DNR, said there is currently a small forest landowner representative, an eastside tribal representative and large industry representative willing to participate in the workgroup to

gather additional data to inform criteria for an eastern Washington rule. He asked if other caucuses had interest in participating in this effort.

Some ideas for additional members were discussed, but no individuals were assigned at this time.

The Committee discussed the need for this eastside workgroup to develop a charter and scope of work. It was acknowledged that the workgroup could bring back recommendations relatively quickly, perhaps one to two meetings. As a result, the Committee did not foresee the need for the group to draft a formal charter.

Board member Swedeen suggested DNR be the lead for the eastside technical workgroup.

### **Committee Recommendations to the Board**

The recommendations the Committee decided to forward to the Board include:

- Request to approve a tentative budget up to \$75,000 to contract for developing GIS model and analysis. It is anticipated that refinements to the cost and an updated timeline would be provided to the Board at the February meeting.
- Acknowledge the formation of a small technical group to share available fish habitat data and assess the feasibility of the data to supplement existing data for inclusion in a spatial analysis for an eastern Washington rule. This group will inform the Committee if data gaps exist and options for collecting additional data if needed. It is anticipated that the technical group will provide the potential options to the Committee by early April.

### **Public Comments**

Darin Cramer, Washington Forest Protection Association, said they support the request for funding the AFF workgroup's analysis. He said he is concerned with DNR moving ahead with DNR's AFF analysis when the current alternatives contain high uncertainty. He believes more time will be wasted if DNR moves ahead without first having the AFF workgroup's analysis completed. He said they support the path forward for the eastside workgroup, but cautioned the committee members that there is limited staff to go around.

Jamie Glasgow, Conservation Caucus, believes the AFF workgroup's effort is not starting from scratch. Given that the Potential Habitat Break science panel found that the proposed 10% metric is within the range of the upper extent for anadromy, he said he is supportive of not waiting for the results from the AFF workgroup. He said the current fish distribution information is within the range of the current criteria being proposed and the Board should move forward to avoid further water typing rule delays.

Meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.