

DRAFT-----TFW Policy Committee----DRAFT
Type F Path Forward - Board Motion to Completion

Board Motion Language	Board Motion/Task	Status/Plan/Assignee	Target Date	Intermediate Task/Assignee	Target Date	Outcome/Product/Decision maker	Process Informed	Target Date	Final Policy Recommendations	Target Date	
1. Policy is directed to complete recommendations for options on a permanent water typing rule, beginning with two tasks to be completed and reported to the Board at the May, 2014 meeting:	1.a. Development of “best practices” recommendations regarding protocol survey electrofishing, including an evaluation of relevant literature, minimizing potential site-specific impacts to Incidental Take Permit covered species, and options for reducing the overall extent of the surveys’ use.	Protocol E-fishing lit synthesis		At Policies Request, AMPA developing the electrofishing literature review contents and gains Policy approval and at Policy request, conduct Lit synthesis and present to Policy when complete			Literature Synthesis to be presented to Policy by AMPA to include identifications of any gaps in science and any areas of suggested focus in order to identify or address BMPs, methods to minimize survey's use and site specific impacts to ITP species - Interact w/ and get input from Policy Technical workgroup on specific questions to be answered by Synthesis	Policy Evaluation			
		Evaluation of Lit Synthesis				Develop flow chart outlining the protocol survey process		Technical group interact with AMPA on Synthesis to id Technical group present for Policy approval, a list of BMPs, proposed methods to minimize potential site specific impacts to ITP species; and options for reducing overall extent of survey's use and identify any additional information or research needed to answer specific questions to be answered by Synthesis			
		E-Fishing BMPs		Policy perform evaluation of Lit Synthesis via technical group and identify BMPs, proposed methods to minimize potential site specific impacts to ITP species; and options for reducing overall extent of survey's use and identify any additional information or research needed to answer above		Evaluate data sharing and ways to minimize unnecessary E-fishing			Policy response to FPB and/or propose to Policy actions that could be included in the final policy recommendations		
		Minimize potential site specific impacts to ITP species				Understanding the Use of Electro Fishing					
		Options for reducing overall extent of survey's use				Flow chart the E-fishing Permit Process					
	1.a.i Not Part of Board Motion - Confirm Physical criteria as habitat and define Recoverable Habitat using physicals	Assess the accuracy and limitations of physical habitat defaults in predicting fish use	Lit Review/Technical Workgroup		Identify potential data or research gaps; propose further action to fill gaps		Determine if physical criteria needs to change				
	1.b. An evaluation of the current rule process to identify off-channel habitat (OCH) under the interim water typing rule, including recommended clarifications in field implementation guidance, or rule language. The evaluation must be based, in part, on field review of approved FPAs and WTMFs.		Policy has taken several actions to accomplish this:							For each element moving through the adaptive management process, TFW Policy will have to decide first if we want to take action in response to the information provided by the adaptive management process. Presuming that TFW Policy agrees to take action in response to that information; this could include recommending rule changes, board manual guidance, agency process changes (with concurrence from the agency), additional scientific review, or any combination thereof. TFW Policy may also identify additional issues related to this topic outside of the scope of the original Board motion and will be developing a workplan for those issues consistent with the adaptive management program.	
		Evaluate current rule process to id OCH	Policy field tours on westside and eastside to see OCH protection in practice;					AMPA assesses adaptive AMP applicability; management and resource implications; proposal development track; and present proposal review packet to Policy; Completes Stage 1			
		Recommend clarifications in field implementation, guidance and/or rule	Policy review the existing guiding language in Act, Rule, and FFR establishing bankfull width and depth to calculate the edge of the stream and OCH, and the start of the riparian management zone				DNR has developed a proposal review packet to move OCH discussions into a formal procedure with timelines.				
		Field review of approved FPAs and WTMFs.	Perform field reviews of approved FPAs and water type mod. forms; visits to determine if this description adequately covers off channel habitat as currently described in rule.						Policy conducts stage 2: development by track; administrator assessment and synthesis; Policy recommendations; Identify any need to initiate additional scientific review; Determine which proposed changes are unaffected by the need for additional scientific review and which require the creation of a TWIG to propose approach to answering specific Policy questions		OCH portion of final rule PI; FPB motion direction to Policy
Review the existing science based definitions of OCH connected at bankfull elevation as intended in the forest practices rules and the FFR											
	Review OCH description developed during Policy field site visits to determine if it adequately covers OCH as described in rule										
2. AMPA to scope and initiate a pilot project to re-run the existing hydrologic model using LiDAR data, including at least two watersheds (west and east). Objectives include:	2.a. Develop quantitative information about the “footprint” of the interim rule;			Execute a contract that compares the original water type model (10 m DEM) to a 2 m LiDAR based DEM in two basins (east and west).			Create Draft GIS hydrography map (based on an updated model) using best available data.	As determined: Develop, revise, and/or update a water-typing model in accordance with the HCP and on which to base the rule of identifying Type F waters.			
	2.b. Compare model-based water type designations to on-the-ground FPAs and WTMFs;	Work with GIS experts to develop a scope of work to compare a 10 m DEM and a 2 m DEM that is LiDAR based to evaluate potential improvements of a water typing model.		Execute a contract that compares the original model (10 m DEM) and LiDAR based 2 m DEM (see above) with biological survey results from WTMFs.			Identify the technical issues related to the use of the model and map. Twig/Technical group review of model/map issues.				
	2.c. Investigate additional model utility, such as detection of OCH, ability to predict physicals and assess footprint effects from using different physicals;			Test a LiDAR 2 m DEM in the two basins (east and west) to determine if OCH can be predicted. Follow up initial pilot work with field evaluation of physical habitat. Compare field data with remotely sensed data to determine if physical criteria can be predicted.				Determine if further changes are needed to the Water Type Modification process.	Water Type Modification Process		
	2.d. Provide information that can inform the Board’s basic administrative choices among “map-as-rule” vs. “guidance map with field adjustments”.	Collate electrofishing work and model results to evaluate options to inform an approach for water typing.		Following the pilot LiDAR evaluation and electrofishing BMP work, a group of practitioners and scientists will need to make recommendations to TFW Policy for review of options for the Board.							