<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Motion Language</th>
<th>TFW Policy Identified Task</th>
<th>Status/Plan/Agenda</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Intermediate Task/Agenda</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Outcome/Product/Decision maker</th>
<th>Process Informed</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Final Policy Recommendations</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protocol Electrofishing</td>
<td>Policy, with the support of the AMPA, convenes a technical group of practitioners with representation from scientists to identify best practices regarding electrofishing within the context of protocol surveys (including a literature synthesis), including: + How to reduce site-specific impacts of protocol surveys' use.</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
<td>Complete and AMPA present technical group's product to Policy to include: identification of any gaps in science and any areas of suggested focus; in order to identify or address BMPs, methods to minimize survey use(s) and site-specific impacts to TFW species.</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
<td>Policy takes action to propose rule change (may include a proposal initiation that results in new research, a look from research findings, or a policy analysis); guidance change (may include a change in guidance on protocol surveys or how electrofishing is being used or is now being training.</td>
<td>Potential: Policy and/or science track (Proposal initiation response from AMPA); Board Manual changes; training development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of LiS Synthesis</td>
<td>Policy reviews a draft technical group workshop report which will include a list of the documents that the technical group will review/consider and also those suggested by Policy that they consider relevant. Policy will approve the technical group's workshop with any edits necessary.</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Policy Considers recommendations from each group and takes next steps forward for each (i.e. proposal initiation); proposes Board Manual changes; sets areas of needed training.</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Policy determines if physical criteria needs to be updated; if so, Board Manual need to be changed.</td>
<td>For each element moving through the adaptive management process; TFW Policy will have to decide if they want to take action in response to the information provided by the adaptive management process. Pretending that TFW Policy agrees to take action in response to that information, this could include recommending rule changes, board manual changes, 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 workaround for those areas common with the adaptive management program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.a. Development of “best practices” recommendations regarding protocol survey electrofishing, including an evaluation of relevant literature, prioritizing potential site-specific impacts to incidental take permit covered species, and options for reducing the overall extent of the surveys’ use.</td>
<td>Conduct a TFW Policy electrofishing workshop to understand the current use of protocol surveys and how electrofishing is being used.</td>
<td>Feb-15</td>
<td>AMPA work with USFWS, USNO, NOAA identify potential data sharing opportunities and processes to get data from scientific collection permit reports to help develop, confirm, inform model, loop and process development assessment</td>
<td>Feb-15</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. AMPA to scope and initiate a pilot project to re-run the existing electrofishing - Board Motion Language</td>
<td>Policy field tours on westside and eastside to see OCH and will be developing a workplan for those areas common with the adaptive management program.</td>
<td>Oct-15</td>
<td>TFW Policy approved on October 1, 2015 a modified version of the AMPA’s recommendations which includes: Three Tracks and associated outreach.</td>
<td>Oct-15</td>
<td>TFW Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.b. An evaluation of the current rule process to identify off-channel habitat (OCH) under the existing water typing rule, including recommended clarifications to field implementation guidance, or rule language. The evaluation must be based, in part, on field review of approved FPAs and WTMFs.</td>
<td>Policy will review the existing guiding language in Act, Rule, and PFR establishing bankfull width and depth to include the edge of the streams and OCH, and the start of the riparian management zone.</td>
<td>Apr-15</td>
<td>TFW Policy approves on October 1, 2014 a modified version of the AMPA’s recommendations which includes: Three Tracks and associated outreach.</td>
<td>Apr-15</td>
<td>TFW Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.c. Net Part of Board Motion – Review PFPs</td>
<td>Performance reviews of approved FPAs and water type models; review of the model and map. Twig/Technical group review identified best practices and use of the model and map. Twig/Technical group review identified best practices and use of the model and map.</td>
<td>Oct-15</td>
<td>TFW Policy approves on October 1, 2014 a modified version of the AMPA’s recommendations which includes: Three Tracks and associated outreach.</td>
<td>Oct-15</td>
<td>TFW Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.a. Develop quantitative information about the “footprint” of the stream rule</td>
<td>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).</td>
<td>Nov-15</td>
<td>Create Draft GIS technology map (based on an updated model) using best available data.</td>
<td>Nov-15</td>
<td>Create Draft GIS technology map (based on an updated model) using best available data.</td>
<td>As determined: Develop, review, and update a water typing model in accordance with the DNR and on which to base the rules of identifying Type F waters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.b. Compare model-based water type designations to the ground truth FPAs and WTMFs.</td>
<td>Compare model-based water type designations to the ground truth FPAs and WTMFs.</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Identify the technical issues related to the use of the model and map and “Type F” Technical group review of modeling issues.</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Identify the technical issues related to the use of the model and map and “Type F” Technical group review of modeling issues.</td>
<td>Water Type Modification Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.c. Investigate additional model utility, such as detection of OCH, ability to predict physicals and assess footprint affects from using different physicals.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Determine if further changes are needed to the Water Typing System.</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Determine if further changes are needed to the Water Typing System.</td>
<td>Water Type Modification Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.d. Provide information that can inform the Board’s basic administrative choices among “map-as-rule” vs. “guidance map and protocol.”</td>
<td>Desktop Review of approved WTMF and End Chains to Develop Specific proposal.</td>
<td>Nov-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>