

Teanaway Community Forest



Washington
Department of
**FISH and
WILDLIFE**



WASHINGTON STATE
Natural Resources

Teanaway Community Forest Advisory Committee

Meeting Summary

February 12, 2015

3:00 – 8:00 PM

Advisory Committee Attendees:

Deborah Essman

Gregg Bafundo

Jason Ridlon

Jim Halstrom

JJ Collins

Andrea Imler

Doug Schindler

Kitty Craig

Martha Wyckoff

Mike Reimer

Urban Eberhart

Tom Tebb

Tom Ring

Gary Berndt

Jeri Downs

Dale Bambrick

Brian Crowley

Advisory Committee Members Absent:

Reagan Dunn

Mark Charlton

Wayne Mohler

Agency and Consultant Staff:

Lisa Dally Wilson – Dally Environmental (DE)

Eric Winford – DNR/WDFW

Michael Livingston – WDFW

Diedra Petrina – DE Team

Larry Leach – DNR

Doug McClelland – DNR

Rick Roeder – DNR

Staff Action Items		Date Due
Eric Winford	Redraft of recreation criteria and motorcycle language provided to AC	2-23-2015
Eric Winford	Revised versions of Performance Measures and Implementation Sections provided to AC by email	2-19-2015
Advisory Committee Action Items		Date Due
TCF Advisory Committee	Send Eric any revisions to Performance Measures or Implementation section (including bullets for adaptive management section in implementation)	2-17-2015

I. Welcome, Review the Day

- a) January 8, 2015 meeting summary was approved; confirmation that the West Fork access is illegal for motorized use
- b) AC Business – MEETING SCHEDULE; there are two meetings in February and two in March. Next meetings: February 26th, March 12th and March 26th. Two meetings in March will be work sessions to review Draft Plan.
- c) AC requested to schedule time in calendars to review the DRAFT plan between March 5th when it will be distributed by the agencies and the March 12th work session.
- d) There was a discussion about a smaller group of AC members meeting outside of the formal TCFAC meetings to work on vision statements that will then be brought to the TCFAC. The AC and agencies were comfortable with a subset of the AC meeting in a public place as long as it is discussed at the TCFAC meeting prior and the group reports back at the next formal meeting. The agencies requested that individuals wait to develop content for vision statements until after they review the first DRAFT plan.
- e) Mike Livingston provided an update on the criteria for Recreation Planning and the general motorcycle language in the Recreation Objectives and Strategies. Agencies are working on these sections and are considering changes that address some of the concerns voiced at the last meeting in an attempt to find more agreement (including the addition of social factors that were solicited from the AC by email in lieu of the cancelled meeting in January). Mike suggested that the performance measures that AC members are reviewing today may help to make things clearer and requested the AC focus on those today.
- f) Advisory Committee members have provided comment and edits to the recreation language provided at the January meeting. Kitty Craig requested that the AC see a re-draft of the Recreation Criteria and Motorcycle language for the meeting on the 26th of February. The agencies have agreed.
- g) There was a brief discussion regarding minority reports. Mike Livingston said the agencies are going to find as much middle ground as they can without a minority report. The agencies do not plan to provide a separate minority report regarding issues where consensus cannot be reached, and instead plan to include AC discussion and different perspectives as sidebars in the plan. Tom Ring did not feel a minority report is appropriate, but instead, the plan should layout where agreements were made and where there isn't agreement.
- h) There was a request that the AC be provided meeting materials for review in a timely manner.

II. Goal 5 – Community Partnership Presentations

- a) **Mary Maj, Cle Elum District Ranger, USFS**, provided an overview of USFS activities as they relate to partnerships in land management activities. She discussed the Forest Planning Process including the 2015 Travel Management Plan for the Okanagan/Wenatchee Forest, the Northwest Forest Plan (which could be used to look at aquatic systems and performance measures at a project level), and the Restoration Strategy. The Forest Service would like to

maintain dialog with the TCFAC and managing agencies, especially with regards to the fire access routes and the USFS three trailheads that originate in the TCF. The USFS would like to work as a neighbor on both the challenges and opportunities facing both TCF and the USFS lands.

- b) **James Schroeder with The Nature Conservancy (TNC)** gave a presentation on the property that they purchased approximately 7 months ago for conservation outcomes. A portion of their acquisition shares a border with the Teanaway Community Forest. TNC purchased the property for conservation and recreation, and are working on a management plan with a target due date of July 2015. They are reaching out to a wide variety of groups and would like to continue to work with the agencies and Advisory Committee regarding conservation and recreation, and other land management activities in the TCF. TNC is interested in meeting community needs as long as they result in conservation outcomes. James is hoping to pursue private/public partnerships that provide opportunities to leverage funding.
- c) **Mitchell Long with Roslyn Urban Forest** provided an overview of the Roslyn Urban Forest and outlined some of their challenges and opportunities as they relate to the TCF. He discussed silviculture practices, recreation and funding challenges. Suncadia deeded approximately 300 acres of forest to Roslyn for conservation and recreational purposes. The Roslyn Urban Forest committee wants to see connections from this land to other recreational opportunities on nearby properties and hopes to coordinate with the TCFAC and agencies.
- d) **Discussion – Q&A.** The AC asked question of the guest presenters.
 - i. Questions regarding travel management - USFS approach to travel management is to look at an area as a whole and address a number of issues at one time (eg., recreation, restoration, aquatics, forest health, fire). Currently doing this in the Swauk. Could potentially do this with the upper Teanaway in coordination with the TCFAC.
 - ii. How did each of the entities form advisory groups – Mitch - when the land was transferred it was mandatory to have a volunteer committee. There are limited funds for management of the Roslyn Urban Forest; funding for improvements comes out of the general budget. Progress is slow because of this. James – TNC coordinates with many existing groups but they don't currently have a formal group. Mary – they participate in many existing groups and would like to participate in some way with the TCFAC. TAPASH is an example.
 - iii. Do the presenters have any concerns regarding the TCF – none of the presenters were worried but the following issues were mentioned: public access, coordination on aquatic projects, user conflicts, too many people for the infrastructure (eg., carrying capacity), Roslyn economic development, funding for restoration, and motorized recreation. All presenters would like to continue participating, especially when discussing recreation.

III. Performance Measures

- a) Overview by Eric Winford. "Performance targets" is basically the early work plan and "performance measures" is what is used to determine the progress we have made, which will be reviewed every year and reflects the objectives.
- b) The AC had some general questions/comments about the document prior to moving through each goal.
 - i. Tom Tebb observed the overlap where one activity ("performance target or performance measure") actually addresses a number of goals and measures.

- Suggested providing a matrix of activity, performance measure and goals addressed.
- ii. There is a lot of repetition with strategies (in each Goal chapter) and performance targets. Targets aren't really targets, they are priority work actions. CHANGE TITLE: TARGET TO PRIORITY WORK ACTION or something similar.
 - iii. Go through the strategies in the individual chapters and use those to develop performance measures and early priority work actions. Need better consistency between strategies and performance.
 - iv. How will this be presented in the public document? – Performance measures will be included by goal, in each chapter.
 - v. Cultural and Historic resources are not addressed in the plan or in performance measures – omission needs to be addressed. Some discussion of adding an introductory section in the plan to address.
 - vi. There are a number of existing plans that already address many of the “performance targets” (work actions) and “performance measures”. Don't recreate the wheel. Example: Temperature TMDL. Data are being collected as part of the process, on 303d list. Target should be meeting the water quality standard. Do this for other measures where plans and policy already exist.
 - vii. Can there be a high level introduction before each set of performance measures? Add one line in title that addresses the objectives or outcomes – agencies will work on this.
 - viii. Don't see any experimental or research oriented focus in performance measures – request to include the cause and effect studies that were discussed in AC input for goals.
 - ix. How realistic are the dates? – the dates are just place holders for now
 - x. AC comment that there are a lot of activities listed in this section. Too many to accomplish. Is there a hierarchy of priorities? – Agency response: This will be addressed at another time, in implementation discussion.
- c) Comments by Goal: The AC provided a number of comments and suggestions by goal and the agencies will provide a new draft of the performance measures for the next meeting:
- i. Goal 1 – add some graphics so it's easier to understand; address sediment here; include an inventory of trails and roads that cross fish bearing streams as a priority work action (previously “target”), use TMDL for temperature issues. Ecology TMDL has a lot of information related to performance measures – build it into the report. Do this with other related plans and processes. Only include performance measures where you can actually measure cause and effect.
 - ii. Goal 2 – are there values (real targets) for specific outcomes or baseline conditions for performance measures; would like to see revenue generation from timber addressed; community issues around forest fires; address partnerships and everyone's accountability; what does “ecological potential” mean; when referring to grazing is this just cattle or other livestock; add other livestock; address economic costs and benefits around livestock grazing; manage livestock grazing to reflect healthy fish habitat; improve grazing conditions (Note: specific language changes on grazing for the agencies). Add performance measure re. cross-boundary actions with USFS, TNC, etc. –

some measure of ability to successfully communicate and coordinate re. fire, forest health.

- iii. Goal 3 – how are you treating performance measures during interim use and before the recreation plan is completed; what activities can be accomplished now before the recreation plan is complete; add enhancements for campgrounds; enforcement is missing (number of contacts, tickets); focus more on access to trail, rivers, recreation areas; track trespassing in interim; where are cultural and historical resources going to fit; what about new trails? Note to add a caveat specifically to goal 3: that the recreation plan will form priority actions. However, the current management plan should have the performance measures. REQUEST for agencies to review Rec version 9.3 and pull performance measures from those strategies. Many are missing here.
- iv. Goal 4 – add redd counts, trends over time (agencies to come up with language); remove “white-headed woodpecker” from Fir Forest title; add migration corridor as a performance measure; Performance Measures are missing from Fish and Wildlife Concentration Areas. Measure vitality, integrity, displacement, and disturbance. See Goal 4 strategies to help develop performance measures. Address what you’re trying to accomplish with the strategy.
- v. Goal 5 – add heading and performance targets; measure funding coming into the forest - activity by activity; successful, collaborative working relationships; number of cross boundary actions and/or projects; agency understands and supports concept of the community to develop a foundation; NGO agencies will work together; consider strategies for goal 5 – build a groundswell of support (broad constituency) to support TCF.

IV. Implementation Topics

- a) Rick Roeder gave an overview of this document; this is a 1st DRAFT and the agencies are looking for high level feedback from AC.
- b) Agencies to re-work the document so it reflects the language in the legislation.
- c) There was a discussion of the future role of the AC - as ambassador advocates for agencies. Request to add function of AC upfront in this section. How many members; are there going to be subsets of the AC sitting on committees addressing various goals (eg., Rec Planning); agencies would like to start with people who are already familiar with the issues and then add people as expertise or other interest group representation is needed. (Note: agencies to address requested additions and language changes to Implementation Section).
- d) Prioritization – AC discussed prioritizing projects based on funding vs. prioritizing goals and how to best address pinchpoints (eg., agency staff limitations). Need to add language to address. Continue to refer to YBIP goals, but also include direct language pertaining to the goals of the TCF legislation.
- e) Adaptive management language – Explain that the plan is a long term management plan but that the performance measures, priority work actions (previously called targets) and targets will be addressed annually as adaptive management. AC to provide replacement language suggestions for adaptive management bullets by Tuesday the 17th.

V. Approach for Addressing Water Rights in Goal 1

Rick Roeder gave an overview of the Teanaway water rights. AC noted that the sum of the water rights is approximately equal to the base flow in Indian Creek and suggested that putting the water rights in trust is appropriate to accomplish watershed goals for the forest. Time did not allow full discussion; water rights will be discussed at the beginning of the next meeting.

VI. Next Steps

- a) February 26 meeting – 3:00 – 8:00 pm: New performance measures, new implementation chapter, water rights discussion.
- b) February 26 – will provide new recreation criteria and planning process version (including social factors) and recreation language for AC review. To be discussed on March 12 with first draft.
- c) First full draft of plan to be provided to AC on March 5th for discussion at March 12th work session.

VII. Public Comments

- a) Lana Thomas Cruse – would like to see that there is a possibility for an amendment for the 11 year plan in case there is some unknown incident that happens.
- b) Lloyd Fetterly – Great project. Going to legislature every year may look like dead weight. An idea of having a non-profit to help is important.
- c) John Dewitt – He is a fan of recreational use in the TCF but not if it is going to destroy the environment; would like to see a balance between environment and recreation even if that means limiting recreational access. Don't let the loudest voices and money overshadow the decision for balance.

Handouts

1. Agenda, February 12, 2015
2. TCFAC Meeting Summary from January 8, 2015 for approval
3. DRAFT Performance Targets & Measures
4. DRAFT Implementation Chapter
5. TCF Plan Review Schedule
6. DRAFT Water Right Principles
7. Water Rights Points of Diversion and Places of Use Map
8. Teanaway Water Rights Schedule Post closing