

# Teanaway Community Forest



Washington  
Department of  
**FISH and  
WILDLIFE**



WASHINGTON STATE  
**Natural Resources**

## Teanaway Community Forest Advisory Committee

### Meeting Summary

November 13, 2014

2:00 – 8:00 PM

#### Advisory Committee Attendees:

Brian Crowley  
Deborah Essman  
Gregg Bafundo  
Jason Ridlon  
Jim Halstrom  
JJ Collins  
Andrea Imler  
Derek Sandison

Kitty Craig  
Martha Wyckoff  
Mike Reimer  
Urban Eberhart  
Wayne Mohler  
Doug Schindler  
Tom Ring  
Gary Berndt

Phil Rigdon  
Mark Charlton  
Jeri Downs  
Reagan Dunn

#### Advisory Committee Members Absent:

Dale Bambrick

#### Agency and Consultant Staff:

Lisa Dally Wilson – Dally Environmental (DE)  
Eric Winford – DNR/WDFW  
Michael Livingston – WDFW  
Sarah Brace – DE Team

Melinda Posner- DFW (breakout facilitator)  
Larry Leach – DNR  
Doug McClelland – DNR  
Todd Welker – DNR (for Rick Roeder)

Staff Action Items		Date Due
DNR/DFW staff	For Roads – As part of the road assessment add value level assessment (address funding and value), also add neighbor/resident road needs into the evaluation in strategy a.-i. Make additional edits. New version to AC for email approval.	11-25-2014
Larry Leach, Phil Rigdon, Eric Winford DNR/DFW staff	For Goal 2a – Forestry - Determine appropriate language changes to Strategy b-ii to reflect management focus on forest structure to support multiple species. Make additional edits per AC input. New version to AC for email approval.	11-25-2014

Eric Winford (DNR)	Eric to provide one page introductions to goals he will use at public meeting as a starting point for introductory pieces for each goal in the plan.	12-5-2014
DNR/DFW staff	For Goal 2b – Grazing – Make additional edits per AC input. New version to AC for email approval.	11-25-2014
DNR/DFW staff	For Goal 3 – Recreation – develop draft list of criteria for recreational use and provide to AC for review prior to Dec discussion	12-4-2014
<b>Advisory Committee Action Items</b>		<b>Date Due</b>
TCF Advisory Committee	Remaining comments or edits on the roads, grazing, forestry drafts from the meeting, please email them to Lisa next week	Friday, November 21

**I. Welcome, Review the Day, Advisory Committee (AC) Business (Lisa Dally Wilson)**

- a) October 9 Meeting Summary approved.
- b) AC Business
  - i. Reminder of Advisory Committee Attendance Agreement – members are expected to attend all meetings barring unusual circumstances.
  - ii. Communication and Participation Agreement (Ground rules) reminder:
    - Agreement to interact respectfully, focus on the issue not the person.
    - Agreement to listen to others, other points of view.
  - iii. There’s also an understanding that if you are representing a constituency, you will work with that constituency to ensure that the information your organization puts out to the public is accurate and respectful to the process.
  - iv. Lisa did not send public comment to you last week. Already have a lot of information to digest and there have been nation requests for public comment sent by the ORV community with links to the Teanaway website. Some national blasts (requests) for public comment have contained erroneous information.
  - v. Eric mentioned he is looking into AC meeting venues closer to Cle Elum and I-90 for winter meetings. Location will be confirmed. There will be two meetings/month in January and February. Call-in is not an option. DNR will provide notification of meeting cancellation due to weather by 9:00 AM of morning of the meeting. Notifications will be made via email if the meeting is cancelled due to weather.
  - vi. Kitty is exploring options for East side/West side video conferencing. Possibly utilize agency video conferencing networks.
  - vii. Public Meeting – Thursday, Dec 4, 5-8 PM. The agencies will presenting current versions of Goals 1-4. Asking public for comments on what’s missing, where we are off track, on track, etc. Will also be asking for feedback on Goal 5 and the Community Partnership piece. (Eric will coordinate with AC members interested in attending the meeting via email)

- viii. "Wild and Scenic River" designation – Eric provided a summary of the designation and discussed the distinction between the National and State Act. Select river corridors within the Yakima River Basin have been proposed for designation. Portions of the North, Middle, and West Forks of the Teanaway River on USFS lands have been proposed by the Yakima River Basin Integrated Water Resource Management Plan. Wild and Scenic designation does not affect water rights.
- c) General Comments/Questions/Updates
- i. Update on a wolf incident. Mike provided an update on the poaching of a wolf from the Teanaway pack provided by the USF&W. Wolves are still protected under the ESA. Animal was discovered on Oct 28. Telemetry collar led to the discovery of the carcass. Female wolf shot in the hind quarters. Call WDFW with any information on this incident.
- ii. Nature Conservancy's land purchase – James Schroeder from TNC provided information about the purchase. On Oct 27<sup>th</sup> TNC announced that they had purchased 48,000 acres from Plum Creek Timber Company. Closing the sale on December 15<sup>th</sup> when they will take ownership. TNC does not have blanket policies around uses (Motorized and otherwise) and is committed to working with the public and community to develop a plan to protect this property. Will look forward to setting up open houses and having conversations. Will plan to do active management – commercial and non-commercial -- starting summer 2015.
- Questions:
- Q: Is there a schedule yet for meetings with stakeholders?  
A: Not yet, these will be set up after TNC closes on the property. Contact James for more info.
  - Q: Do you see long-term transfer of land to reduce checker-board condition?  
A: We'd like to have long-term conservation management. Will explore all avenues, but this land is inside the boundary of the Tapash sustainable forest collaborative.
  - Q: Are there interim plans for management?  
A: What is currently allowed will be permitted moving forward until we have a plan in place. Looking at the agreements between USFS and Plum Creek and through community conversation will develop the plan toward fall 2015.

## II. Roads -- (Todd Welker and Larry Leach, DNR)

- a) Refer to handout in the meeting packet on new draft road management process. This language will replace roads language that currently exists in Goal 1 and 4 objectives and strategies. Roads may be a stand-alone section in the plan.
- b) Todd gave an overview of DNR's road activities in the TCF. 24 gates, still have to fix 11 fish blockages (if we decide to keep those roads where the blockages are located). Currently

approximately 4.1 miles of road/section which contributes 4% of the annual average sediment load to streams (per the 1996 Teanaway Watershed Analysis).

- c) Larry outlined the approach to roads maintenance moving forward:
- i. Assessment of the entire road network. 80% there now. This baseline information includes condition, where problems exist, maintenance cost implications, sediment load delivery potential, etc.
  - ii. Evaluate all roads in inventory based on their impacts. Track what their uses would be over time. Will be able to prioritize where they have the greatest risk to habitat, streams, etc.
  - iii. Identify near and long-term management needs for these roads (i.e. easements, landowner uses, etc.). Figure out which roads to decommission (put it into a low maintenance state and keep it on the books); which roads to abandon (not to be used again, remove culverts, replant, etc.).
  - iv. Look at prioritized list and figure out what tools are needed to fix roads. (Additional culverts, hard surfacing, different fish passage structures, etc.). Examine what this will cost.
  - v. Look at the prioritized list, identify opportunities to help cover cost of road improvements via harvest, grants, etc.
  - vi. Establish a monitoring program to track improvements of habitat and water quality based on road actions taken.
- d) Challenges/opportunities with this process:
- i. Change of ownership – influences prioritization
  - ii. Many fish improvement projects are on Forest Service roads and their permitting process needs to sync up with our grant funding availability. Need to collaborate up front to prepare roads for improvements in these riparian areas.
  - iii. This is a model for the trails system – can use some of these same concepts for evaluating trails.
  - iv. Q: Where is the crossover between a road and a trail?  
A: There are roads that people hike/ride that they call trails, and these can be reduced if only being used by horse and feet.
  - v. Mike L. heard back from the AC that there were not enough specifics about roads. Need to be able to hand off to land managers to do some work. We decided that this would stand alone (vs. embedding it into other goals) so we kept it as a separate goal.
  - vi. Q: Was it agency consensus that fewer roads are better than more? It's a labyrinth out there!  
A: Mike: Our plan is objective-driven decision on what roads are needed and which are not. This prioritization will help us get to what we need.

- vii. Comment: As part of the road assessment add an objective for value level assessment (address funding and value), also add neighbor/resident road needs into the evaluation in strategy a.-i. Agencies agreed to address.
  - viii. Q: We've got the numbers of fish blockages, etc. Were these data ground-truthed?  
A: Larry: 334 miles were driven, etc. Regarding fish barriers: these were modeled and where a road crossed a stream, the pipes were examined to see if they were barriers to fish. That number may be a little higher than reality.
  - ix. Q: Can we add opportunity for capital dollars to the document? Also wondering if there's a way to monitor roads at an engineering level but also for their use (trails, community use). Can we identify objectives for collaboration?  
A: Larry: we are still building the matrix we're going to use. Did include the funding available piece.
- e) Additional comments:
- i. Pleasure driving is highly valued in other forests. Could be revenue resource.
  - ii. Maintenance of roads is key. Needs to be part of the strategy and discussion. Culverts need debris pulled out periodically. There are large rocks on the roads occasionally. Need to be incorporated in the plan – will this be addressed? On tribal land this is a huge issue. Suggestion: Add this to objectives and strategies for roads.
  - iii. There are some incredible models of measuring site specific and cumulative impacts in watersheds (e.g. Yakima Integrated Watershed Plan). Encourage agencies to leverage those resources; TNC tools could be helpful to our process.
  - iv. Next steps: Questions or comments on the roads piece, please make sure you email them to Lisa next week (Friday, November 21) so they get incorporated in the next draft. December: final draft.

### III. Forestry – Goal 2a (All)

- a) Questions and Comments
  - i. Q: Under strategy b-ii: Managing and Maintaining Owl Habitat (Pg 2), there states an Increase the quantity of owl habitat also Increase open space for woodpeckers. These seem in conflict.  
A: Mike DFW: The idea here is to first understand site potential, what is the historic distribution of stand types, then identify potential for owl habitat as well as dry species habitat (other sp.).
  - ii. Comment: Concern about species-specific focus, vs. forest structure. Get more into “what is the current structure of the forest”. Concerned about getting too into the weeds and species.
  - iii. Q: 1993 onward we spend \$\$ on spotted owl, now comes the Bard owl and we have a new issue.

- A: Mike DFW: Spotted owls are called out based on the YBIP. The TCF is a place we can mitigate for spotted owl habitat that is damaged in other areas in the basin.
- iv. Comment: Management focus on forest structure which will change over time, instead of drawing a circle around habitat.
  - v. Larry DNR: Do away with the circles, manage the habitat where it wants to grow, we can move habitat around the landscape and keep both the forest and habitat healthy. That's where DNR is headed. (Phil concurs).
  - vi. Action: Phil and Larry to discuss appropriate language changes to Strategy b-ii to reflect management focus on forest structure to support multiple species.
  - vii. Comment: Missing is the mandate for the state to manage for Spotted owl. Need a better understanding of what the state is required to do to manage these species.
  - viii. Comment: There could be a place for "unknown techniques" for adapting to climate change.
  - ix. Repetition throughout objectives. Doug S provided edits to reduce repetition  
Comment: redundancy should stay until we have an introduction or vision upfront that provides overarching information that is redundant. Decision to leave redundancy until introductory statements are provided. Eric to provide one page introductions to goals he will use at public meeting as a starting point.
  - x. Harvest timber to generate revenue  
Comment: Strengthen revenue generation part of Objective 2. Do we need to add it to all other goals that have activities that can generate revenue?
  - xi. Comment: Confusion about the concept of "net gains"? (Strategy A. 3rd line).  
Agreement to change language to sustainable yield. Include a definition of "sustainable yields".
- b) Vision statements. There was a strong push from the AC to include vision statements (not included in this current version).
- i. Comment: Mike DFW: Not convinced that everyone wants to go through a visioning process. Some kind of statement for each goal may reduce redundancy in language. Didn't want to get side-tracked.
  - ii. AC Comment: Some form of introduction or vision statement sets a boundary of where we want to go for each of these goals; a statement of current conditions, where we want to go, how we want to get there.
  - iii. Agencies welcome AC members to provide key concepts for introduction to goals/vision.
- c) Summary and next steps for forestry:
- i. Redundancy – keep it in for now until some sort of vision or intro is developed.  
Eric: Introductions to each Goal will be shared with the public at the open houses. May meet the needs for the vision statements. One-pager that acts as a summary of the

work we're doing and includes intent of each goal and desired conditions. AC members can provide key concepts to add to this.

- ii. Revenue generation – highlight in this goal (2a) plus all other goals that have revenue generation as well as Goal 5.
- iii. Agencies will work on language regarding 'net gains' and 'sustainable gains'
- iv. Add cross-reference to Goal 4.
- v. Add context of the state and federal requirements that the state is obligated to manage (spotted owl) – so we know what the state needs to do.

#### **IV. Grazing -- Goal 2b (Eric Winford)**

- a) Eric provided an overview of the changes made to the next draft of the Grazing Objectives and Strategies. Many comments were received and substantial changes were made. Pushed to have a stronger focus on protecting the resources (aquatic habitat, riparian habitat, fish habitat) through cattle management. Added a strategy to restrict access to where and when restoration is underway. Added language to recognize that agencies are driving the push to improve infrastructure. Will partner with agencies to fund these. Will use performance measures to monitor impacts and habitat quality such as stream bank condition, riparian area impacts, etc. with triggers for when management actions are necessary to avoid impacts.
- b) Questions and Comments
  - i. Conversation about performance measures –where are we going with that and what changes are needed.
  - ii. Q: Revenue neutral grazing is not mentioned in agency's goals – is this no longer an objective?
  - iii. Lisa: A request was made that this be tracked. Is there other input from AC for revenue neutral grazing condition?
  - iv. Comment: Don't want to put impose so many requirements on cattle grazers to eliminate it.
  - v. Comment: If we are using public \$\$ to support private enterprise, it's important for the public to be informed and for the agencies to answer why. Need to educate the public on where public funds are being used and the benefit. Tracking the cost to provide justification for using public dollars.
  - vi. Comment: there may be benefits that we should track as well.
  - vii. Decision to add as either a performance measure or an objective to "identify the public costs and benefits of grazing in the TCF"
  - viii. Comment: Are we looking at the capacity for grazing? Some of the grass out there looks pretty over-grazed. They exclude grazing in areas to protect meadows. Are we maintaining current practices (see pg 2)?
  - ix. Comment: Strategy A: add "Location" to statement

- x. Comment: From field trips, heard that grazing and riparian areas are mutually exclusive. Are we going to address this in our plan?
  - xi. Response: Adaptive management is how to introduce riparian species that are constant with our goals for those areas.
  - xii. Comment: Mike DNR: Crosswalk with aquatic restoration and grazing. Also riparian habitat and grazing. Need more active management than we've had in the past. Two scales " Broad scale Mgmt" and "Site specific restoration".
  - xiii. Comment: we've lost definition of 'open range'. Worried about trespassing cattle. These are not addressed.
  - xiv. Comment: What's the fencing situation in TCF? Learned that there is a lot of fencing up there, too much? Is there a preference of tools we would recommend?
  - xv. Comment: like to see language about keeping cattle out of private property. Also, adaptive mgmt term is highly redundant and used frequently. There is some confusing language in the document about adaptive mgmt (circular logic/reference).
- c) Next steps for grazing:
- i. Performance measures: cost and benefit to the public of grazing. Benefit to community. Need strong justification for if we're going to spend public dollars on public enterprise and why.
  - ii. End result not clear – are you moving away from the riparian grazing? Clarify that we're not moving forward with current practices.
  - iii. Agencies add: Removal of fences guidance and preferences of tools we'd recommend.
  - iv. Grazing section has not been fully vetted – please review and provide Lisa comments by Friday, 11/21. This is the second go-around on this. We will finalize after comments are received.

## V. Goal 5: Brainstorming session next Steps

Breakout sessions addressed four topic areas with the intention to garner AC input for development of recommendations pertaining to:

- Community Partnerships
- Education and outreach
- Economics
- Enforcement and user management

## VI. Goal 5 Report Back

The AC split into three groups and rotated through four topic areas mentioned above. Education and Outreach, Community Partnerships, Funding, and Enforcement. The facilitators provided summaries of the breakout efforts. The information collected will be compiled and provided to the agencies for use in developing recommendations.



## VI. Recreation (Doug and Mike L.)

- a) Doug (DNR) provided an overview of the current version of Recreation Objectives and Strategies, and Mike (DFW) introduced the concept of criteria that will be used for making decisions regarding recreation use and location of that use during the recreation planning process.
  - i. Q: Regarding comment ‘motorcycle use to be determined’ (strategy i): will we have time to review something to before the public meeting.  
A: Doug: We’ll need a strategy in place before the public meeting.
  - ii. Comment: Address different types of trail experiences separately (eg., hiking experience, mt biking experience, horse riding experience). They seem to have been lumped in this new version. Still value in having some of those things mentioned. See pg. 1. Section 2.II. Separate issues – different types of trails
- b) Doug (DNR) Camping discussion: We need more clarity on camping: we talk about that is a primitive experience (Pg 2 objective 2). Need clarification – what is primitive experience? What types of facilities are needed? What level of experience of camping is appropriate in this forest?
  - i. Comment: The word primitive is misleading. Primitive is not the same as campground experience.
  - ii. Additional comments/suggestions
    - Use term “rustic experience”
    - Provide primitive facilities
    - More defined campsites
    - Campground host? Possible, but not necessarily required
    - No hook-ups
    - Do people pay for camping? If folks need a discover pass to drive up there, they should have a pass to camp.
- c) Mike (DFW) ORV discussion: Recreation criteria that AC would help to develop/refine. Criteria would apply to all recreation uses. Criteria would be applied in future recreation planning process. The ORV discussion is taking place with with AC and also between two agencies. Need some kind of framework for evaluating particular use on the land that considers physical, biological and social values. Draft criteria will be shared with the AC and AC will be able to provide input to the criteria development. Overarching goals of watershed compatibility:
  - Physical criteria
  - Biological criteria
  - Social criteria

- Go through Goal 1 and 4 (physical and biological criteria), then determine whether an area is suitable for other recreation uses. Consider single use and multi-use trail needs and desired experiences.
- Tie performance measures to particular use to see how we're going to achieve compatibility with all the different uses. Will bring draft criteria before the AC prior to December's meeting.

i. Questions and Comments

- Mike L.: an example of a performance measure and adaptive management to address that performance measure: Analyze # of trails with erosion and multiple users. Check back in 6 months -- are we creating a problem with multiple users on erosion? If so, adjust use to diminish erosion.
- Mike L.: Framework and criteria for determining recreation use would be established for the strategic plan (end of June 2015) in the recreation section of the plan.
- Comment: Still want to have the opportunity to do restoration on existing USFS trailheads – opportunity to look at that system (existing FS trails). Request to add this piece to the rec strategy now rather than in Rec planning process.
- Q: Draft of criteria in Dec– will this be available? A draft will be developed for the December meeting.
- Comment: ORV access is driving this. Should separate this into two categories: those uses that have been historically authorized and those that have been historically unauthorized. Additional criteria should be applied to uses that are currently unauthorized given we are considering changing those unauthorized uses to legal and managed ones (eg., more scrutiny is required).

d) Next steps for recreation:

- Move forward with the criteria approach. Instead of having a complete blank for motorcycle use consider (1) adding an objective for ORV use that relies on criteria for evaluation, and (2) developing an objective around USFS trailheads.
- Keep the trail section, evaluation of the trail network will be done with the criteria.
- Lisa summary: Meat on the bones of this document plus the criteria. The details will get ironed out in a much more detailed level in rec planning. Move forward with both criteria + recreation goal

**VII. Public Comments**

Three members of the public provided comment during the public comment period. Public comment is included in the DNR public comment summary.

## Handouts

1. Agenda, November 13
2. TCFAC Meeting Summary from October 9, 2014 for approval
3. Briefing Paper on Wild and Scenic Rivers (11/7/2014)
4. TCF Draft Road Management Process (11/7/2014)
5. TCF: Objectives and Strategies for Goal 2a: Forestry (Draft 7, 10/1/2014)
6. TCF: Objectives and Strategies for Goal 2b: Grazing (Draft 9.2, 11/10/2014)
7. TCF Goal 5 Breakout session questions (Draft of 11/6/2014)
8. TCF: Recreation Objectives and Strategies for Goal 3 (Draft 9, 11/6/2014)