

**Water Typing System Rule Committee Meeting**  
**January 5, 2022**  
Meeting conducted via Zoom Webinar

**Committee Members Present:**

Bob Guenther, Committee Chair and General Public Member  
Cody Desautel, General Public Member  
David Herrera, General Public Member  
Jeff Davis, Director's designee, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Tom Nelson, General Public Member

**Staff**

Marc Engel and Marc Ratcliff, DNR  
Phil Ferester, ATG

**Welcome and Introductions**

Bob Guenther, Committee chair, called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

**Approval of Minutes**

MOTION: Cody Desautel moved to approve the December 14, 2021 meeting minutes.

SECONDED: Tom Nelson

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

**Overview of Additional Spatial Analysis for the Anadromous Fish Floor (AFF)**

Ash Roorbach, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission (NWIFC), provided a brief progress report on the additional analysis requested by the Water Typing Committee (Committee) for anadromous fish floor (AFF) alternatives. He said they are still in the process of completing this work and have not finalized the analysis. Technical team members have not had time to fully review the additional work by Terrainworks. He mentioned that Lisa Belleveau will replace Gus Seixas as a member of the principal investigators group which were tasked with synthesizing and summarizing the additional analysis work.

Dan Miller, Terrainworks, said his company was asked to do some additional spatial analysis work for AFF alternative A4 at 5, 7 and 10%, and develop histograms and PDF maps for the alternatives. He said they extended the AFF up the tributaries for alternative D and alternative 4 based on the alternatives specific criteria (core, stopping distances, barriers, etc.). He said the data being used for comparison is Statewide Washington Integrated Fish Distribution (SWIFD), other anadromy and concurred F/N points.

Miller's presentation of the [additional analysis](#) included an overview of additional histograms and stream maps developed to provide comparisons for each AFF alternative. He described some of the discrepancies given different types of data used. He said it is obvious that as gradients increase, the AFF extends further upstream beyond known anadromy. The new analysis compared how all AFF alternatives compare (extend upstream/downstream) to a SWIFD core, known anadromy, and concurred Type F/N points.

He clarified that their results do not indicate a new water typing model, but simply use the best data available to find the best presumed anadromous fish habitat location. He shared how the false positives and false negatives for each AFF alternative provide a comparison for making a determination for the AFF alternatives. He said he will be providing more PDF maps that visually compare the modeled AFF alternatives to existing anadromy data.

Committee member Desautel asked if the AFF contained an option for electrofishing upstream and downstream from the AFF point.

Committee member Herrera said the goal of the AFF was to identify a point where electrofishing would not occur below the AFF point.

Committee member Nelson acknowledged that the principal investigators have not fully analyzed this yet. He said he is not interested in doing all this work to arrive at a AFF that still requires an interdisciplinary team (ID) team to help define the AFF.

Jim Peters, NWIFC, clarified that the use of ID teams would be used in rare situations, not the norm for beginning the fish habitat assessment.

### **AFF Policy Recommendations**

Jamie Glasgow, conservation caucus, said the technical group met on January 3 and acknowledged that they would have a final additional analysis by the end of this week. Once that is provided, a revised recommendation would be provided by Jan 14. He said the goal is to have the technical member and policy members will further discuss these last analysis outcomes and they would attempt to still provide a recommendation for the February 2022 Board meeting.

Marc Engel, DNR, said the policy members need time to digest the amended analysis and maps to help in their recommendation. He said another Committee meeting would be scheduled for determine potential recommendations. He said the Board is still expecting some sort of recommendation in February – either a final recommendation or a recommendation to continue discussions.

Steve Barnowe-Meyer, small forest landowner caucus, concurred that the technical and policy groups need adequate time to evaluate the analysis changes plus field implementation options and Board Manual concepts for the AFF.

Peters said his caucus is pushing to meet the February 2022 timeline and hopes that redundant reviews of the completed work does not occur.

Chair Guenther thanked all the members working to get this done, but stressed the importance of taking the appropriate time to ensure the AFF is a quality product.

### **Public Comment**

Jim Peters, NWIFC, representing the Western Washington treaty tribes, commented that the anadromous fish floor was never intended to be limited to where known salmon is. It was something to set up where one could presume anadromy or where salmon would be. He said at

the policy level there's been some caucuses that believe a consensus recommendation is unlikely which is discouraging. He encouraged his fellow policy people to make the decision early on if it's not possible. He said their caucus has spent a lot of time in the TFW process trying to reach consensus and never getting there, and in some cases being the Caucus that compromises. Their tribes continue to say "we're going to compromise ourselves out of fish." Without our salmon resources, we are almost at a time to get recovery going.

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

Committee member Nelson suggested the Committee schedule a meeting after the principal investigators and policy group has had time to digest the additional analysis and develop any new recommendations.

Committee member Herrera said the Committee is tasked with providing a recommendation in February. He said the exercise was never to land on what the AFF should be as that decision belongs to the Board. He said he is surprised that the development for the AFF has taken three years. He said this work is simply to look at how much fish habitat is protected at various percentages and could be forwarded to the Board without having implementation issues resolved.

Committee member Davis said he understands that the exercise was for analyzing different AFF alternatives based on fish data and understanding what the effects are on fish. He supports having a recommendation in February.

Chair Guenther requested that the Committee hold another meeting prior to the Board meeting in February 2022. He said this would provide time to digest the new information and arrive at recommendations.

Committee members agreed to hold a meeting on Monday, February 24 at 10:00 a.m..

Meeting adjourned at 3 p.m.