

Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee
August 6, 2015 Meeting Summary

Decisions and Actions from Meeting

Decision	Notes
1. Approved the July 9 meeting summary with edits.	Consensus by all caucuses present
2. Approved CMER recommendation to continue Dr. Moskal's project to study design phase.	Consensus by all caucuses present
3. Approved the policy statement on the re-direction of ENREP TWIG (see page 6).	Consensus by all caucuses present
4. Approved the proposal to convene an electrofishing technical group.	This proposal was tentatively approved at the July 9 Policy meeting, pending a vote from the eastside tribal caucus. At this meeting, the eastside tribal caucus voted sideways.
5. Policy's next meeting will take place on September 10 and 11 instead of September 3.	Consensus by all caucuses present

Action	Assignment
1. Draft a job description for Co-Chairs. Caucuses are welcome to email ideas.	Adrian Miller with Dick Miller and Mary Scurlock
2. Send input on the Type F Matrix to Chris Hanlon-Meyer (copy Adrian and Hans).	All caucuses, if desired
3. Send the off-channel habitat proposal initiation by August 14.	DNR
4. Circulate Dick Miller's proposal on risk tolerance to Policy. Caucuses can send Adrian any input on this proposal.	Adrian Miller & Chris Hanlon-Meyer

Welcome, Introductions, & Old Business – Adrian Miller and Chris Hanlon-Meyer, Co-Chairs of the Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee (Policy), welcomed participants and led introductions (*see Attachment 1 for a list of participants*). Policy reviewed the agenda, at which point Co-Chairs proposed moving a few later agenda items earlier until the internet connection was improved for screen-sharing.

Announcement: Co-Chair Chris Hanlon-Meyer has taken a position at the Department of Ecology Air Quality Program. This is his last Policy meeting; his last day at DNR will be August 14 and his first day at Ecology will be September 1.

Extensive Vegetation Remote Sensing Pilot Project

Presentation on feasibility of remote sensing tools for pilot project

Dr. Monika Moskal, Associate Professor of Remote Sensing at the University of Washington School of Environmental and Forest Sciences, presented a literature review on the feasibility of applying remote sensing to a riparian stand conditions assessment for the Riparian Scientific Advisory Group (RSAG).

This literature review, conducted between April and June 2015, is intended to inform a Riparian Forest Extensive Monitoring pilot project that would provide Policy a scientific basis for characterizing the status of riparian forests. She also provided Policy with a memorandum from RSAG with an overview of the problem statement, recommended study approach, and research proposal for Policy's consideration.

Dr. Moskal first gave a brief overview of three remote sensing tools including aerial photography, satellites, and LIDAR. Her research compared these tools' accuracy, speed, and price in measuring 13 stand metrics including hydrology, canopy height, crown diameter, snag detection, canopy percent cover, stand density, conifer/deciduous classification, species, vegetation class, age, basal area, diameter at breast height, and large woody debris. The desired results would be balanced among all three remote-sensing techniques for any given stand metric. Her presentation ended with the following recommendations for Policy:

- A pilot project should encompass methods highlighted in yellow and green in the 'summary matrix table' identified during the presentation.
- The pilot should not include methods based in interferometric synthetic aperture radar (ifSAR) and Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) data due to data availability and poor resolution, respectively.
- National Agriculture Imagery Program (NAIP) data analysis is highly desirable in the pilot because of the spatial and spectral similarities of NAIP data to high resolution satellite data. Although the NAIP results are yellow, this is partially due to the lack of published research using these type of data.
- Because the availability of stereo NAIP data varies, the approach in the pilot should only be explored if existing data are already available; no new data should be flown.
- A location that already has most data available should be utilized in the pilot study, as acquiring new data can delay the analysis for up to a year and significantly increase costs due to data acquisition.
- A location with field data available is ideal, and if no field data is available the pilot will need an adequate field data campaign to capture the range of variability of the 13 metrics, which needs to be used to drive the empirical models for some of the variables and for accuracy assessments.

Based on questions from caucuses, Dr. Moskal clarified or added the following:

- She has not looked at pictometry data sets because there are few publications on how to use pictometry. Pictometry is different than traditional remotely-sensed data because it is taken at an oblique angle and can be more time consuming to use. However, pictometry is useful for canopy assessments and when it can be overlapped with areas that have had a lot of data collected – particularly field data.
- The problem with doing a research scale pilot is the lack of statewide datasets. It is possible that drones and satellites can help with these statewide datasets in the future.
- There is no clear plot size that works best for a pilot project – it depends on plot conditions and the sensing technology used. For example, survey grade GPS data tends to require larger plots. Stand Management Coop would be great for a pilot project however it does not currently have a lot of LIDAR data. In general, the more data the better the pilot project will be.

Other discussion on this presentation included the following points:

- Caucuses commented that this was one of the best CMER presentations they have seen.
- A caucus requested that future project memos for Policy include members of the research group.

Decision: Policy voted to approve the CMER recommendation to continue the project to study design phase.

Updates

Forest Practices Board (Board) meeting topics

Marc Ratcliff recapped what the Board would discuss at its August 11 meeting. The August Board meeting is traditionally a chance for all groups to report to the Board. The new Board Chair is trying out a new agenda format.

Policy will ask the Board to approve the newly-revised Section 16 of the Board Manual which contains amendments from the stakeholder review that just ended and continuation of the delivery assessments through October. The hope is to finish this in four meetings and to schedule a field review to test how the Manual presents the assessments and methods.

Other agenda items will include:

- A Cultural Resources Roundtable report and a Policy report;
- A presentation from the U.S Fish and Wildlife Service about barred owl control measures;
- Discussion about the Board's progress on a 2016 work plan; and
- Nomination of a new CMER member brought forward by the AMPA. It was noted that all voting CMER members need to be approved by the Board and that the new CMER Co-Chair is not a voting member. It was also noted that Mark Hayes will be a CMER voting member and will take a vacant seat.

Status of off-channel habitat proposal initiation

The AMPA noted that he is waiting to receive the off-channel habitat proposal initiation, which Marc Engel is finalizing. Off-channel habitat is specific to Type F waters. To implement the rule it is critical to know where to start the riparian buffer (which is related to bankfull width). The Forests and Fish Report states that bankfull width is measured at approximately the 1.5-year flood event level and this is one of the key variables, along with drainage slope, that determine off-channel habitat. A lot of effort goes into the rules around this although it is difficult to write these off-channel habitat rules with total clarity. This proposal initiation addresses Board motions to date pertaining to off-channel habitat, and is the start of a full review based on Forests and Fish Report, HCP, rules, and remaining scientific uncertainties.

Discussion on this proposal initiation included the following points:

- The AMPA cannot respond to a proposal initiation request until he receives one. The AMPA will receive the off-channel habitat proposal initiation by the August Board meeting.
- Policy is considering more input than usual at the front-end of this proposal initiation. This will be a DNR proposal reflecting significant input from Policy. The process being followed for this off-channel habitat proposal is accurately following the process outlined in the Board manual.

- If the proposal initiation is delivered to Policy within a reasonable timeframe then Policy should have an opportunity to review it before its September meeting. A caucus noted it is possible the proposal initiation will not be ready for review before the September Policy meeting.
- A caucus noted that the small landowner caucus had to go to the Board in order to get priority consideration from Policy. Another caucus noted that the off-channel habitat proposal was already top priority work which is why Policy was discussing it before sending it to the AMPA.
- Policy will be prepared to take action based on Board recommendations on the proposal initiation at Policy's September meeting.

Procedure for Identifying Policy Co-Chairs

This was a follow up item from a previous meeting about whether Policy wanted to develop a more formal Co-Chair nomination procedure than there currently was. The AMPA began by reviewing CMER Co-Chair requirements and nomination procedures as a potential model for Policy's procedure. The CMER Protocols and Standards Manual outlines the requirement for CMER Co-Chair terms, roles and responsibilities, notice for unfulfilled terms, desired skills, and ways to deal with multiple candidates. Voting CMER members nominate Co-Chairs and terms are for two years.

Policy discussion on this procedure included the following points:

- The latest CMER Co-Chair nomination process took several months but was well spent and ensured potential Co-Chairs understood expectations of the role. A caucus noted that Co-Chair rotations are important since it is a significant time commitment.
- Policy discussed a caucus's concerns about whether Co-Chairs should also be able to vote on behalf of their caucus. A caucus suggested the ideas of 1) a Co-Chair potentially voting when they are the only member of their caucus, and 2) increasing participation grants for co-chairs. The Co-Chairs clarified that Policy does not make decisions about participation grants and that it is fair to recognize further discussion may be needed about this if the only barrier to Co-Chair participation is compensation.
- A Co-Chair noted that he is starting the conversation among caucuses about taking a more top-down approach to reaching out to caucus principals regarding their commitment to the program.
- The following ideas summarize the input from caucuses on the issue of identifying Co-Chairs:
 - 1) A Policy Co-Chair job description is an important tool for recruitment.
 - 2) Policy should consider the length of Co-Chair terms and the amount of flexibility Co-Chairs should have. A two year time commitment was considered a reasonable timeframe. There were different opinions about the reasonableness of forced Co-Chair rotations.
 - 3) Concerns were expressed about whether Co-Chairs should be able to vote at Policy meetings. It is up to all members to look out for perceived bias at Policy meetings.
 - 4) If the only barrier to Co-Chair participation is financial, then the program may consider participation grants.
 - 5) Consider keeping options open to allow Co-Chairs to renew their position.
 - 6) Consider how to prepare for planned and unplanned Co-Chair transitions. Policy should reach out to other potential caucus principals about any interest they have in the Co-Chair position.

Decision: Adrian Miller will draft a Co-Chair job description with input from Dick Miller and Mary Scurlock. Other caucuses are welcome to offer their input as well and can email their input to Adrian.

Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness Program (ENREP)

Review current status of ENREP

The AMPA invited ENREP TWIG members Rick Woodsmith, Greg Stewart, Howard Haemmerle, and Bill Ehinger to speak about redirection of the TWIG's research. The TWIG was asked to study if prescriptions found in the Type N Riparian Prescriptions Rule Group are effective in achieving their performance targets and water quality standards in Eastern Washington. The TWIG needed Policy to clarify some of its directives around harvesting prescriptions in the study design. Greg Stewart gave a presentation outlining the TWIG's request to:

- 1) Not test elements of the rules which Best Available Science (BAS) strongly suggests are unlikely to result in meeting performance targets;
- 2) Not test resource elements that have previously been adequately tested; and
- 3) Validate elements of the rules in widespread use, which based on BAS appear to have a high likelihood of being effective.

The TWIG's presentation included data showing relationships between change in riparian shade and stream temperature as a function of buffer width. The TWIG considered many factors like strength of study designs, BAS, robustness, and ability to sample for the questions. The previous direction from Policy was unclear what factors to consider in conducting this study. The TWIG considered whether it should focus on breadth or depth of research and whether it is necessary to test buffers at all ranges.

Policy discussion on this issue included the following points:

- It may be important to understand the effect of buffer widths on temperature for streams of different widths.
- A few caucuses noted their support of the TWIG's review of BAS in determining which riparian buffer treatments to test. These caucuses noted the TWIG should already have the leeway they are requesting in designing studies based on BAS because they felt the Policy direction was simply to consider evaluating a wide range of treatments; it is okay that the TWIG's review of BAS indicated that a narrower range of treatments is the relevant scope for the ENREP study. Another caucus noted that they believed the direction from Policy was binding.
- Several caucuses noted that existing BAS doesn't always consider the full breadth of potential prescriptions, which is why experimental prescriptions are appropriate, desired, and allowed in the AMP.
- Policy must be very careful when providing any language in a study proposal that could potentially lead to misinterpretation of the study design by a technical group.
- A caucus noted that they are looking for a wide range of treatments to evaluate a broad response to differing buffer widths, while others want to understand the effects of a narrower range of treatments. Also, it is a Policy question to determine whether this will be an experimental study (evaluating prescriptions outside of rule) or an effectiveness study (evaluating the rule performance). Policy must decide if it will guide TWIG toward one or the other or give the TWIG room to choose.
- A caucus noted there have been times when Policy has not provided adequate guidance to CMER. The concern is if Policy is not specific enough about critical questions needed for management decisions and is not clear about providing them, time can be wasted arguing over what Policy wants. A key question is how much guidance is necessary to provide CMER.

- Policy discussed whether there was room for an increased budget if it wanted to expand the study later. A Co-Chair noted that the budget was already approved for this study but Policy could discuss arguments for why more money would make sense.
- The TWIG should continue conversations with landowners about planning harvest units for the study.

A Co-Chair summarized key takeaways from Policy's discussion. Policy sounded open to considering some balance between effectiveness monitoring and experimental design. Most would not support an experimental design that fully tests the wide range of buffer-width gradients.

Decision: Policy approved re-direction of the ENREP TWIG through the following statement:

Policy retracts previous guidance to the ENREP TWIG and provides the following:

- *Recommend that ENREP TWIG determines the effectiveness/experimental study design based upon BAS.*

Electrofishing Technical Group

The AMPA gave an overview of the Electrofishing/Protocol Survey Technical Group's upcoming work. The focus of this group is on evaluating elements of the Board motion including site specific impacts and minimizing use of electrofishing. The AMPA hopes the group is comprised of qualified biologists who use protocol surveys and have demonstrated expertise with electrofishing. He also wants solution-oriented people who can think of outside-the-box ways to address the two Board motions on this issue. The group will brainstorm relevant topics around the Board motion, draft a literature review white paper, determine how questions, topics, and ideas around the Board motion fit within the Type F matrix, and develop a recommendation addressing the Board motion.

The group will meet for the first time prior to the September Policy meeting to develop a purpose statement and consider questions and ideas posed by caucuses. The first meeting will be based around the availabilities of group members. The AMPA expects that group members would initially commit to two meetings per month and hopefully do some work outside of the meetings. Depending on the number of questions generated about the Board motion, this group could finish its work within one or a few months. The AMPA noted that caucuses can attend but should not actively participate in the group's meetings.

Discussion on this issue included the following ideas:

- A caucus questioned the idea of the electrofishing technical group developing its own purpose statement. Typically, Policy would define a clear purpose statement for one of its subgroups so that the right questions were being answered that would adequately and appropriately inform Policy. A Co-Chair and the AMPA clarified that the purpose would be largely guided by section 1a on the Type F Matrix. A Co-Chair clarified that Policy needs good ideas on how to solve problems around section 1a, and if a good idea comes out of this group the decision about how to implement that idea will come out of Policy. The AMPA added that this group will develop recommendations that Policy can adopt or not.
- The AMPA clarified that the electrofishing group will focus on technical questions about the Board motion – not policy questions.

- Policy should have a direct line of communication with the electrofishing group. Policy will consider whether certain electrofishing issues require Policy discussion. It will be an iterative process.
- A caucus noted that if a future issue for technical consideration is borderline within the scope of the electrofishing group then the group should take it on. Policy might also need some direct conversation with the Board Chair about the role of the group.

Decision: Policy followed up on the initial decision made at the July 9 meeting (*the conservation and westside tribal caucuses voted sideways and all other caucuses voted “thumbs up”*. *The eastside tribal caucus representative was absent from the meeting so Policy agreed to wait...*). At the August meeting, the eastside tribal caucus voted sideways to convene the electrofishing technical group, and thus the group will move forward.

Type F Pathway Matrix Review

Review updated matrix from Co-Chairs

Co-Chair Chris Hanlon Meyer presented a matrix intended to 1) act as a crosswalk between Board motions and Policy actions, 2) illustrate steps and timeframes necessary to implement Policy actions, and 3) capture additional issues not addressed in Board motions. He explained the Type F Pathway Matrix is adaptable based on several types of input and is not meant to be a specific plan. It is an internal Policy communication tool to show the Board how Policy is moving forward on the Board's motions. The current form of this matrix is based solely on the Co-Chair's interpretation with a color scheme demonstrating different Type F activities. For example, the peach color indicates where Policy has a decision to move forward and the yellow color represents likely final outcomes from work on those decisions. The Co-Chairs have received several comments from caucuses on this matrix and the AMPA and Co-Chairs will consider how to incorporate this input and present the Matrix to the Board. Chris might capture comments and questions about each cell using the “comment” feature in Excel.

Policy will further consider and add to this matrix at its September meeting and look at specific actions on Board motions. Policy might need discussion at the September meeting on timeframes for each task.

Discussion on this issue included the following ideas:

- A caucus stated that Policy still needs to consider how to use this matrix to integrate electrofishing, physicals, off-channel habitat (OCH), and maps. The caucus noted that the Board meeting agenda item mentions additional direction on the Type F work and questioned whether Policy wanted to ask the Board anything specific about this. A Co-Chair clarified that Policy is not asking the Board for more guidance on issues captured in the matrix – particularly since Policy does not currently have a purpose statement or timeframe for the electrofishing group.
- A caucus urged Policy to fill in matrix details and particularly timelines as soon as possible. A Co-Chair clarified that this matrix will help Policy take control back from the Board and address Board motions in a comprehensive way.
- The Co-Chairs noted that they would ensure that the Board had the latest matrix information at the August 11 meeting.

- A caucus noted that if Policy is creating a second technical group on the physicals then it seems that Policy would not start deliberating on recommendations until all of the technical information was delivered on physicals and electrofishing.
- A caucus noted that this matrix is very helpful although there is a lot of work that has to be done on the physicals as well as details around the maps, particularly map updates. This caucus also suggested that Policy consider how to evaluate options related to each Board motion.
- The AMPA noted that it does not seem necessary to wait on the electrofishing group's input before moving onto physicals. Also, it would be helpful to know what specific map and modeling needs are soon so they can be incorporated into the matrix.
- A Co-Chair cautioned Policy about taking on too much at once since a lot of the work on these Board motions will take place outside of Policy meetings – particularly when there are so many unknowns. Subgroups will form later for addressing specific tasks.
- A Co-Chair mentioned there may be one technical group to start, with more added later. It was clarified that a second technical group's work might need to start while the first group's work continues (staggered but concurrent work). The AMPA added that each technical group may require different members and few people have skills that overlap with these groups. Another caucus noted that many of these technical components do involve the same people (individuals may have knowledge and experience with many of these topics).
- A caucus questioned the number of technical groups that the Co-Chairs and AMPA can handle at once and also questioned the technical group timeframes. A Co-Chair cautioned against guessing right now about the timeframes for these technical groups' work.

Policy will continue to get as much feedback as possible on this matrix and verbally describe feedback on this. Caucuses can send input on the Type F Matrix to Chris Hanlon-Meyer but copy Adrian and Hans.

CMER Update

- This was Mark Hick's last day as CMER Co-Chair. Policy thanked Mark for his service and welcomed Doug Hooks as the new CMER Co-Chair.
- An overview of the latest CMER meeting:
 - Dr. Monika Moskal presented her literature review on remote sensing, similar to the presentation that Policy received.
 - The ENREP TWIG presented on issues affecting its study design.
 - Doug Hooks was nominated as CMER Co-Chair.
 - An update was provided on the deep-seated landslide literature review.
 - An update was provided on the EWRAP (Eastern Washington Riparian Assessment Process). One of EWRAP's technical staff will identify key issues for its final report.
 - The Forested Wetland Effectiveness Monitoring TWIG gave an update on its progress. It is working to finalize objectives and move onto Policy by the next CMER meeting.
 - The Unstable Slopes TWIG is on hold pending project managers figuring out a way to pay for pro-bono experts serving on the TWIG.

Discussion on the CMER update included:

- The importance of money management, for both CMER and Policy. Policy also discussed the appropriate role for Policy in budget discussions and its role in managing CMER project

budgets. The AMPA explained that DNR project managers will check in with project teams monthly to determine what may be on track, what savings may be possible, what they have left to spend, and whether or not other projects may be ready to move forward if money will not be spent. The AMPA envisions that this discussion should happen within CMER and then between CMER and Policy. Policy could get a project prioritization list from CMER and those projects could be ready to go when money is available. Overall, the budget and project prioritization has to make sense for both CMER and Policy. A caucus added that Policy should start thinking about the need for alternative projects as a contingency.

- LWAG is moving forward on developing the first part of salamander study.

Review July Draft Meeting Summary & Action Items

Policy made two edits to one bullet point from the July 9 Policy draft meeting summary and no changes to the existing edits.

Decision: Policy approved the July 9 meeting summary with edits.

Next Steps

Policy reviewed action items from the meeting.

Other discussion points:

- Policy may have a social event between the August and September Policy meetings, or between the two-day September Policy meeting.
- A caucus mentioned that, beginning in September, Rich Doenges will be the new Ecology caucus representative.

Decision: Policy's next meeting will take place September 10 and 11.

Attachment 1 – Participants by Caucus at 8/6/15 Meeting

Conservation Caucus

Chris Mendoza
*Mary Scurlock

County Caucus

*Kendra Smith, Skagit County

Federal Caucus

*Marty Acker, USFWS

Industrial Timber Landowners (Large)

Doug Hooks, WFPA
Adrian Miller, Olympia Resource Management
Co-Chair
*Karen Terwilleger, WFPA

Non-Industrial Timber Landowners (Small)

*Dick Miller, WFFA

Others

Hans Berge, AMPA
Bill Ehinger, Ecology
Greg Stewart, DNR
Rick Woodsmith, ENREP (phone)
Howard Haemmerle, DNR
Evan Lewis, Triangle Associates

State Caucus – DNR

*Marc Engel, DNR
Chris Hanlon-Meyer, DNR, Interim Co-Chair

State Caucus – Ecology and Fish & Wildlife

*Mark Hicks, Ecology
*Terry Jackson, WDFW

Tribal Caucus – Eastside

Marc Gauthier, UCUT (phone)
*Ray Entz, UCUT

Tribal Caucus – Westside

Mark Mobbs, Quinault Indian Nation
*Jim Peters, NWIFC
Curt Veldhuisen, SRSC (phone)

Attachment 2 – Ongoing Priorities Checklist

Priority	Assignment	Status & Notes
Type N	Type N policy subgroup	Caucuses encouraged to talk offline.
Type F	Policy	Policy completed the off-channel habitat field trips and now is discussing both electrofishing and off-channel habitat to respond to the February 2014 Board motions.
Unstable Slopes	Policy	Board accepted Policy's recommendations; now DNR and UPSAG are working on implementing those recommendations. UPSAG is hiring a contractor to do a literature review.
Adaptive Mgmt Program Reform Rule Changes		Accepted by Board at August 2013 meeting, CR-103 process initiated. Implemented initial changes at November 2013 meeting, will tweak changes for subsequent meetings.
Ongoing CMER reports reviewed by Policy	Mark Hicks & Todd Baldwin, CMER Co-Chairs	CMER Co-Chairs to give update(s) as needed at Policy meetings; AMPA to give quarterly reports for when CMER studies to come to Policy

*This table notes the Policy Committee priorities that were sent to the Forest Practices Board and any other major topics or issues that arise during the year.

Attachment 3 – Entities, Groups, or Subgroups: Schedule and Notes

Entity, Group, or Subgroup	Next Meeting Date	Notes
TFW Policy Committee	September 10 and 11	
CMER	August 25	
Type N Policy Subgroup	TBD	
Type F		To be addressed at regular Policy meetings.
Forest Practices Board	August 11	
Small Forest Landowners Template Subgroup		