

**Draft Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee Meeting Notes**  
**Thursday, Sept 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2021 // 11:30 am - 4:20 pm**  
**Remotely held using Zoom**

Motions for Sept. 2nd, 2021	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
<p><b>August Meeting Notes</b></p> <p><b>Motion 1</b></p> <p>Steve Barnowe-Meyer (<i>SFLO</i>) moved to approve the August 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting Notes with amendments and with chat box text removed.</p> <p><b>The motion passed</b></p>	<p>Seconded by: Ray Entz (<i>Eastside Tribal Caucus</i>)</p> <p>Up: Court Stanley, Darin Cramer, Jim Peters, Ray Entz, Steve Barnowe-Meyer, Alec Brown</p> <p>Absent: Federal Caucus/ DNR/ DSW</p>
<p><b>Forested Wetland Effectiveness Project (FWEP)</b></p> <p><b>Motion 2</b></p> <p>Steve Barnowe-Meyer (<i>SFLO</i>) moved to approve the Project Charter for the Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project.</p> <p><b>The motion passed</b></p>	<p>Seconded by: Ray Entz (<i>Eastside Tribal Caucus</i>)</p> <p>Up: Court Stanley, Alec Brown, Jim Peters, Ray Entz, Brandon Austin, Steve Barnowe-Meyer, Darin Cramer</p> <p>Absent: Federal Caucus/ DNR</p>

Action Items for Sept. 2nd, 2021	
Action Items	Responsibility
<p><b>Action Item 1 - FP Board Water Typing Request to Policy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-chairs to talk to the FP Board Chair about the Water Typing Strategy request for Policy to take up the PHB and DPC studies for clarification. The new FP Board Chair will be included in the conversation.</li> <li>• Co-chairs will talk with Eszter Munes for updates on the project.</li> </ul>	<p>Co-chairs</p>
<p><b>Action Item 2- FP Board Water Typing Request to Policy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy will form an informal subgroup with the caucuses to work on the issues.</li> </ul>	<p>Caucuses</p>

<p><b>Action Item 3 - SFLO Dispute</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ken Miller will send out a draft of the consensus recommendation on the SFLO Advisory Committee.</li> </ul>	<p>Ken Miller</p>
<p><b>Action Item 4 – SAO Audit Recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work Group to look at SAO Audit Recommendations and look at additional recommendations.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Volunteers:</u> Court Stanley / Alec Brown / Darin Cramer / Brandon Austin and Ray Entz. Steve Barnowe-Meyer added to distribution list.</p>
<p><b>Action Item 5 - SAO Audit Recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Co-chairs to talk with the auditors.</li> </ul>	<p>Co-chairs</p>
<p><b>Action Item 6 - WFPA Smart Buffer</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Put on October Policy Agenda pertaining to CMER’s request for clarification.</li> </ul>	<p>Co-chairs</p>
<p><b>Action Item 7 - Outside Science and PI Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What CMER can do and not do</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Action Item 8 - Ice Breaker</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>October Meeting</li> </ul>	<p>Ray Entz</p>
<p><b>Action Item 9 – Extensive Monitoring</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Email to be sent to the Work Group for confirmation of continuing participation in the group.</li> </ul>	<p>Brandon Austin</p>
<p><b>Action Item 10 -</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relatively Low Impact PI and AMPA recommendation</li> </ul>	<p>Saboor Jawad</p>
<p><b>Action Item 11 -</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Net Gains Definition</li> </ul>	<p>Saboor Jawad</p>

## Meeting Notes:

### Forest Practices (FP) August Board Meeting

Marc Engel (*Policy co-chair*)

Marc gave the following updates from the August FP Board Meeting:

- Policy co-chairs made a presentation to the FP Board on the Type Np buffer deliberations from the Policy Type Np Workgroup meetings.
- The FP Board has requested that Policy present at their November meeting the status of where Policy is with the development of Type Np buffer alternatives which will be turned into recommendations.
- The FP Board requested Policy provide a rule making timeline after the FP Board receives Policy's Type Np buffer recommendations.
- There was an update from Joe Shramek regarding the implementation of the SAO recommendations that were accepted at their May meeting.
- Policy has two recommendations that need to be addressed within the next calendar year and will be incorporated into Policy's work plan. Policy will weigh in on other recommendations that they believe will provide benefit from discussion and additional information.
- The FP Board approved a new voting member at CMER. The FP Board discussed CMER voting membership and requested that Policy discuss this and bring back input to this topic at their November meeting.

Meghan Tuttle asked for feedback from Policy on how they would like to respond to the FP Board request for input to the CMER membership topic.

Darin Cramer noted that if the FP Board is requesting something from Policy the normal procedure is that a motion is passed at the FP Board meeting. He added that if Policy can collectively discuss the issue of CMER membership and provide input to the FP Board they should do that because this was a concern brought forward from Ray Entz. Jim Peters noted that for the FP Board to request something from Policy they need to consider how this impacts our schedule and budget and make it clear to the FP Board that Policy can't always make a decision in the timeline they are requesting. Ray Entz noted that he didn't remember this being an assignment from the FP Board but rather a note that if Policy had a concern about CMER membership they should bring their recommendations back to the FP Board meeting in November. Marc Engel noted that when the FP Board gives us an assignment it should be the result of a motion. Jim Peters noted that this is definitely a discussion to have. We need to discuss the CMER voting membership and that it could grow to 25 voting members and whether it should be restricted to one or two CMER voting member per caucus. Saboor Jawad noted that this discussion is part of the SAO recommendation concerning decision making models that needs to be addressed by both Policy and CMER.

Marc Engel noted that there was one last request from the FP Board to Policy and no motion was made on this.

- The FP Board requested that Policy discuss the status of the PHB validation and Default Physical Criteria Assessment (DPC) studies and bring back a report for the November meeting. He noted that these studies are being developed under the guidance of the FP Board and not Policy.

### PHB and DPC Study Request Discussion:

Darin Cramer noted that no guidance or oversight has been provided by anybody on the science for these studies. He added that Study Plans are being developed on this for a rule making that is ongoing and he is interested in having a discussion on this and giving it more attention than what the Board has done. Ray Entz noted that the FP Board requested that CMER ask ISAG to give them an update on the status of the studies. Meghan Tuttle noted that the studies are not currently funded in the MPS. Court Stanley noted Policy created a short report that indicates to the FP Board that they need to talk to CMER. Jim Peters noted that Policy had asked for an extension from the FP Board and the FP Board denied the request and the studies are now in CMER with oversight from the FP Board. Eszter Munes noted that CMER will be providing the Board an update in November and wondered if they are requesting additional information. She noted that CMER has been providing quarterly updates to the FP Board, including an updated charter and project management plan.

Action Item – In order to get clarification about Policy’s role in taking up the Water Typing Strategy request from the FP Board, the co-chairs will talk to the FP Board Chair. The co-chairs will include the new FP Board Chair in the conversation. The co-chairs will have further discussions with Eszter Munes about updates on the studies. The co-chairs will also discuss the workload that Policy is currently undertaking with regard to adding additional requests to this from the FP Board.

Darin Cramer suggested Policy should consider the option of having the caucuses meet informally to work on the water typing issues. Jim Peters noted that Policy voted not to fund the water typing studies because it would have taken two-thirds of the biennial budget. He added if Policy decides to take this up again we need to deal with it quickly. Steve Barnowe-Meyer noted that the water typing process is broken and if Policy takes this up again we need to get the principals together and work our way through this as a primary task.

---

## **Welcome, Introductions, & Old Business**

Meghan Tuttle (*Policy co-chair*)

### **Updates**

- Tom O’Brien (State Caucus) is not attending today’s meeting and Ecology has his vote.
- Marc Engel is not attending the afternoon portion of the meeting. DNR is listed as absent.

### **Introductions**

Saboor Jawad introduced himself as the new AMPA to Policy.

### **Caucus Updates**

#### SFLO Caucus

Ken Miller noted that WFFA has put through a proposal initiation from the SFLO Advisory Committee for following criteria for defining the term “relatively low impact” to the SFLO and invited comments from Policy.

### Westside Tribal Caucus

Jim Peters noted that his caucus needs to start their legislative updates and added that they would like some advance notice from the other caucuses for any updates. Jim requested that Ken Miller send out the SFLO proposal initiation for them to review again. Saboor Jawad noted that he is working on the SFLO proposal, has scheduled meetings, and will hopefully have this back to Policy at the October meeting.

### Eastside Tribal Caucus

Ray Entz asked that the caucuses get their priorities in early for the legislative updates.

---

### **Meeting Notes:**

Steve Barnowe-Meyer (*SFLO*) moved to approve the August Meeting Notes with amendments and chat box comments removed. Ray Entz (*Eastside Tribal Caucus*) seconded the motion. **The motion passed.**

---

### **Policy Collaboration / Accountability**

Meghan Tuttle (*Policy co-chair*)

Meghan noted in the spirit of the CPEACE training she would like to discuss how to better understand ways we can improve accountability in Policy.

### Eastside Tribal Caucus

Ray Entz noted that we need to go beyond our task recommendations from the SAO report and take up some of the functional and structural issues and hopefully have a process with results. He added that his caucus is committed. He noted that even if compromise and collaboration may not be the best for an individual caucus on a specific issue, as a group we have to move forward.

Meghan Tuttle asked if there was a structure or process that Policy can model that was successful and better than what we have.

### Eastside Tribal Caucus

Ray Entz responded he was not sure there was a better model but there was a consistent model that has worked in the past. He added that the closest process he knew of was the Columbia Fish and Basin Wildlife Authority which has been disbanded. He noted that from his experience when groups begin not to feel heard it will unravel what they are working on. He also noted that when the benefit of the whole is not felt by all this can also unravel the collaborative. He added that his caucus is at that tipping point. He noted that the facilitator for CPEACE resigned, which she had never done before, and that is a strong indicator of where we are at.

### SFLO Caucus

Ken Miller noted that his caucus is certainly at a tipping point but that they are committed to see this through. He added that his constituents are unhappy and discouraged with our progress. He noted that when Forest and Fish first started everyone was very candid about their issues and biases and it worked well. He added that our group should move in that direction to make more progress.

### Western Tribal Caucus

Jim Peters noted that there are some examples of processes like Policy's and if you go back to the beginning of TFW in the first 5 to 10 years it worked well because they had Policy meetings that involved members who were principals, administrators and science-based. He added that when Forest and Fish started it was about listed species and that changed the game with bringing in new members that were not always active. He added we have some resource issues and from the standpoint of the people he represents it is challenging to look at proposals that don't recognize the impacts to the resources. He added that it is important to get rid of the false perceptions and have conversations about our common goals and include the principals. He added that some of his caucus feels that their comments and concerns aren't recognized or being heard at CMER and if there was true accountability that might change. He noted that there will always be some economic impact to the landowners and we have to look to lessen that impact. He noted that the benefit of TFW was that everyone was involved in setting up the ground rules.

### County Caucus

Court Stanley noted that in the beginning of Forest and Fish, caucus members played golf together and fished together which created trust. He noted that some teams function and some don't and the key factor in a high functioning team is trust. He added that COVID prevents us from meeting in person but he sees a level of trust within our group even though we meet virtually. He added that we can have those tough conversations and hold ourselves accountable.

### Large Owner Landowner Caucus

Darin Cramer noted that the system has always been challenging with structural and principal changes. He noted that there are different people here with a different understanding of where we came from and why they are here. He added that in the past there were decision makers at the meetings and even when they became involved in serious arguments after the meeting they would go out together to play golf, fish, or just have drinks which created trust. He added that they could have heated debates without compromising their relationships because of the established trust and they appeared to have more of a unified vision which he noted our group has lost. He added his caucus is committed to work with everyone.

Meghan Tuttle noted that we clearly know of things we need to do to build relationships and trust by meeting in person, having field trips, etc., but she asked the group if they feel they need to spend more time on the perception issue or on the TFW programs and why we are here.

### Conservative Caucus

Alec Brown noted that he thought it was a good idea to have an informal hangout after the meeting. He added that the system was set up formally and we look at the formal structure of the system to solve the problem which doesn't necessarily lead to social gatherings. He added that as Policy members we need to be more assertive with our principals and we need to be empowered.

Meghan summarized some points:

- We are moving in a good direction with hiring a facilitator.
- There is a potential of creating some informal social meetings.

- Policy members should get authority or get the principal at the table for decisions.
  - Policy will look at the perception issue.
- 

## **TFW Policy SAO Audit Recommendation Actions**

Saboor Jawad (*AMPA*)

Saboor gave a summary of the SAO recommendations and actions that are required:

- The SAO audit report recommendations that pertain to CMER and Policy are # 5 and #6.
- On SAO recommendation #6, the FP Board expects option papers from Policy and CMER by November 2022.
- The FP Board expects a recommendation from Policy for option 5 (a net gains option) in May 2022.
- The FP Board expects progress updates from AMPA every six months. This update is due in November meeting of the FP Board
- Saboor requested Policy form a work group on these two recommendations and wondered if a joint workgroup with both CMER and Policy was an option they would consider.

Meghan Tuttle noted that Policy is wondering about the “net gains” definition. Saboor Jawad noted that the audit report when referring to “net gains” was looking at a means to develop a win/win scenario and to bundle more projects together for decision making. He added that he will bring more clarity on the “net gains” definition to the next meeting.

Jim Peters noted that in the past DNR explained “net gains” as combining projects together. Court Stanley interprets “net gains” as every caucus getting a gain out of a decision. Ken Miller noted that his interpretation was that in each step of the process there was a gain somewhere. Darin Cramer noted his interpretation was that it referred to the packaging of projects. Steve Barnowe-Meyer noted that he interprets it as meeting the needs of all involved which rarely occurs. Jim Peters suggested Policy ask the auditors for their definition or have the auditors come to Policy to discuss this.

Meghan Tuttle suggested that Policy could approve a definition of “net gains” to help the Work Group and asked for volunteers for the Work Group.

The following volunteered for the Work Group: Court Stanley, Alec Brown, Darin Cramer, Brandon Austin and Ray Entz with the intent to go beyond the two assignments and to tackle process improvements and accountability.

---

## **Forested Wetland Effectiveness Project (FWEP)**

**Decision:** approve FWEP Charter

Eszter Munes (*DNR*)

Eszter noted that the FWEP Project Charter was presented in July to Policy but was not approved because of differences in the language between the Charter and the CMER Work Plan and was sent back to WetSAG. She added that WetSAG aligned the language for the objectives and critical questions with the FWEP Chrono sequence Study Design and that other, less substantive changes were made for clarity.

---

Steve Barnowe-Meyer noted he appreciated that the Charter was improved and clearer.

Steve Barnowe-Meyer (*SFLO*) moved to approve the Project Charter for the Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project. Ray Entz (*Eastside Tribal Caucus*) seconded the motion. **The motion passed.**

---

### **Extensive Monitoring Follow-up**

Brandon Austin (*Chair of the CMER/Policy Work Group*)

Brandon gave some highlights:

- Brandon will continue as chair if Policy agrees. Policy members agreed at the meeting to have Brandon continue as Chair.
  - The Work Group is discussing recommendations and working through the AMPA to get a plan going forward on how this project gets to CMER and is incorporated into the MPS.
  - It is important to have some cost estimates and priorities for the budget committee.
  - Brandon will send an email out to the Work Group to see who is still interested in participating.
- 

### **Dispute Resolution Facilitator**

Meghan Tuttle (*Policy co-chair*) / Saboor Jawad (*AMPA*)

Meghan and Saboor gave some updates:

- A Work Group has been formed but they have not met yet.
  - Marc Engel, Meghan Tuttle and Saboor Jawad are working on the draft contract that will be shared with the Work Group.
  - The Scope of Work is being developed.
  - There will be a timeline to advertise and interview applicants.
  - They are hoping to have someone hired by the 1<sup>st</sup> week of December.
- 

### **CMER Update**

Jenny Knoth (*CMER co-chair*)

Jenny gave the highlights from the CMER meeting on August 24<sup>th</sup>.

- Glen Merritt gave a presentation to CMER on the “Watershed Health Monitoring for Statewide Status and Trends”.
  - CMER approved the Soft Rock Chapters 1, 2, 3 and 4 and the next step is the Executive Summary and Six Questions Document that they are working on.
  - The Hard Rock Six Questions is still being worked on.
  - CMER is waiting to hear an update from Policy on Extensive Monitoring.
  - CMER reviewed the WFPA Smart Buffer study design and a Dispute Resolution Process was invoked. The AMPA and CMER co-chairs are going to meet to discuss the Dispute Resolution and next steps and will report back to CMER in September.
-



- In reference to the WFLPA Smart Buffer Design, CMER needs to understand what Policy needs from them in this process.
- The SFLO review had some disagreements but they came to an agreement to work on bringing back a memo to Policy hopefully by October.
- The Road Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project is moving along well.
- CMER is bringing in interesting topics for their science sessions.

#### Smart Buffer Design Discussion

Darin Cramer noted that he thought that Policy had asked CMER for a technical review of the Smart Buffer Design proposal. Alec Brown noted that Policy has not discussed this project for a year and half and we need more advance notice to respond to CMER's request for what Policy is asking them. Jenny Knoth noted that she would request more clarifying information from CMER to submit to Policy.

Ray Entz noted that the Smart Buffer project is not a CMER project and if we were just asking for a review it might have been better to send it to ISPR. He added that there is no process for outside science and CMER is not equipped to deal with these requests from Policy and we need to figure a better way to request these reviews by CMER.

Jenny Knoth noted that outside science is something to be used and relied on. She added that it is important to use outside science in the Adaptive Management Program and how to use the various forms of outside science that is presented to them.

Brandon Austin read the Policy motion from the June 2020 meeting to give clarity to the question being asked by Jenny Knoth. The motion read *“Accept the Washington Forest Protection Association (WFLPA) Smart Buffer Proposal Initiation (PI) and direct to CMER for review of the draft study design.”* He also read from the notes from the June 2020 Policy meeting *“Mark Hicks began by reviewing the documents sent to Policy. He stated that it is up to Policy to decide whether or not the AMP has the resources to deal with this and also consider the impact it would have on staff and other resources. If accepted, this would be sent to CMER, after which it would be prioritized for review. Hicks stated that this would be treated as if it had been generated internally – there would be more than one CMER review and a guided decision-making process. This could take an undetermined amount of time to get through CMER.”* Brandon added Policy needs to come up with better questions and direction to give to CMER and be clear on what response we want from CMER.

Darin Cramer noted that this is about the PI process and outside science and the interpretation of what that should be is the real issue.

Ken Miller noted that maybe the problem is that there is no clear definition of how CMER responds to outside science proposals. He added that it might have been more effective or accepted to have done this in house as opposed to having an outside contractor.

---

#### **Conclusions and Action Items:**

The Policy motion and action items were reviewed.

---

**Recap of the Np Discussion Meeting Action Items from September 2<sup>nd</sup> (held in the morning before the Policy Meeting)**

Action Items	Responsibility
<p><b>Action Item 1 -</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Informal subcommittee to interview Facilitator and discuss Facilitator prerequisites</li> </ul>	<p>Meghan Tuttle /Darin Cramer/ Steve Barnowe-Meyer / Court Stanley / Marc Engel /Saboor Jawad</p>
<p><b>Action Item 2 -</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop potential alternative Type Np buffer recommendations from caucuses</li> </ul>	<p>Caucuses to think about alternate buffer configurations and next steps and maybe even potentially draft some proposals. Caucuses to talk to each other informally between meetings to move forward with the process.</p>
<p><b>Action Item 3 -</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discuss the Work Group Report – discuss alternatives</li> <li>Caucuses to let the team know what they would like more information on.</li> <li>Team to obtain more information on the rule making process.</li> <li>Team to meet and organize a summary of the presentation.</li> </ul>	<p>Team: Jim Peters / Darin Cramer / Steve Barnowe-Meyer</p>
<p><b>Action Item 4 -</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stream Information</li> </ul>	<p>Darin Cramer will bring information to the next meeting.</p>
<p><b>Action Item 5 -</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PI Presentation on economic impacts will be put on the agenda for one of the next two meetings.</li> </ul>	<p>John Ehreinreich</p>

---

The meeting was adjourned.

---

**Future Policy meeting dates:**

- October 7<sup>th</sup>
- November 4<sup>th</sup>
- December 2<sup>nd</sup>

## **Attendees:**

### **Conservation Caucus**

\*Alec Brown (WEC)  
Chris Mendoza (CMER co-chair)

### **County Caucus**

\*Court Stanley  
Kendra Smith (Skagit)  
Paul Jewell

### **Large Industrial Landowner Caucus**

\*Darin Cramer (WFPA)  
Doug Hooks (WFPA)  
Meghan Tuttle (Weyerhaeuser/ co-chair)  
Joe Murray (WFPA)

### **Small Forest Landowner**

\*Steve Barnowe-Meyer (WFFA)  
\*Ken Miller (WFFA)  
Jenny Knoth (WFFA/CMER co-chair)

### **State Caucus**

\*Brandon Austin (ECY)

### **Westside Tribal Caucus**

\*Jim Peters (NWIFC)  
Ash Roorbach (NWIFC)  
Mark Mobbs (Quinalt)  
Scott Schuyler (Upper Skagit Tribe)

### **Eastside Tribal Caucus**

\*Ray Entz (Kalispel)

### **Adaptive Management Program/CMER Staff**

Saboor Jawad (AMPA)  
Lori Clark (DNR)  
Marc Ratcliff (DNR)  
Teresa Miskovic (DNR)  
Eszter Munes (DNR)  
Mary Colton (DNR)