

Timber, Fish and Wildlife Policy Committee

Thursday, April 7, 2022 // 9:00am – 3:14pm

Dispute Meeting 3:15pm – 5:18pm

Remotely held using Zoom

Motions	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
<p>February 2022 Meeting Notes</p> <p>Motion: Steve Barnowe-Meyer moved to approve February 2022 meeting notes, as amended.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Court Stanley</p> <p>Up: Ray Entz, Steve Barnowe-Meyer, Court Stanley, Jim Peters, Rachel Baker, Darin Cramer, Marc Engel, and Brandon Austin</p>
<p>March 2022 Meeting Notes</p> <p>Motion: Steve Barnowe-Meyer moved to approve March 2022 meeting notes, as amended.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Darin Cramer</p> <p>Up: Ray Entz, Steve Barnowe-Meyer, Court Stanley, Jim Peters, Rachel Baker, Darin Cramer, Marc Engel, and Brandon Austin</p>
<p>Extensive Monitoring</p> <p>Decision: Approve Extensive Monitoring: Policy to CMER Questions</p> <p>Tom O’Brien moved that TFW Policy forwards the extensive monitoring request as outlined in the edited workgroup memo to CMER to scope a landscape scale extensive monitoring project to collect data to understand status/trends of key indicators and provide context for ongoing and future prescription scale studies</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Darin Cramer</p> <p>Up: Steve Barnowe-Meyer, Marc Engel, Jim Peters, Brandon Austin, Court Stanley, Cody Thomas, Darin Cramer</p> <p>Sideways: Rachel Baker</p>

Action Items	
Items	Action
COVID Protocol	Send out COVID protocols for in-person meetings before meet, part of mailing.

Policy Calendar Invites	Send Policy calendar invites beyond June to all Policy members. They appear on my calendar for the rest of the year
Update from UPSAG co-chairs	On study prioritization and progress. (should have a written update by next Policy meeting)
MPS	Online workspace scope of work will come to policy from AMP staff
MPS and Budget Meeting	Friday the 15th of April MPS and Budget Meeting 8am-9am for fiscal year of biennium (same mailing for today, unless substantial changes)
SAO Recommendation – Net Gains	Couple hours for May Policy Meeting
Science Review of AMP	May Policy Meeting

NOTES

Updates:

In-person meetings will start June 2022, scheduled June – December in the same conference room that was used prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. Brandon Austin, will meet with Saboor Jawad (AMPA) and Natalie Church (Administrative Assistant) in late April/early May to do a walk-through of the building and conference room. There will be the capability for hybrid meetings.

Jim Peters, requests to have a COVID-19 protocol sent out with the June 2022 TFW Policy mailing.

Marc Engel discussed a possible travel to Eastern Washington in October. Meghan Tuttle asked to potentially hold the first Wednesday and Thursday in October.

Caucus updates:

Steve Barnowe-Meyer stepping down from TFW Policy at the end of May 2022. SFLO is currently looking to fill this position.

This will be Ray Entz’s last full Policy meeting and will finish the current dispute resolutions. He will be stepping aside from regular business.

Jim Peters discussed the Lorraine Loomis Act and how it is implemented in moving forward. He urges TFW Policy members to attend those meetings to get insight. Westside tribes are wanting to mirror TFW Policy as much as possible while going through the process. They are discussing establishing a standard and then discussing how the standard gets implemented. He also mentioned that there was a chance of a lawsuit and that the Western Washington Tribes are not part of that and that they adhere to the TFW Policy process. Western Washington Tribes are trying to schedule a meeting with the public lands commissioner to make sure that it is clear that they are not threatening a lawsuit.

Darin Cramer stated that Jason Callahan is leaving WFPA and gone to work with Green Diamond. Looking for a Government Relations Director.

Staff Updates:

Saboor Jawad mentioned that the CMER Eastern WA Scientists interviews will be concluded in April.

RCS Add-on:

Saboor Jawad reviewed RCS Add-On Proposal that was sent out in the mailing. The AMPA Request Memo summarizes the discussion in CMER. CMER received a proposal from RSAG to add additional treatments to the existing RCS Study Design. It was not clear if the RCS Add-on proposal was a Policy priority. Last month CMER passed a motion requesting AMPA to facilitate this question for Policy with the current version of the proposal. CMER wanted to know if the additional treatments included Add-on proposal is a priority for Policy for the AMP as well as if the CMER approval of the RCS Study Design captures the full scope of treatments that Policy would like to have investigated. The Add-on proposal that was sent out in the mailing was not approved by CMER. CMER did approve the existing ISPR-approved Study Design for RCS, which was sent out in the Policy mailing. CMER could possibly continue technical discussions on the RCS Add-on should Policy determine it to be a priority. The priority is the question for Policy to add to the MPS because of the expenses and it also alters the scope of the RCS study. Saboor Jawad reviewed the RCS Add-On: Purpose and Feasibility of Adding Treatments to RCS Study Design document.

Eastside Tribes are not in support for RCS Add-On proposal, if it is approved they will be invoking a dispute. Some reasons for that is that they do not approve the RCS Add-On study as it is designed, there is effect on the water temperatures, and the study could be done somewhere else besides a Type F stream. Eastside Tribes will not support any work on the eastside on a Type F Streams. They do not support additional expenses that will cause harm from a budgetary perspective. Conservation caucus echoes most of Eastside Tribes' comments. Industrial Landowners discussed the different steps that Policy was involved. The project was originally set as the Eastside as the default for this project and discussed the possibility of making it a statewide project. Policy asked if CMER could create Study Designs for both option 1 and option 2 primarily for budgetary reasons; option 1 was ultimately chosen. As a technical perspective this could be a good idea as it could help the accuracy and precision of the results. Ray Entz is concerned about the concept of the original Study Design.

Lori Clark explained the ISPR comments were to do a field trial for a few reasons, the complex nature of this study, and would help refine the budget. Field trial, however, isn't a condition of ISPR approval.

Ray Entz stated that the project is not the same as it started. Finding a different site could be beneficial and he would support that. He is not against the Study Design, the concern is that if it is done on a Type F stream, then the tribes are not in support because it is a known negative impact.

Meghan Tuttle: Questions to answer for CMER:

- Whether the treatments included in the Add-on proposal are Policy priority for the Adaptive Management Program (AMP)
- Whether the CMER approved RCS Study Design captures the full scope of treatments that Policy would like to have investigated

Meghan Tuttle stated that this was just an initial discussion on what we want to send back to CMER. The next meeting for us to craft and come up with what we would like to give back to CMER.

Jim Peters, Westside Tribes, explained that he stands by the decision made for the original study, just not able to approve attaching the Add-Ons to that: he has similar concerns as Ray Entz.

Ecology is still in support of the original RCS Study and would like to have clarification on implementation on Type F streams. His Add-On study concern is making sure that it included the whole width of options and feels neutral on the add-on.

Ray Entz stated in the chat "a possible travel to Eastern Washington in October. Meghan Tuttle asked to potentially hold the first Wednesday and Thursday in October. the easy response from us is No on full Add-On for as a Policy priority - 1st Q of the ask. And the second Q is we have unresolved concerns over Type F stream impacts to gather canopy data on ES Type F streams down to 25 feet. All this is tied to budgetary concerns and the fact that rule validation studies are required to be completed by 2030. That is only 4 biennia out and the first 3 are shown as a deficit currently... A pilot study is likely going to show the project costs will skyrocket based upon implementation issues. We could suggest that the field trial be about the operational feasibility and costing on an upland and not a riparian site. That will give us the data necessary to understand the potential budgetary impacts to the full study. The MPS will need to be very specific to not get voted down today."

Steve Barnowe-Meyer with Small Forest Landowners agrees with Ray Entz's "operational suggestions" above for the field trial, not needing to occur along streams.

Extensive Monitoring:

Brandon Austin reviewed the Extensive Monitoring document that was sent out in the mailing. He explained that the group is hoping to have an open dialogue with CMER about Extensive

Monitoring. The group did not develop a problem statement for this. Discussed that the purpose is to start filling in some gaps in the information that we already have related to the original program expectation.

Ray Entz stated that they approve moving forward with Extensive Monitoring document to CMER and the budget line to support it in 2023, but we need to find budget room in 2024-2025 Budget (and beyond) to continue supporting this effort into the future as an important part of the Program.

Discussion about if there needs to be a problem statement or not.

Rachel Baker with Conservation explained that there would be a benefit from a clear problem statement. What has changed and what will we do with this information? If this goes to CMER they could have the same issues as Policy and the problem statement could give more clarity as we go on.

Marc Engel with DNR explains that he still has questions around a problem statement and criteria on how we are going to collect data and interpret the results. Suggests to keep workgroup together to refine this to address concerns of Policy if we are serious about this and want to move forward with Extensive Monitoring. Okay to approve with MPS and budget as long as the workgroup continues to work on this. Brandon Austin with Ecology states that it sounds like we are requesting CMER to help guide us. Hoping to dial in on what are the options of doing the extensive monitoring, the cost benefits? How can we come up with a problem statement? Difficult to come up with a problem statement.

Jim Peters from the Westside Tribes explained that if there is agreement that we don't have a problem statement we need to remember that is what we did. There isn't going to be a question on what the problem is. Make sure to put in a lot of effort here so if something procedural happens we are able to confirm. Need to document that is the route that we took. Not willing to stop this moving forward. Just want to make sure to document that we collectively decided that we chose not to create a problem statement.

Jenny Knoth explained that we need to understand what a problem statement is and what a testable hypothesis is to be able to understand Extensive Monitoring.

There were live updates done to the Extensive Monitoring Document.

The motion was given by Tom O'Brien.

Friendly amendment from Cody Thomas:

- What is the distribution of stream temperature in Type F and N streams across FFR regulated lands, and how is the distribution changing over time as the forest practices prescriptions are implemented?
- For Type F and N streams, what is the status of riparian stand condition; e.g. stand structure, large wood present (contributing to pools and stream morphology), and shade.

- What is the variation in stream temperature distribution on FFR regulated lands compared to non-FFR regulated lands?
- What other questions can we answer with this data?
 - For example: Are there cost efficient add-ons can we implement, such as amphibian presence/absence (eDNA)?
- Which of the resource targets are able to be collected from various remote sensing options (LIDAR, Landsat imagery, etc...)

Statement from Marc Engel with DNR in the chat "Policy agrees to forward the extensive monitoring request to CMER to scope a landscape scale extensive monitoring project to collect data to understand status/trends of key indicators and provide context for ongoing and future prescription scale studies"

Tom accepted the friendly amendment to motion to attach the workgroup memo as amended.

MPS Review:

Marc Engel emphasized that while we have the discussion around the MPS we need to keep in mind that the MPS needs to be approved before the May FPB meeting. It will be too late if we do not do so this month. If it is not approved today another meeting will need to take place to approve the MPS and associated budget to present to the FP Board. Another thing that we need to discuss, which has been a large part of today's discussion, is the MPS that we are looking at today is the second year in this biennium and the associated budget. We need to prepare the MPS to present to the Board at their August meeting for the next biennium. What this means is we need to be thinking in terms of a completed MPS for us to review and approve by the June meeting with July being the fallback at the very latest. We need to be mindful of the next few steps.

Saboor Jawad reviewed AMPA memo that was sent out in the mailing which has the updates for the MPS. He then reviewed the MPS Excel spreadsheet line by line.

Jim Peters commented on LiDAR with the understanding that the governor is going to increase LiDAR statewide. What to make sure that we have full coverage on that. What was signed and what was not signed (talk about next time brought up in a meeting).. Marc Engel with DNR explained that WGS is the keeper for all of the LiDAR data for Washington so there is money there but the timing is an issue and they were trying to fill in the holes of the MPS. Greg Stewart also explained that they are using more federal lands this summer so we will be piggy backing on existing WGS contracts.

Darin Cramer, with Industrial Landowners, wanted to make sure that people are aware that there are savings now but most likely will not be moving forward because of some delays and that some of these savings can be rolled over to next fiscal year.

Darin then asked a series of questions on MPS budget lines:

He asked if there was going to be an update from UPSAG and Lori Clark explained that UPSAG is planning on presenting an update to CMER and are willing to present an update to Policy but not able to bring forward a workshop at this time. UPSAG would be able to give an update most likely in June or July which is after they present to CMER.

Darin asked a question about the CMER technical editor line and a discussion followed about the technical editing budget item and how it has not been used recently. Saboor explained that this budget item is not only for technical editing but will most likely be used as a statistical support, the latter being part of an SAO recommendation. Darin asked about the current status of West Side Type F project and inquired about cost elements for this project in the amended MPS. Saboor responded that West Side Type F exploratory report is significantly delayed but on its way to CMER for review and approval. Policy will then receive the package and that additional costs are to assemble a project team for a BACI design. Darin inquired whether BACI was part of the plan or should it be a Policy discussion once the exploratory report is delivered. Darin's questions also led to a discussion on ETHEP project budget. The costs – as explained by Lori – are for a PI to conclude study design elements and for site selection work in the field. Darin also inquired about the status of Water Typing Saboor responded that there is a PHB Study Design in review at CMER; which may still need to go through ISPR review. Part of funding is for a statistician currently working with ISAG for statistical support and for site selection field work that'll serve both PHB and DPC

Approval needs to be done by April 25, 2022. Meeting was scheduled for April 15, 2022 to approve the MPS and associated budget.

SAO Audit Recommendation (Net Gains):

Saboor presented each of the six options in the Options Paper SAO Recommendation # 5: Adopt a Net Gains Model for Project Planning that was sent out in the mailing.

It is important to emphasize what these are potential options for Policy to further develop and will not be implemented right away. The Board is not accepting or approving these changes and these will not be reflected in the Board Manual or in the rules right away. This Option Paper lists six items that Policy will need time to discuss to develop further and gives a background of each item for the Board to let them know that this is the current thinking.

Rachel Baker with Conservation expressed concern about the statement of “only “win-win” agreements in which all parties see more gain than loss should be completed.” Saboor Jawad explained that that statement is from the State Auditor's office and that the program's four goals are now also listed in the options paper. Rachael also pointed out that the option on dispute timelines need to align with the Settlement Agreement of 2012. A cross-walk with the settlement agreement would be needed.

This document, if accepted by Policy as-is, will be delivered to the Board as options as points that Policy is thinking about. The cover memo will clarify that these are not a request to approve these changes in the Board Manual it is only what Policy feels Net Gains can be for Policy.

Meghan Tuttle mentioned the implementation timeline and asked if there is enough time to complete this. Saboor Jawad responded that as long as there is an effort from all Policy members

it could be completed in time. Meghan suggested to possibly change it to TFW Policy evaluation and leave out specifics at this time.

Steve Barnowe-Meyer encouraged participation from CMER but all the while looking at the firewall.

Darin Cramer expressed his concerns on how some of the topics are described in this Options Paper. It may be beneficial to make them more general and less detail under each of the topics. He explained that he would typically avoid doing that but it might be what needs to be done to get this completed. Court Stanley agrees to keep it general. Saboor asked if we keep details just for Policy and more general with the Board do we collapse to cover memo for the board.

This topic will be continued at the May Policy Meeting.

Current State of Dispute:

For the record, the dispute over the PI for Type Np Buffer Basin GIS/FPA Project was concluded in stage ii with the industrial caucus withdrawing the PI and dispute with the concurrence of other disputing parties. The mediator will prepare and share a final report.

CMER SAG Updates:

Jenny Knoth gave a brief update for each project listed on the CMER SAG Updates document that was sent with the mailing for the meeting.

Attendees by Caucus

Conservation Caucus

*Rachel Baker (WEC)
Chris Mendoza (CMER co-chair)

County Caucus

*Court Stanley
Kendra Smith (Skagit)

Large Industrial Landowner Caucus

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

Small Forest Landowner

*Steve Barnowe-Meyer (WFFA)
*Ken Miller (WFFA)

Jenny Knoth (WFFA/CMER co-chair)

State Caucus

*Brandon Austin (ECY)

*Tom O'Brien (WDFW)

Darric Lowery (WDFW)

Westside Tribal Caucus

*Jim Peters (NWIFC)

Ash Roorbach (NWIFC)

Mark Mobbs (Quinault Indian Nation)

Eastside Tribal Caucus

*Ray Entz (Kalispel)

Cody Thomas (UCUT)

Adaptive Management Program/CMER Staff

Saboor Jawad (AMPA)

Lori Clark (DNR)

Anna Toledo (DNR)

Alexander Prescott (DNR)

Jenny Schofield (DNR)

Natalie Church (DNR)

Jenelle Black (CMER Science Staff)

Greg Stewart (CMER Science Staff)

DNR Staff:

*Marc Engel (DNR/Co-chair)

Tracey Hawkins (DNR)

Public:

Jacob Hibbeln (Triangle Associates)

Alex Sweetser (Triangle Associates)

*Voting member

Ray Entz stepped away at 11:00AM and returned at 2:08PM

Cody Thomas stepped in for Ray Entz while he was away

Tom O'Brien stepped away at 9:30AM-10:00AM

Court Stanley stepped away at 11:30AM-12:30PM

Kendra Smith stepped in for Court Stanley while he was away