

## DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

**Forest Practices Division** 1111 Washington St SE Olympia, WA 98504

**360-902-1400** FPD@DNR.WA.GOV WWW.DNR.WA.GOV

## **MEMORANDUM**

April 16, 2021

TO: Forest Practices Board

FROM: Mark Hicks, Adaptive Management Program Administrator

SUBJECT: Master Project Schedule Proposed for FY22-23

The purpose of this memo is to transmit the draft Master Project Schedule and associated budget for the 21-23 biennium for your consideration of approval.

The TFW Policy Committee passed the 21-23 biennium MPS at their April, 2020 meeting. Ray Entz, the Eastside Tribal representative, voted down the MPS based on concerns with three studies.

The majority of the TFW Policy Committee is requesting your support for the MPS and its associated revised budget for FY22 and FY23 (columns M and O). A memo from Ray Entz explaining his concerns is being provided separately to the Board.

Summary of the Master Project Schedule (MPS) for the 19-21 Biennium:

- The MPS submitted to the Board shows the cost allowances approved by the Board in August 2020 alongside our current estimates for these projects. Changes are highlighted by yellow cells.
- The current 19-21 biennium ends on June 30, 2021. We expect to close out this current biennium with only about \$50,000 of our project funds remaining unspent.
- At the May 2021 Board meeting we need authorization for expending funds in the 21-23 biennium, beginning July 1, 2021.
- At this time, both the Senate and House budgets provide \$16.1 million for the adaptive management program. This amount covers our funding needs and corresponds to your funding request from August 2020.

- Changes to the MPS and the associated budget since your August meeting are unremarkable overall:
  - o No new projects have been added or removed from the MPS, and the projected cost of research projects for the 21-23 biennium increased by less than \$20,000.
  - o A new line item (line 20) is included to provide \$45,000 each biennium to help hire a mediator to help try to resolve disputes.
  - Only about \$50,000 is left in the contingency fund (line 14, column M) after accounting for estimated project costs.
  - o Moving forward into the 21-23 biennium, we are projecting full use of the allotted project funds.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me (<u>mark.hicks@dnr.wa.gov</u>, 360-902-1909).

The ESTG Caucus is in non-consensus with portions of the MPS budget as presented to the Forest Practices Board on 12 May 2021 by the TFW Policy Committee. While we recognize that this is out of sequence and not likely to affect the transmission of the MPS to the Forest Practices Board, we were not at the Table when this budget was approved. Our issues have been long standing and identified in previous MPS budgets over the previous 7 plus years. Many letters identifying these issues have been sent to the AMPAs, FPB Chair, FPB, and Commissioner with little to no action taken to resolve them.

We are also concerned with the impacts to the budget in the long term by prioritizing projects that are not meeting the HCP or FFR rule effectiveness and will likely never be used for rule adjustments. As we start to consider funding extensive and intensive monitoring, there is literally no room in the budget to be able to engage in those important next steps in the Program or complete effectiveness monitoring on remaining rules (especially on the eastside).

## We are in non-consensus with projects prioritized on lines 40, 47, 56 of the MPS budget spreadsheet.

Line 40 – Amphibians in discontinuous flowing Np reaches. Our principal concern is prioritizing single species/guild projects in front of rule effectiveness projects. There are still several rules that have yet to be tested for effectiveness and we are in year 22 of the FFR AMP implementation. "Nice to know" or "want to know" projects should not be prioritized over the "need to know" projects.

Line 47 – Riparian Characteristics and Shade Response. The cost of this study has continued to increase significantly and based on a recent RSAG request; this study is down to studying a single variable at a cost exceeding \$1 million. Consistent with previous discussions in 2018, we have again pointed out this study could be done on non-fish bearing streams or upland forests. The current AMPA (original author) and some members of CMER feel the only way to complete this study is by degrading riparian habitat on Type F and Np streams up to 25' BFW. The east side tribes find these impacts from buffer reductions unacceptable and inconsistent with current state riparian protection policy (especially considering offers have been made to alleviate those concerns). Our non-consensus for this project can change if the eastside portion of the study is either removed, or the study design is changed to eliminate impacts to Type F buffers.

Line 56 – Hard Rock Phase III. This study is another response-based extension to a project that seems to be never ending. We disagree that (CMER and Policy) approvals for this project remain valid. That said, the PI for the project did indicate that this question has already answered in that no data to date has shown that amphibian genetics nor demographics have been impacted over the long term in very intensively managed watersheds. We feel this study needs to move into future potential projects. It is also another example of a "want to" or "nice to know," versus a "need-to-know" project.

1	Master Project Schedule and Budget for the Adaptive Management Program	The first column of each FY-Column-Pair reflects the August 2020 Board Approved MPS values.												
2	MPS last approved by Board August 12, 2020	The second column of each FY pair are used to show revised costs estimates												
3	Yellow highlighting indicates new or revised cost estimates. Updated 3/30/21													
4	Expenditure	Approved	Revised	Approved	Revised	Approved	Revised	Α						
	Expenditure	FY2022	FY2022	FY2023	FY2023	FY2024	FY2024	F						
_	Advisionation and Dunamous Staff													

Yellow highlighting indicates new or revised cost estimates. Updated 3/30/21	Annroyad	Povised	Approved	Povisod	Annroyad	Povisod	Annroyad	Povisod	Approved	Povisod	Approved	Revised	Approved	Revised	Approved	Povisod	Approved	Povisod	Approved	Povisod	Approved	Povisod	Approved	Povisod	Approved	Povisod	Approved	Revis
Expenditure	Approved FY2022	Revised FY2022	FY2023	Revised FY2023	Approved FY2024	Revised FY2024	Approved FY2025	Revised FY2025	Approved FY2026	Revised FY2026	Approved FY2027	FY2027	Approved FY2028	FY2028	Approved FY2029	Revised FY2029	FY2030	Revised FY2030	Approved FY2031	Revised FY2031	Approved FY2032	Revised FY2032	FY2033	Revised FY2033	Approved FY2034	Revised FY2034	Approved FY2035	FY20
Administration and Program Staff																												
rogram Administration (AMPA and Contract Specialist)	262,200			339,95	0 346,749	346,749	346,749	346,749	353,684	353,684	353,684		360,758	360,758	360,758	360,758	367,973	367,973	367,973	367,973	375,332			375,332	382,839	382,839	382,839	
Administrative Assistant <i>(supports TFW Policy &amp; CMER)</i> Project Support (3.75 Project Managers)	96,300 616,200	96,30	96,300 00 616,200	96,30	98,226 0 628,524	98,226 628,524	98,226 628,524	98,226 628,524	100,191 641,094	100,191 641,094	100,191 641.094	100,191 641.094	102,194 653.916	102,194 653,916	102,194 653,916	102,194 653 916	104,238	104,238	104,238 666,995	104,238 666,995	106,323 680,335		106,323 680,335	106,323 680,335	108,449 693,941	108,449 693.941	108,449 693,941	
Full time CMER Scientists at the NWIFC (Up to 4 staff: Ecologist, Geologist, Riparian, Wetland)	495,126	495,12	<mark></mark>	521.00	1 554,355	554,355	579,844	579.844	735.467	735.467	748.338	748.338	761.434	761,434	774,759	774.759	788.317	788.317	802.113	802,113	816,150			830,433	844,965	844,965	859,752	
CMER Scientist Eastside (NRS 4)	177,100	177,10	177,100	177,10	0 180,642	180,642	180,642	180,642	184,255	184,255	184,255	184,255	187,940	187,940	187,940	187,940	191,699	191,699	191,699	191,699	195,533		195,533	195,533	199,443	199,443	199,443	3
Independent Scientific Peer-Review	69,525	69,52	.5 69,525	69,52	<mark>5</mark> 71,611	71,611	71,611	71,611	73 <i>,</i> 759	73 <i>,</i> 759	73 <i>,</i> 759	73,759	75,972	75,972	75 <i>,</i> 972	75 <i>,</i> 972	78,251	78,251	78,251	78,251	80,599	80,599	80,599	80,599	83,016	83,016	83,016	ز
Information Management System Updates		4,00	00	4,00	0	4,000		4,000	)	4,000		4,000		4,000		4,000		4,000		4,000		4,000	)	4,000		4,000		
CMER Conference (Facility, refreshments, programs)	(		5,000	5,00	0 10,000			5,000	)	0		5,000	0	0		5,000	10,000	·····		5,000				5,000				
Contingency Fund for Projects  TEW Policy Committee Facilitation (on call contract)	100,000	50,16	164,410	)	100,000	100,000	45,492	45,492	100,000	100,000	0	C	100,000	100,000	0	0	100,000	100,000	0	0	100,000	100,000	0	0	100,000	100,000	C	4
TFW Policy Committee Facilitation (on-call contract) Technical Editor (on-call contract)	•••••								·																			<b>A</b>
Policy Committee Non-CMER Initiatives																												
Type Np Workgroup (Collaborative Research Allowance, Direct Buy, & Enhanced Participation Grants)																												<b>x</b> aaaaaaaa
AMP Principals Facilitation (Center for Conservation Peacebuilding)																												
Dispute Resolution Mediation Contingency Funds		45,00	<mark>)0</mark>			45,000		***************************************		45,000				45,000				45,000				45,000	<mark>)</mark>			45,000		
Research and Monitoring Projects																												
Hard Rock Lithology- Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project - Temperature Monitoring (Report extended data)	15,000	15.00	0																									
Hard Rock Lithology- Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project - Extended Amphibian (Analysis & Summary Report)	15,000	15,00	0						<b></b>																			<i>A</i>
Soft Rock Lithology -Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project - (1) Monitoring ends fall 2017, 2-yr post-harvest Soft Rock Lithology -Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project - Extended monitoring through 2020 (FY21)		) 	0		••••																							A
Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring Vegetation, Type F/N - Westside (Remote Sensing) Transferability					•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••																							4
Unstable Slopes Criteria - Object-based Landform Mapping	28,450	28,45	<mark>50</mark> (	)	0				1																		•••••	
Unstable Slopes Criteria - Shallow Landslide Susceptibility	50,000	50,00	0 <mark>0</mark> 150,000	150,00	<del></del>		25,000	25,000	)																			
Unstable Slopes Criteria - Shallow Landslide Runout			50,000	50,00	0 100,000		25,000	25,000																				
Unstable Slopes Criteria - Management Susceptibility Modeling			(		<u>0</u> 25,000	•		••••••	•	75,000	25,000	•															•••••	4
Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness (ENREP)	687,717	600,73	702,035	602,92	737,632	630,233	590,730	524,608	550,511	456,029 375,020	289,904 245,860	•	93,550	100,000	275.020	275 020	207.000	297.860	24.000	21.600								
Westside Type F Riparian Prescription Monitoring	521 080	661.04	546 080	606.04	506,980	616.047	167,272 486,980	167,272 506,147	375,020 486,980	3/5,020 506.047	245,860 291,000	245,860 251,000	134,660	134,660 75,000	3/5,020	375,020 35,000	297,860	297,860	21,600	21,600								<i>A</i>
Road Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring  Deep Seated Research Strategy Mapping Objectives	521,980 100.000	25 00	546,980 00 60.000	75 00	0 25,000	75 000	400,980	390,147 42 500	460,980	25 000	231,000	331,000	75,000	75,000	23,000	23,000												•
Deep Seated Research Strategy Pilot Classification	40,000	25,00	25,000	75,00	0 50,000	75,000		42,500	)	25,000																		4
Deep Seated Research Strategy Toolkit Development	25,000	25,00	00	35,00	0																							***************************************
Deep Seated Research Strategy Groundwater Modeling	C	45,00	50,000	25,00	<mark>0</mark> 100,000	50,000	125,000	<b>25,00</b> 0	25,000	50,000		15,000																
Deep Seated Research Strategy Physical Modeling	(	45,00	<mark>00</mark> 75,000	25,00	<mark>0</mark> 50,000	50,000	50,000	25,000	100,000	50,000	175,000	15,000	175,000	0	25,000	0												
Deep Seated Research Strategy Landslide Monitoring	C	O	0 25,000	25,00	<mark>0</mark> 25,000	0	25 <i>,</i> 000	65 <i>,</i> 000	25,000	0	25,000	160,000	25,000	200,000	25,000	200,000												<u> </u>
Amphibians in discontinuously flowing Np reaches	(	)	0 0	)	0 0	(	80,000	80,000	250,000	250,000	360,000	360,000	360,000	360,000	360,000	360,000	250,000	250,000	0	0	25,000	25,000						<b></b>
Eastside Timber Harvest Types Evaluation Project (ETHEP)  Water Typing Strategy (PHR Validation, Physicals, LiDAR Model Man)						60,000																						<b>4</b>
Water Typing Strategy (PHB Validation, Physicals, LiDAR Model Map) Fish/Habitat Detection using eDNA re-scoped to pilot project					····				<b>-</b>																			A
Riparian Literature Synthesis Project			····	•	···				·																		•••••	•
Wetlands Intrinsic Potential (WIP) Tool	•••••		···	•	···				<b>1</b>																		•••••	
Literature Review Forested Wetlands (Updated; WetSAG)																												
Riparian Characteristics and Shade Response	98,955	136,34	188,190	242,08	<mark>9</mark> 188,190	347,112	20,000	20,000	)																			,
Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Study	165,000	368,93	232,500	189,75	3 182,500	171,562	200,000	116,219	150,000	55,000	150,000	55,000	200,000	200,000	0	0	0	0										
Wetlands Management Zone Effectiveness Monitoring	(	)	0 0	)	0	)()	0	С	100,000	100,000	0	С	360,000	360,000	360,000	360,000	360,000	360,000	360,000	360,000	100,000		45,000	45,000				<u></u>
Wetlands Intensive Monitoring  Road Sub Pasin Scale Effectiveness Monitoring - Resemble (Rescaping)			····												50,000 75,000	50,000	200,000 250,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000					••••••	<b></b>
Road Sub-Basin-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Resample (Re-scoping) Watershed Scale Assessment of Cumulative Effects (roads and riparian) post Effectiveness Monitoring			····		····				0	Ω	n		Λ	Ω	75,000 50.000	75,000 50.000	340.000	340.000	250,000 340.000	250,000 340.000	250,000 340.000	250,000 340.000	340.000	340,000	340.000	340.000	100000	0
EMEP - for going through ISPR review.			••••		···				·	0				0	30,000	30,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	100000	<b>A</b>
RMAP checklist survey																												<b></b>
LiDAR for Unstable Slopes and ENREP work	198,644	-			····				1																		•••••	
Type Np Hard Rock Phase III - Amphibian Demographics	142,800	142,800	304,500	304,500	300,300	300,300	82,950	82,950	0	0																		
AMP Research Expenses (Lines 6 to 53)	3,889,997	3,983,92	4,398,691	4,324,38	····		3,929,019		4,325,961			•		3,720,874	3,500,559								2,653,554	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Projected Available Funds for Research (Rev. minus Partic Grants and Indirect)	4,138,725	4,154,15	4,157,964	4,154,15	7 4,138,725	4,154,157	4,157,964	4,154,157	4,138,725	4,154,157	4,157,964	4,154,157	4,138,725	4,154,157	4,157,964	4,154,157	4,068,656	4,305,504	4,068,656	4,305,504	4,068,656	4,305,504		4,305,504	4,068,656	4,305,504	4,068,656	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Rollover funds from previous FY (1st FY to 2nd FY)  Balance at the end of Fiscal Year (Funds + FY1 Rollover - Expenses)	248.728	170.23	0 248,728	1/0,23	0 (220.944)	(454 164)	(220,944) 8 000	(454,164) (197 291)	) (187 236)	(140 389)	(187,236) 307,642	(140,389) 386 682	473 300	/33 282	473,300 1 130 705	433,282 927,880	63 323	0 261 171	63,323 749 111	261,171 1 174 807	799.385	987 233	799,385 3 2.214.487	987,233	1.316.001	1.503.849	1,316,001 2,957,216	
Durance at the ena of riscar rear (runus + ril konover - Lapenses)	248,728	170,23	8,000		(220,344)	(434,104	8,000	(137,231)	(187,230)	(140,389)	307,042	380,082	473,300	433,202	1,130,703	<u>327,880</u>	03,323	201,171	743,111	1,174,807	799,383	987,233	2,214,407	2,030,183	1,310,001	1,303,843	2,937,210	3,5
<u>REVENUE</u>																												
GF-S - AMP Carry Forward (i.e. base admin funding) (Gov. Budget assumes \$562,000 for FY22-23)	262,200	281,00	339,950	281,00	<mark>0</mark> 346,749	281,000	346,749	281,000	353,684	281,000	353 <i>,</i> 684	281,000	360,758	281,000	360,758	281,000	367,973	281,000	367,973	281,000	375,332	281,000	375,332	281,000	382 <i>,</i> 839	281,000	382,839	و
FFSA - AMP (Business and Occupation Tax surcharge)(Gov. Budget \$10,713,605 for FY22-23)	4,000,000	5,356,80	4,000,000	5,356,80	0 346,749 3 4,000,000	5,356,803	346,749 4,000,000	5,356,803	4,000,000	5,356,803	4,000,000	5,356,803	4,000,000	5,356,803	4,000,000	5,356,803	4,000,000	5,356,803	4,000,000	5,356,803	4,000,000	5,356,803	4,000,000	5,356,803	4,000,000	5,356,803	4,000,000	5,3
GF-S - AMP Research (Biennium Legislative Request) (Not contained in Gov. Budget FY22-23)	3,542,956	5	<mark>0</mark> 3,465,206	5	<mark>0</mark> 3,458,407	(	3,458,407	C	3,451,472	0	3,451,472	C	3,444,398	0	3,444,398	0	3,437,183	0	3,437,183	0	3,429,824	(	3,429,824	0	3,422,317	0	3,422,317	
MTCA operating (Gov. Budget Proposal is \$4,808,402 for FY22-23)		2,404,20	<mark>)1</mark>	2,404,20	<mark>1</mark>	2,404,201		2,404,201	L	2,404,201		2,404,201		2,404,201		2,404,201		2,404,201		2,404,201		2,404,201	L	2,404,201		2,404,201		2,4
Cultivated of December	7.00	0.010.11	7.00		7.00-		7.005.4		7.005.4-5	0.040.0	7.005 7.5	0.000	7.005.45.5	0.010.0	7 005 151	0.040.0	7.005.15.1	0.040.0	7 005 15		7 00	0.0.10.11	7 005 1 = 1	0.040.00	7 005 15	0.040.0		
Subtotal of Revenue	<u>7,805,156</u>	<u>8,042,00</u>	<u>7,805,156</u>	8,042,00	4 7,805,156	8,042,004	<u>7,805,156</u>	<u>8,042,004</u>	7,805,156	<u>8,042,004</u>	<u>7,805,156</u>	<u>8,042,004</u>	7,805,156	8,042,004	<u>7,805,156</u>	<u>8,042,004</u>	<u>7,805,156</u>	<u>8,042,004</u>	<u>7,805,156</u>	8,042,004	<u>7,805,156</u>	8,042,004	7,805,156	8,042,004	<u>7,805,156</u>	8,042,004	7,805,156	<u>8,0</u>
EXPENSES TFW Participation Agreements and Indirect					···				·																			
Tribal Participation Agreements	2,500,000	2.750.00	2,500,000	2.750.00	0 2,500,000	2,750,000	2,500,000	2.750.000	2,500,000	2.750.000	2,500,000	2,750,000	2,500,000	2.750 000	2,500,000	2.750.000	2,500,000	2.750.000	2,500,000	2.750 000	2,500,000	2.750.000	2,500,000	2,750,000	2,500,000	2.750.000	2,500,000	2
NGO and County Participation Grants	537,332	518.09	518,093	518.09	537,332	518,093	518,093	518,093	537,332	518,093	518,093	518,093	537,332	518,093	518,093	518,093	537,332	518,093	518,093	518,093	537,332	518.093	518,093	518,093	537,332	518,093	518,093	
State Agencies	367,990	358,64	367,990	358,64	5 367,990	358,645	367,990	358,645	367,990	358,645	367,990		367,990	358,645	367,990	358,645	367,990	358,645	367,990	358,645	367,990	. <mark> </mark>	367,990	358,645	367,990	358,645	367,990	
FFSA DAHP ( Dept. Archeology & Historic Preservation)	94,500	94,50	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	94,50			94,500	94,500	94,500	94,500	94,500	94,500	94,500	94,500	94,500	94,500	94,500	94,500	94,500	94,500	94,500	94,500		94,500	94 <i>,</i> 500	94,500	94,500	<mark> </mark>
FFSA DNR Indirect	166,610	166,61		166,61	0 166,610	166,610	166,610	166,610	166,610	166,610	166,610		166,610	166,610	166,610	166,610	166,610	166,610	166,610	166,610	166,610	. 🏚	166,610	166,610	166,610	166,610	166,610	1
Subtotal of TFW Participation Agreements, DAHP, and indirect	<u>3,666,432</u>	<u>3,887,84</u>	3,647,193	<u>3,887,84</u>	8 3,666,432	<u>3,887,848</u>	<u>3,647,193</u>	<u>3,887,848</u>	<u>3,666,432</u>	<u>3,887,848</u>	<u>3,647,193</u>	<u>3,887,848</u>	3,666,432	<u>3,887,848</u>	<u>3,647,193</u>	<u>3,887,848</u>	<u>3,736,500</u>	<u>3,736,500</u>	<u>3,736,500</u>	<u>3,736,500</u>	<u>3,736,500</u>	3,736,500	3,736,500	<u>3,736,500</u>	<u>3,736,500</u>	<u>3,736,500</u>	3,736,500	3,
PROGRAM TOTALS	7.005.454	9,042,00	7.005.454	0.042.00	4 7.005.450	0.042.004	7,805,156	0.042.004	7 005 450	0.042.004	7 005 450	0.042.004	7.005.450	9.042.004	7 005 450	0.042.004	7.005.456	0.042.004	7 005 450	0.042.004	7 005 454	9.043.00	1 7.005.450	9.042.004	7 005 450	0.042.004	7 005 450	
Revenue AMP Research Expenses	7,805,156 3,889,997	8,042,00 3,983,92	<del> <mark>.</mark> .</del>	8,042,00 4,324,38		8,042,004 4,608,321	7,805,156 3,929,019	8,042,004 3,897,283	7,805,156 4,325,961	8,042,004 4,294,546	7,805,156 3,663,085	8,042,004 3,627,085	7,805,156 3,665,424	8,042,004 3,720,874	7,805,156 3,500,559	8,042,004 3.659.559	7,805,156 4,005,333	8,042,004 4,044,333	7,805,156 3,382,868	8,042,004 3.391.868	7,805,156 3,269,271	8,042,00 <sup>4</sup> 3,318,271	7,805,156 2,653,554	8,042,004 2,662,554	7,805,156 2,752,655	8,042,004 2,801,655	7,805,156 2,427,441	
TFW Participation Agreements and Indirect	3,889,997	3,983,92	<mark></mark>	4,324,38	4,359,669 8 3,666,432	3.887.848	3,929,019	3,897,283 3,887,848	3,666,432	4,294,546 3.887.848	3,663,085	3,627,085	3,665,424	3,720,874	3,500,559	3,659,559 3.887.848	4,005,333 3,736,500		3,382,868	3,331,868	3,269,271	- <b>(-</b>		3,736,500	2,752,655 3,736,500	3,736,500	2,427,441 3,736,500	
Balance at the end of each fiscal year		, ,	, ,	(170.231	(220.944)	(454.164	228,944	256,873	(187,236)	(140,389)	494,879	-,,-	473,300	433,282	657,404	494,597	63,323	261,171	685,788	913,636	799,385	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		1,642,950	1,316,001	1,503,849	1,641,215	
Cumulative Balance at end of Bienniu		<u>=: =,=5</u>	8,000	)	0	, ,	8.000	(197.291)	)		307,642	386,682			1,130,705	927,880			749,111	1,174.807	<u>. 55,555</u>	22.,230	2,214,487	2,630,183	, ,		2,957,216	3
Carrier and the Contract of th			-,				.,	, , , , , , , , , , ,			,				, , , , , ,	,			,	, , , , , , , , ,			, ,	, , ,			, ,	