

**Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee
Regular Meeting**

MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, July 14, 2020 // 9:00 am – 3:00 pm
Remotely held using GoToMeeting

Prepared for TFW Policy by Jacob Hibbeln, AMP Senior Secretary

Motions July 14, 2020	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
1. Nominate Marc Engel, DNR, as the new TFW Policy co-chair.	(Up: ECY/WDFW, Counties, Westside Tribes, SFL, Industrial Timber; Abstained: DNR; Absent: Conservation, Eastside Tribes, Federal)
2. Approve the Hard Rock Phase III Extended Monitoring Study proposal for integration into the Master Project Schedule (MPS).	Steve Barnowe-Meyer/Don Nauer (Up: ECY/WDFW, Counties, Westside Tribes, SFL, Industrial Timber, DNR, Conservation; Absent: Eastside Tribes, Federal)
3. Accept the Scenario 2 MPS as presented on July 14, 2020.	Steve Barnowe-Meyer/Don Nauer (Up: ECY/WDFW, Counties, Westside Tribes, SFL, Industrial Timber, DNR, Conservation; Absent: Eastside Tribes, Federal)
4. Policy transmit the SFL Template Proposal Initiation Scientific Justification, the Cramer Fish Sciences review, and the ISPR documentation as supporting materials to CMER for the purpose of responding to the 6 questions for completed outside science. CMER shall return the answers to the 6 questions as soon as possible, within 90 days after receiving draft answers to the 6 questions or as soon as possible. If additional time is needed, CMER shall make that justification to Policy at least 30 days prior to the original deadline.	Ken Miller/Darin Cramer (Up: ECY/WDFW, Counties, Westside Tribes, SFL, Industrial Timber, DNR; Absent: Conservation, Eastside Tribes, Federal)
5. Accept the SFL Dispute resolution language as appropriately framed as follows: The SFL Caucus invokes dispute resolution based upon a lack of progress on the core RMZ width prescriptions of 25, 50, and 75 feet, despite some progress in the workgroups being made. Specifically this Dispute is limited to RMZ widths within WFFA’s “Alternate Harvest prescriptions for Small Forest Landowners in Western Washington, January 21, 2015” proposal.	Darin Cramer/Brandon Austin (Up: ECY/WDFW, Counties, Westside Tribes, SFL, Industrial Timber; Sideways: DNR; Absent: Conservation, Eastside Tribes, Federal)

Selection of new TFW Policy Co-Chair

Terra Rentz, WDFW/Co-chair

After stating that she had checked in with each caucus, Rentz formally nominated Marc Engel, DNR, as the new Policy co-chair.

Darin Cramer, Industrial Timber, asked if Engel would still be a voting member as well as a co-chair. Engel responded that he will still be both, but on topics where he will have a big role as a voting Policy member, facilitation will be deferred to Rentz.

Rentz then called for a vote and Engel was confirmed as new co-chair of Policy. She reminded Policy that technically her last meeting is in August and a new co-chair needs to be found to replace her.

Hard Rock Phase III Extended Amphibian Monitoring Study

Rentz and Aimee McIntyre, WDFW

Once Rentz gave a brief summary of the goal of the conversation, McIntyre, WDFW and project PI, recapped why extended monitoring is necessary for this project.

The decision was whether Policy would formally approve or reject the proposal of this project and to add it to the Master Project Schedule (MPS). Approving this proposal would mean that the project would proceed and be integrated into the MPS. Rentz then called for a round table discussion.

All caucuses acknowledged that value of the extended Hard Rock amphibian monitoring proposal and were supportive of integrating this into the MPS due to the amount of data that would be collected as a result of extended monitoring to help address the observed decline in tailed frogs identified in the Hard Rock Phase II Extended Monitoring Study.

Motion #2 to approve the Hard Rock Phase III Extended Amphibian Monitoring Study proposal for integration into the MPS was made and passed.

FY 22-23 and out years Master Project Schedule (MPS)

Mark Hicks, AMPA

Hicks presented on the main points of the MPS, first summarizing the results of the two previous budget subcommittee meetings. Choices were narrowed down from four to two scenarios, one of which incorporates the Hard Rock Phase III Extended Amphibian Monitoring project.

Hicks then covered differences between each budget scenario; the main differences of which were when the CMER scientists would be hired and when the Westside Type F Riparian Prescriptions and Amphibians in Intermittent Streams projects would start.

Rentz asked if it would be in Policy's best interests for the positive variance to be at zero and if there should be added line items for scoping and implementation. Hicks agreed that the variance should be reflected as zero and responded that costs for scoping and implementation would be covered by contingency money, that the positive balance would be reflected there, and therefore is not necessary to add as line items on the MPS.

After the floor was opened for discussion, voting members agreed that Scenario 2 made more sense given the previous motion regarding Phase III of the Hard Rock project.

Motion #3 to accept the Scenario 2 MPS was introduced.

Before a vote was taken, Darin Cramer, Industrial Timber, stated his support for this motion, although he thinks that Policy should have a discussion about the extensive monitoring workshop.

Jim Peters, Westside Tribes, asked what would happen with the projects taken off the schedule. Hicks responded that he was not suggesting that projects which did not have money assigned would be completely removed from the MPS. Cramer responded, stating that projects shouldn't be removed but instead put them in the parking lot or list them as a below the line project. Hicks concurred and assured Policy that he was creating and would maintain a separate tracking list for completed and "below the line" projects.

Motion #3 was voted on and passed.

SFL Template – Process for Review of Martin Report

Rentz

Ken Miller, SFL, motioned to transmit the SFL Template Proposal Initiation Science Justification to CMER to answer the 6 questions for completed outside science, asking for a 60-90 day return. Seconded by Cramer.

Rentz then recapped the history of this issue, clarifying that the goal of this discussion was to decide what to do with the Martin report. Rentz then provided space for each caucus to ask any questions before Miller's motion was fully entertained.

Each caucus agreed that the motion should contain clear language on exactly what should be reviewed by CMER and what document(s) the 6 questions should address. Engel stated that the WFFA PI, ISPR documents (ISPR report, Policy sub-committee questions to ISPR) and the Cramer Fish Sciences Report by Mark Teply should be sent to CMER for review.

Hicks responded that SAGs typically answer the 6 questions, after which the document is moved to CMER for approval. CMER determines which SAG this would be assigned to. The fastest timeline would be about 4 months.

The motion was amended to include the supplemental questions to ISPR that the template workgroup had created. After further discussion of exactly what the 6 questions would be responding to as well as the timeline suggested in Miller's motion, Engel requested that a friendly amendment be made to soften the timeline of the project – the friendly amendment requested that CMER notify Policy if the 6 questions document could not be delivered in the specified timeline, CMER notify Policy at least 30 days in advance.

Nauer commented that the Martin study is 5 years old now and is not based on current science. Therefore, applying new science that could challenge any of the previous conclusions would have to be a part of the conversation. The questions posed by the Policy subgroup to ISPR would certainly help with conducting an accurate review.

Ash Roorbach, NWIFC, stated the importance of following the proper process as outlined in the Protocol and Standards Manual, which includes achieving consensus on the document. He expressed concern of

Policy setting up CMER for a Dispute Resolution. CMER will want to make comments and have the author respond to comments. CMER might have a hard time coming to a consensus on a document without first making edits. Hicks clarified that Policy is not asking CMER to take up the Martin Report as a CMER product, but to conduct an assessment as completed outside science and therefore CMER is not able to request changes to the Martin report.

Further clarification requested by Jenny Knoth, CMER co-chair, on whether Policy was asking CMER to review the SFL Template Proposal in its entirety or just the Martin Report. After it was clarified that Policy would be asking CMER to review the Martin Report and not the template, Cramer made motion # 4 to transmit the SFL Template Proposal Initiation Science Justification by Doug Martin to CMER.

Hicks commented that the system is set up so that CMER takes completed outside research into review and answer the 6 questions, it is not about asking the author to rewrite the science. Cramer then clarified that the 6 questions should respond to the Martin report – the ISPR documents and Cramer Fish Science review should be supporting documents. Policy would only be asking for one 6 questions document.

The motion was then revised to include the friendly amendment. This requested that if CMER could not complete the 6 questions document in the 90 day timeline, they notify Policy at least 30 days in advance. Exact verbiage is captured in motion #4. After the friendly amendment was confirmed, the motion was voted on and passed.

Small Forest Landowner (SFL) Caucus Dispute Resolution

Rentz

Rentz first recapped the process regarding Dispute Resolutions as outlined in the Forest Practices Board Manual. The goal of the discussion was to agree on how to frame the Dispute Resolution and to identify which caucuses are participating in the Dispute Resolution process. Rentz articulated that not every caucus needs to be involved, but if one agrees to partake in the process he or she must be at all the meetings.

Rentz then put the Dispute Resolution language that was sent out to Policy up for display. The language presented is as follows: “The SFL Caucus invokes dispute resolution based upon the inability to make substantive progress at TFW Policy on WFFA’s “Alternate Harvest prescriptions for Small Forest Landowners in Western Washington, January 21, 2015” proposal. Despite some progress in workgroups, the inability of the Technical SFL Prescriptions Workgroup to bring recommendations to Policy made it clear a formal Dispute Resolution process is now appropriate on the core RMZ width prescriptions. Specifically this Dispute is limited to RMZ widths.”

Lisa Remlinger, Conservation caucus, stated that her caucus felt that this language was not specific enough and that they would like to be part of the Dispute Resolution process going forward. State caucuses agreed that the language as it stood was not clear about exactly what is being disagreed upon. Several caucus members expressed concern with the language regarding the original Proposal Initiation (PI) because Policy already agreed that the PI as a whole does not qualify as a template. The motion language should clearly reflect that the Dispute Resolution will not include a full discussion of the original Proposal Initiation.

Rentz received confirmation from Miller that he would be okay with clarifying that Policy would not entertain the PI as a whole since it was already voted on. Miller stated that the SFL caucus would not discuss thinning, single tree, or any small bullet prescriptions as originally described in the PI.

After this, Rentz put forward revised dispute language which clarified that the dispute is limited to RMZ widths, as those widths are listed in the proposal. The language is as follows: “The SFL Caucus invokes dispute resolution based upon TFW Policy's inability to make substantive progress at resolving RMZ width prescriptions within on WFFA’s “Alternate Harvest prescriptions for Small Forest Landowners in Western Washington, January 21, 2015” proposal. Despite some progress in workgroups, the inability of the Technical SFL Prescriptions Workgroup to bring recommendations to Policy made it clear a formal Dispute Resolution process is now appropriate on the core RMZ width prescriptions. Specifically this Dispute is limited to RMZ widths, as those widths are listed in the proposal”

Miller expressed that his concern with this language is that people will think that the rest of the prescriptions are not open for consideration but confirmed that the dispute is limited to RMZ widths. Rentz then stated that the first sentence created speculations within many of the caucuses that the issue of the template proposal as a whole will be brought into the Dispute Resolution process, which is why the language needs to be clarified.

Engel added that Policy needed to identify the widths reviewed and include that Policy was not be able to come to a resolution. He made it clear that the dispute is about the fact that there has been a technical group that met and did not achieve consensus on width prescription recommendations.

After this, Rentz put forward a second revision to the dispute language attempting to clarify what was being disputed. Specifically, the revised motion language was as follows: *The SFL Caucus invokes dispute resolution based upon a lack of progress on the core RMZ width prescriptions of 25, 50, and 75 feet, despite some progress in the workgroups being made. Specifically, this Dispute is limited to RMZ widths within WFFA’s “Alternate Harvest prescriptions for Small Forest Landowners in Western Washington, January 21, 2015” proposal.* Miller agreed on motion language and Cramer made motion #5 to accept the SFL Dispute Resolution language.

Every caucus agreed to be a part of the Dispute Resolution process. Rentz stated there would be an introductory meeting followed by 4-6 half-day meetings. All caucuses must be in attendance for every meeting and sending proxies is not allowed.

Attendees by Caucus

*Caucus representative

Jenny Knoth (WFFA/ CMER Co-chair)

Conservation Caucus

*Lisa Remlinger (WEC)

State Caucus

*Brandon Austin (ECY)

* Don Nauer (WDFW)

County Caucus

*Paul Jewell (WSAC)

Bill Ehinger (ECY)

Kendra Smith (Skagit)

Aimee McIntyre (WDFW)

Terra Rentz (WDFW/co-chair)

Large Industrial Landowner Caucus

*Darin Cramer (WFPA)

John Heimburg (WDFW)

Charles Hooks (WFPA)

Westside Tribal Caucus

*Jim Peters (NWIFC)

Small Forest Landowner Caucus

*Steve Barnowe-Meyer (WFFA)

Ash Roorbach (NWIFC)

*Ken Miller (WFFA)

Curt Veldhuisen (SRSC)

Joseph Pavel (Skokomish)

Eastside Tribal Caucus

John Sirois (UCUT)

Adaptive Management Program/CMER

Staff

Mark Hicks (AMPA)

Ben Flint (DNR)

Joseph Shramek (DNR)

Teresa Miskovic (DNR)

Eszter Munes (DNR)

Malia Volke (DNR)

Jenelle Black (NWIFC)

Jacob Hibbeln (DNR)

