State of Washington
Decision Package

Agency: 490 Department of Natural Resources
Decision Package Code/Title: ED Landscape-Level Wildlife Assessment
Budget Period: 2009-11
Budget Level: PL - Performance Level

Recommendation Summary Text:

This proposal provides half of the funding needed to complete the Forest Practices Board's Landscape-Level Wildlife Assessment Project (LLWA); the other half of needed funding will be obtained from federal grants and other sources. LLWA is a scientific analysis led by Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) that evaluates current and future wildlife habitat conditions on lands under the Forest Practices Board's (FPB) jurisdiction. LLWA is the cornerstone of FPB's Wildlife Work Plan. Results will be used to assess effectiveness of the Forest Practices Rules in providing habitat for upland wildlife species on Washington's non-federal forest lands. The project has been developed and implemented in a collaborative manner and is supported by all participants in Washington's Timber-Fish-Wildlife agreement.

Fiscal Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Expenditures</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State</td>
<td>206,200</td>
<td>168,800</td>
<td>375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>206,200</td>
<td>168,800</td>
<td>375,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Package Description:

LLWA is a comprehensive scientific landscape analysis to determine the extent to which the Forest Practices Rules, combined with voluntary landowner measures and federal forest management, contribute to wildlife habitats in Washington. The project also is assessing effects of urbanization on wildlife habitats. It is not only assessing current habitat conditions, but also will enable predictions of future wildlife habitat conditions, as forests change over time.

LLWA will:
- Assist FPB in assessing how the Forest Practices Rules are protecting wildlife.
- Help quantify the effects and contributions of the Forest Practices Rules and other forest management actions on habitats of upland wildlife species. Baseline habitat conditions are changing, and will continue to change (improve) as stream protection buffers and other forested areas grow through time.
- Provide information and assessment tools for landscape planning for wildlife habitats on state and private forestlands.
- Serve as the scientific foundation for policy dialogue on possible approaches for upland forest wildlife habitat conservation, including forest landowner incentives.
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Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

LLWA is developing modeling tools to predict responses of wildlife species to habitat changes associated with forest management, the Forest Practices Rules, habitat conservation plan strategies, etc. The project has two objectives:

1) To understand how privately owned lands, in combination with other land ownership (e.g., public lands, tribal lands), contribute to wildlife habitat. This objective is conceived as a coarse filter analysis. A coarse filter analysis is a forest community-based approach that relies on relatively generalized relationships between wildlife and their habitat.

2) To understand how commercial forest, forestlands on the urban fringe, and small privately owned forest lands that are managed according to Forest Practices Rules, in combination with other forest management activities (both regulatory and voluntary), function as wildlife habitat now and into the future. This is conceived as a fine filter analysis. A fine filter analysis is a detailed assessment including the use of species or guild habitat models, forest inventory data, and use of the University of Washington's Landscape Management System. Data collected and analyses conducted as part of the coarse filter analysis in Objective 1) will support the fine filter analyses to facilitate developing a landscape level perspective on wildlife habitat across the state. Participation grants are included to provide partial funding to ensure consistent collaborative participation by caucuses otherwise unable to participate (e.g., Indian Tribes, small forest landowners, the Forests & Fish Conservation Caucus).

Performance Measure Detail

Activity: A016    Forest Practices Act and Rules

No measures submitted for package

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

This proposal supports the Department of Natural Resources' strategic plan as follows:

Goal: DNR is faithfully implementing its responsibilities as a regulator.
Strategy: Be fair, impartial, and consistent.

Does this decision package provide essential support to one of the Governor's priorities?

Yes, this request provides essential support to several of the Priorities of Government:
- Improve the quality of Washington's natural resources
- Improve the ability of state government to achieve its results efficiently and effectively

Does this decision package make key contributions to statewide results? Would it rate as a high priority in the Priorities of Government process?

Yes, this request contributes to the following statewide results:

- Improve the quality of Washington's natural resources
- Establish safeguards and standards to protect natural resources
- Provide good science and resource monitoring date to support decision-making.

- Improve the ability of state government to achieve its results efficiently and effectively
- Improve support for government decision makers

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?
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Beyond regulatory applications, project results will inform forest landowners on how to voluntarily adjust their management programs to provide favorable wildlife habitat conditions while accomplishing other management objectives. Results will be useful for large and small private landowners, state and local government land managers, and Indian Tribes.

**What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?**

DNR considered 2 alternatives. First, DNR considered seeking grants from federal and private sector sources for the entire amount needed to complete LLWA. However, it is uncertain whether full funding can be obtained; completely relying upon other funding sources would be overly optimistic and jeopardize completion of LLWA. Second, DNR considered requesting full funding from the State, in this proposal. DNR rejected that alternative due to the State's overall, projected 09-11 Biennium budget deficit and because it is likely that some funds can be obtained from other sources. This proposal was chosen because it combines a core of State funding with an amount that is reasonable to expect can be obtained from federal and other sources.

**What are the consequences of not funding this package?**

Unless funding is obtained from other sources, LLWA will be terminated. Research objectives will be only partially met, and comprehensive analysis products anticipated by FPB for use in rule assessment will not be forthcoming. FPB will have to evaluate effectiveness of the Forest Practices Rules in providing habitat for upland wildlife species without the benefit of a rigorous, comprehensive analysis.

**What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?**

None.

**What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?**

None.

**Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions**

All funds will be passed through to Department of Fish and Wildlife, the University of Washington and other organizations for $375,000.

This proposal does not affect any form of revenue.

**Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?**

Cost are as follows: Object E $375,000.

All costs are one-time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object Detail</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E Goods And Services</td>
<td>206,200</td>
<td>168,800</td>
<td>375,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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