

Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee

**Policy's Task List**

v. 2-19-16

*A small group of Policy (Adrian Miller, Hans Berge, Rich Doenges, Mark Hicks, & Mary Scurlock) discussed various documents that constituted "Policy's task list". They organized the topics into three categories, listed below with recommendations for Policy to consider.*

**Recommendation: Keep on Policy's Task List**

---

- Determine Type Np/Ns regulatory break  
*Develop an action plan to determine whether there is a better alternative to identify PIPs in the field as the basis for protecting Type N waters.*
- Determine Type F/N regulatory break; implement permanent water typing rules; identify fish habitat
- Groundwater recharge  
*This could be met by the mass wasting research strategy. UPSAG is working on the scoping documents referred to in an older priority.*
- L-1 key questions, resource objectives, thresholds, and critical questions  
*Review L-1 key questions, resource objectives, thresholds, and critical questions; divide L-1 into buckets and work on one bucket at a time.*  
→ **Question for Policy:** Should policy review questions in L-1 as each study comes up, or outside the context of a specific study?

**Recommendation: Full Policy Committee Discussion**

---

- Eastside performance targets  
*Direction was given to CMER and the research/monitoring strategy for eastern Washington, particularly pertaining to the need for performance targets.*  
→ **Question for Policy:** More clarification needed? What should be done with this idea?
- Board Manual Review/Revisions  
*Participate with DNR and CMER in reviewing and revising Board Manual Section 22.*  
→ **Question for Policy:** Was this meant to go beyond revising Section 22 (completed in 2013)? Are there other Board Manual Sections that need attention in the short-term? If not, this could be marked as complete.
- Extensive Monitoring – Fish Passage  
*Review how to proceed with extensiveness monitoring related to fish passage.*  
→ **Question for Policy:** Is this still relevant to Policy's work? If not, remove from task list.
- Economic impact analysis  
*Define and discuss need for economic impact analyses, including what, when, why, by who, etc.*  
→ **Question for Policy:** Is this still relevant to Policy's work? If not, remove from task list.
- Climate change  
*Discuss whether or not climate change should be considered in the AMP program.*  
→ **Question for Policy:** Is this important to keep on the task list? Is this something to give direction to CMER to include in technical work (e.g., include within best available science analyses when specific resource objectives are being studied)?
- Determine timing and coordination between compliance monitoring and effectiveness monitoring projects  
*Compliance monitoring is a DNR program, not part of the AMP, yet still has implications on the*

**Commented [HM(1):** We know the original intent was to move from rule group to rule group examining the L1 questions and performance targets. Policy did this for the N-rule group and recognized the value of really diving into a rule group (the multiple projects and related questions and assumptions). It went beyond the L1 questions but included them. Policy realized at the time they could not productively tackle the full work plan at one time and would benefit from working through it one rule group at a time. History and intent aside, we have seen the benefit of focus that occurs when policy is deliberating on a project, but we have also seen the impact it has can have on project timelines and the people working on those projects. So from my perspective there is a tradeoff and the task along with the general accomplish it just needs to be affirmed going forward.

**Commented [HM(2):** This is also on CMER's task list and it may have been at the request from Policy. In which case the question is really whether having CMER follow through with this is still a priority. What we last had on CMER's task list said: "SAGE will develop a position paper that discusses any affect not having targets has on doing effectiveness research, and advise both CMER and Policy on the availability and strength of existing sources of information on which to potentially base targets on. Todd will discuss with Sage at next meeting and get back to CMER."

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION

*work of the AMP.*

→ Question for Policy: Is this important to keep on Policy's task list? If so, how to do this effectively?

- Conduct an independent review every 10 years of the structure, process, and performance of the AMP

*The review to be done by an independent 3<sup>rd</sup>-party research organizations and to include considerations such as: structure and function for technical performance, fiscal efficiency, and overall accountability; performance and efficiency of the consensus-based decision process; the rigor of CMER science and responsiveness of CMER to body of Pacific Northwest science; and the interactions of science and policy.*

→ Question for Policy: This is important to do, but how to keep this on a 10-year cycle?

### Recommendation: Remove from Policy's Task List

---

*These topics are recommended for removal from Policy's Task List due to being complete, integral to ongoing work, or no longer relevant.*

- Focus on L-1 effectiveness monitoring
- Intensive monitoring
- Clarify when and how research and monitoring results will be used to assess current rules and policies
- Incorporate key components of CMER science synthesis in the CMER Work Plan
- Synthesize applicable non-CMER science for priority topic areas
- Convene the caucus principals to re-assess commitment to TFW/FFR vision and ground rules; write a joint letter summarizing the outcome of this discussion and giving appropriate direction to caucus representatives
- Develop and implement an AMP communications and outreach strategy
- Develop partnerships with other natural resource research organizations (this could be incorporated into the AMPA's regular updates to Policy)