

Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee  
 October 10, 2014 Meeting Summary

Decisions and Actions from Meeting

Decision	Notes
1. Agreed upon edits to the <i>Policy's Response to Board Motions</i> document that will be forwarded to the Board for the November meeting.	Agreement by all caucuses present

Action	Assignment
1. Finalize <i>Policy's Response to Board Motions</i> document and send to DNR for inclusion in the Board's November meeting packet; cc Policy caucuses with the finalized version.	Policy Committee Co-Chairs

**Welcome & Introductions** – Stephen Bernath and Adrian Miller, Co-Chairs of the Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee (Policy), welcomed participants and led introductions (*see Attachment 1 for a list of attendees*). The Co-Chairs announced that the two main purposes of this meeting were to hear from the technical group about the work they compiled for the Forest Practices Board (Board) and to finalize the document summarizing Policy's response to the Board's May 2014 motions about unstable slopes.

There was also an agenda topic to review a list of draft questions to focus the unstable slopes literature review. The Co-Chairs recommended holding off on that discussion, as the literature review is a product that the recently re-created Upland Scientific Advisory Group (UPSAG) will draft. If Policy wishes to see the draft literature review or scoping questions at some point in the process, that can be arranged.

Policy discussed the difference between questions for the unstable slopes research strategy and scoping questions for the literature review. Policy allocated \$50,000 this year for the literature review, which will be scoped and performed by UPSAG or a contractor. UPSAG is also responsible for drafting a research strategy specific to glacial deep-seated landslides. The process for drafting the research strategy will be further developed by UPSAG. Once those pieces are complete, UPSAG will also continue working on other recommendations from the outcome of the Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring Report. As UPSAG works on each of these pieces, caucuses are encouraged to have representation on UPSAG and CMER to participate in more detailed discussions.

**Information from FPAs on Mitigation Measures** – Adrian Miller and Doug Hooks reviewed information that the technical group compiled specific to mitigation measures used in previous FPAs approved by DNR over the last several years. Discussion points included:

- The technical group tried to be thoughtful about how to provide the best information to the Board. They considered what people actually do when harvesting on or around glacial deep-seated landslides (GDSLs) and/or groundwater recharge areas (GWRAs). In order to answer that question, the technical group looked at actual FPAs approved in the last three or four years.

- First, the technical group looked at DNR's list of sites that field geologists visit, and queried the list for any reference to GDSLs. That turned up only 13 FPAs that had mitigation measures assigned to them.
- In order to find more FPAs with mitigation measures for GDSLs, the technical group asked caucuses to self-identify various forest practices they were aware of that had various mitigations. Both tribal caucuses and the industrial landowner caucus provided the majority of these FPAs, which led to a list of 42 FPAs. This is further described in Appendix C of the *Policy's Response to Board Motions* document.
- There was some discussion about the word "mitigation," which several caucuses agreed can be misleading in the context of unstable slopes. Policy agreed that since the word is used in the WAC, it is best to continue using the word for consistency. However, this is something that the Co-Chairs can clarify for the Board.
- Policy discussed the best way to cite the WAC in the document to the Board, since the WAC is very specific and important for the Board to have in front of them yet is a lengthy description.
- It was noted that if an area was ever documented as moving in the past, DNR will always note that that land is or was a GDSL.
- It was noted that "salvage" is a different category under the WAC since it is a light-intensive prescription. This was further clarified in the document to the Board.
- The technical group was able to identify what DNR approved, but there is another part of the story that the technical group was not able to tell, which is why DNR approved or did not approve an application, including the geotechnical review. It was noted that if Policy wants the Board to know that part of the story, it would require DNR staff to tell that story.
- Policy agreed to clarify for the Board that mitigation measures are the same whether the harvest area could deliver to a creek or a house. The measures allow for treating fish like people, not treating people like fish.
- The non-industrial landowner representative brought forward the issue that it can often be difficult for small landowners to hire a Qualified Expert (QE). While Policy agreed that it can be hard to find a QE and there are not many available to hire because of the rigorous certification process, it was not agreed if this is an issue for Policy to address/resolve.
- DNR noted that they always have SEPA documents for every Class IV Special FPA, but whether or not the entire SEPA document package can be uploaded to FPARS depends on the amount of information. This is something that DNR can address when they upgrade FPARS in the future.

**Policy's Response to Board Motions document** – Policy went through each section of the *Policy's Response to Board Motions* document. Edits made at this meeting will be finalized and that version will be used in the Board's November meeting packet. Most of the discussion focused on direct edits to the document (*please refer to the latest version available*). Other discussion points included:

- Policy discussed risk tolerance. It was noted that the entire Adaptive Management Program has a zero-risk tolerance for unstable slopes threatening public safety. The same risk tolerance is applied whether that unstable slope threatens a house (human safety) or a creek with fish (resource safety).
- It was noted that while DNR worked hard on revising Board Manual Section 16, that revision was focused on GDSLs and GWRAs. At some point, Policy will recommend that more revisions be done to that section, especially dealing with specific issues like run-out.

- Policy acknowledged that people in the field can sometimes disagree about what a GDSL is. This note was included in the document.

**Decision:** All present caucuses indicated comfort with the edits made to the document today. This version, once cleaned up, will be included in the Board's November meeting packet.

**Next Steps**

- The Co-Chairs will finalize this document by October 17 so DNR can include the document in the Board's November meeting packet. They will try to send the clean version to Policy caucuses prior to October 17, so everyone has a last chance to take a look, but this will depend on capacity.
- The Co-Chairs will present this document to the Board on November 12. If there is anything mischaracterized in the document, caucuses can ask the Co-Chairs to verbally correct that at the Board meeting.

The Co-Chairs adjourned the meeting at 12:45pm.

DRAFT

Attachment 1 – Participants by Caucus at 10/10/14 Meeting

**Conservation Caucus**

\*Mary Scurlock

**County Caucus**

\*Kendra Smith, Skagit County

**Federal Caucus**

*No representative present*

**Landowner Caucus – Industrial (large)**

Doug Hooks, WFPA

Adrian Miller, Olympic Resource Management,  
Co-Chair

\*Karen Terwilleger, WFPA (phone)

**Landowner Caucus – Non-industrial (small)**

\*Dick Miller, WFFA

\*Caucus leads

**Others**

Claire Turpel, Triangle Associates

**State Caucus – DNR**

Marc Engel, DNR

\*Chris Hanlon-Meyer, DNR

**State Caucus – Ecology & WDFW**

\*Stephen Bernath, Ecology, Co-Chair

\*Terry Jackson, WDFW

**Tribal Caucus – Eastside**

\*Ray Entz, UCUT/Kalispel Tribe (phone)

**Tribal Caucus – Westside**

\*Joseph Pavel, Skokomish Tribe (phone)

Nancy Sturhan, NWIFC

Curt Veldhuisen, SRSC

Attachment 2 – Ongoing Priorities Checklist

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Assignment</b>	<b>Status &amp;Notes</b>
<b>Type N</b>	Type N policy subgroup	On hold until other workload lessens.
<b>Type F</b>	Policy	On hold until other workload lessens.
<b>Unstable Slopes</b>	Policy	Board motions from May 2014 re-directed Policy to focus on this workload and report back in November 2014.
<b>Bull Trout Overlay</b>	Policy	To be further discussed on conference call prior to November 2014 Board meeting.
<b>Adaptive Mgmt Program Reform Rule Changes</b>		Accepted by Board at August meeting, CR-103 process initiated. Implemented initial changes at November 2013 meeting, will tweak changes for subsequent meetings.
<b>Ongoing CMER reports reviewed by Policy</b>	Mark Hicks & Todd Baldwin, CMER Co-Chairs	CMER Co-Chairs to give update(s) as needed at Policy meetings; AMPA to give quarterly reports for when CMER studies to come to Policy

\*This table notes the Policy Committee priorities that were sent to the Forest Practices Board and any other major topics or issues that arise during the year.

Attachment 3 – Entities, Groups, or Subgroups: Schedule and Notes

<b>Entity, Group, or Subgroup</b>	<b>Next Meeting Date</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>TFW Policy Committee</b>	November 13, 2014	Rescheduled from November 6
<b>CMER</b>	October 28, 2014	
<b>Type N Policy Subgroup</b>	TBD	On hold due to workload constraints.
<b>Type F Subcommittee(s)</b>	TBD	On hold due to workload constraints.
<b>Forest Practices Board</b>	November 12, 2014	