



**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:
  - 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.
  - 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.
  - 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 ([mark.hicks@dnr.wa.gov](mailto:mark.hicks@dnr.wa.gov), 360-902-1909).

## East Side Tribal Governments' 2021-2023 MPS Non-Consent Budget Position Paper

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.