

Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee  
 August 1, 2019 APPROVED Meeting Summary  
 v.9.5.19

<b>Action</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<b>Ask Bruce Jones or other NWIFC staff to give a presentation to Policy on DNR's information management system.</b>	Mark Hicks
<b>Ask Aimee McIntyre to give a presentation to Policy on the Amphibian Genetics Study findings.</b>	Terra Rentz
<b>Develop the Type Np Workgroup contract statement of work and compensation plan and present to Policy for comment at the September 5 meeting.</b>	Mark Hicks, Darin Cramer, and Jim Peters
<b>Reach out to candidates for the Type Np Workgroup using the ranking system generated by Policy on August 1, 2019.</b>	Mark Hicks
<b>Update budget and contract for 3 additional meetings of the Small Forest Landowner Template Workgroup.</b>	Mark Hicks
<b>Provide a breakdown for the ENREP project budget to Policy.</b>	Chris Mendoza (complete, see 8/2 email)
<b>Send the ENREP memo (as amended by Policy on August 1, 2019) to CMER.</b>	Mark Hicks
<b>Form a group of AMP participants to review the technical recommendations from recent findings reports received by Policy and identify common themes. Consider process improvements within the AMP to address the recommendations.</b>	Chris Conklin (lead), Jim Peters, Marc Engel, Scott Swanson
<b>Prepare a presentation on the B&amp;O Surcharge issue for Policy at the September 5 meeting.</b>	Jim Peters

<b>Decision</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>Approve the July meeting summary as amended.</b>	The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.

<b>Accept the ranking system generated by Policy for participation in the Technical Type Np Prescriptions Workgroup (see list on page 4).</b>	The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.
<b>Direct the AMPA to use the ranking system generated by Policy to approach candidates for participation in the Technical Type Np Prescriptions Workgroup (see list on page 4).</b>	The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.
<b>Direct the AMPA to present the contract scope of work for the Type Np Prescriptions Workgroup to Policy at the September Policy meeting.</b>	The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.
<b>Direct the AMPA and DNR to fund note-taking support for three additional meetings of the Small Forest Landowner Template Workgroup.</b>	The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.
<b>Recommend that the Buffer-Shade study findings do not warrant action by the Board at this time, however the technical implications and recommendations portion of the report warrant action by the AMP. Additionally, recommend that the study and findings be provided to the Technical Type Np Prescriptions Workgroup as a source of information.</b>	The Conservation caucus voted thumbs sideways; the Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.
<b>Send the ENREP Questions relevant for Policy Evaluation memo as amended on August 1, 2019 to CMER.</b>	The Conservation caucus and Industrial Landowner caucus voted thumbs sideways; Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.
<b>Recommend that the Board receive training on Board Manual Section 22, including the Protocol and Standards Manual.</b>	The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.

Welcome, Introductions, & Old Business – Policy Co-Chairs Curt Veldhuisen, Skagit River System Cooperative (SRSC), and Terra Rentz, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), opened the meeting and reviewed the day’s agenda.

Joe Shramek, Department of Natural Resources (DNR), introduced Mark Hicks as the new Adaptive Management Program Administrator (AMPA). Joe thanked Policy representatives and CMER members for their support in the evaluation panel during the hiring process. Joe also shared that Emily Hernandez has been promoted to the position of Environmental Planner V. Terra thanked Joe for steering an inclusive and intentional process that engaged both CMER and Policy.

Mark Hicks shared some information about his background with Policy. Mark holds resource management-related degrees at the bachelor’s and master’s levels from Oregon State University. He previously worked at the Department of Ecology, where he managed the aquatic herbicide program, oversaw water quality standards, and served as a lead technical staff in forestry. Mark has served as

CMER voting representative and co-chair. Mark shared that he is looking forward to working with everyone in the Adaptive Management Program (AMP) and meeting with stakeholder groups to hear their priorities.

Rich Doenges, Ecology, shared that there will be some changes in Ecology staff representatives at Policy and the Forest Practices Board. Maia Bellon will be serving as the Ecology representative at the Forest Practices Board meetings beginning in August 2019. Rich will begin attending the Board meetings in later months. Beginning in September, another Ecology staff member will attend Policy meetings as the Ecology representative. Ecology is also looking for a new CMER representative to fill Mark Hicks's seat on the committee.

Scott Swanson, Washington State Association of Counties (WSAC), shared that the Counties caucus will likely be unrepresented at the August 14 Board meeting, since their Board representative resigned. They expect to have someone in place to attend the November 2019 Board meeting.

Jim Peters, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission (NWIFC), requested that the Policy agenda include time for legislative updates starting in September. Jim also invited any Policy representatives who are interested in the Business and Occupation (B&O) Surcharge bill to participate in helping it through the legislative process during this year's legislative session. Interested Policy members should contact Jim. Terra suggested that Jim give an official update at the next meeting to inform Policy representatives about the B&O Surcharge bill.

Jim shared that NWIFC is choosing between two candidates for the lead scientist position on CMER. Jim noted that there is space on the interview panel and invited interested Policy representatives to join.

The group reviewed the July meeting summary. Some amendments were suggested, and the document was edited on screen.

**Decision:** Approve the July meeting summary as amended. The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.

**Action:** Jim Peters will prepare a presentation on the B&O Surcharge issue for Policy at the September 5 meeting.

**CMER Update** – Doug Hooks, Washington Forest Protection Association (WFPA) and CMER Co-Chair, provided Policy with an update from the July 2019 CMER meeting. Highlights are listed below.

- CMER is in the process of rotating co-chairs. Chris Mendoza has taken Jenny Knoth's place as Co-Chair. Doug asked that representatives reach out to potential nominees for the CMER co-chair position in their caucuses.
- The Information Management System that is used to store CMER study documents did not receive funding in the DNR budget. It is uncertain how documents will be stored and accessed by AMP participants. Joe Shramek clarified that DNR is looking for ways to improve its Information Management System agency-wide. This includes the management system of Forest Practices Applications.
  - A Policy representative noted that it is very difficult to find documents within the system. It was suggested that Policy ask for a NWIFC staff member to give Policy a presentation on the Information Management System.
- CMER approved small budget requests to finish the Wetland Intrinsic Potential Tool and the Riparian Characteristics and Shade study design. The AMPA will determine whether these will be funded through the contingency fund or whether this funding needs approval by Policy and the Board. CMER approved the westside Type N Effectiveness Amphibians Genetic Report, and

LWAG will complete the Findings Report for CMER approval and give a report to Policy in September. CMER also approved the Final Hardwood Conversion Report, and Policy can expect the findings report in September.

- The Eastside Modeling Effectiveness Project has been returned from the Independent Scientific Review Process (ISPR) but needs a small amount of money to continue. The Policy Co-Chairs noted that there is currently no money in the AMP budget for this project.
- The Stable Isotopes section of the Hard Rock Phase I study was not approved by ISPR but was included in the appendix of the report. CMER determined that this section should be included in the body of the Phase II report, noting that ISPR concerns from Phase I are addressed in the Phase II report. The Phase I report and appendix will be provided to ISPR when Phase II is submitted.
- CMER reviewed the Policy/CMER subgroup recommendations for determining if and when a project nearing completion should be extended beyond the scope of the initial study design. This was a request from the Board and although consensus was not part of that request, the subgroup decided that attempting to seek consensus from CMER and Policy before providing a response was appropriate. Comments will be accepted through August 13, 2019 and CMER will seek approval of the recommendations at the August meeting, with the intent of delivering the recommendations to the Board in November.
- CMER is reviewing recommendations for updates to their Ground Rules and developing a Code of Conduct. Comments will be accepted through August 13, 2019. Once approved and consistency with the Board Manual Section 22 is ensured, the Code of Conduct will be inserted into the Protocol and Standards Manual (PSM).
- CMER reminded the Scientific Advisory Groups (SAGs) that they need to formally document their decisions with votes. Chris Mendoza will present to the SAGs on the PSM Chapters 4, 5 and 6, which relate to this protocol.
- Regarding the extensive comments on the Hard Rock Phase II study, CMER directed the PI to prioritize reviewing these comments in order to bring forward the review for CMER approval in August. This will likely delay work on the Soft Rock study.

Doug reminded Policy that CMER had produced a document about Extensive Status and Trends Monitoring Strategy which obtained consensus and CMER would like this to appear on Policy's agenda.

A Policy representative asked if it would be appropriate for a Principal Investigator (PI) to give a preliminary presentation on the Hard Rock Phase II report to the Technical Type Np Prescriptions Workgroup at the time that the report goes to ISPR. There was some discussion on the topic with the general agreement that this would be appropriate as long as it was communicated that further changes could be made to the report.

Doug noted that CMER is not taking action on the Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness Project (ENREP) and is waiting for Policy to send the group its Policy questions. Doug, Chris Mendoza, and Emily Hernandez, DNR, agreed to attend the Policy discussion later in the day to ensure that Policy's questions are clearly communicated to CMER.

Technical Type Np Prescriptions Workgroup Membership Selection – Policy reviewed the results of the voting process for the selection of members of the Technical Type Np Prescriptions Workgroup. In this process, each caucus submitted via email their preferred rankings of the nominees. Steve Barnowe-Meyer, Washington Farm Forest Association (WFFA), left the room during this discussion as he was among the nominees. The Policy Co-Chairs shared the average rankings of Type Np Workgroup nominees. Terra reminded Policy that the Type Np Workgroup members who receive funding will receive it through a cooperative research agreement with DNR. For this to occur, all members must be selected by consensus.

The Co-Chairs recommended that Policy approve a single list that identifies its top six candidates as well as appropriate alternates if a priority candidate is no longer able to participate in the Workgroup.

Policy then discussed the rankings. Some clarifications were made about candidates' expertise. The Co-Chairs also recommended that the Workgroup consist of six members to balance fields of expertise. The table below shows the ranking system generated by Policy.

Biological	Physical	Silviculture/Field Forestry
J. Richardson	J. Groom	C. Lunde
B. Bilby	J. Stednick	S. Barnowe-Meyer
<i>Alternates</i>		
D. Olson	T. Beechie	
A. McIntyre	B. Ehinger	
M. Pollock		
J. Knoth		
A. Kroll		

Scott Swanson, WSAC, moved that Policy Direct the AMPA to use the ranking system generated by Policy to approach candidates for participation in the Technical Type Np Prescriptions Workgroup. The motion was seconded. It was suggested that Policy divide the topic into two motions. Scott agreed to separate the motions and moved that Policy accept the ranking system generated by Policy for participation in the Technical Type Np Prescriptions Workgroup. The motion was seconded.

Jim Peters asked whether it would be appropriate for the Workgroup to invite additional experts to attend certain Workgroup meetings. Terra noted that there may be room in the budget for Workgroup expenses to compensate invited experts.

Policy representatives expressed concern that the proposed stipend amount would not adequately compensate the Workgroup participants. Mark Hicks, AMPA, suggested that he meet with Jim Peters and Darin Cramer, the Workgroup Co-Chairs, to discuss the statement of work and present it to Policy.

**Decision:** Accept the ranking system generated by Policy for participation in the Technical Type Np Prescriptions Workgroup. The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.

Policy then opened the floor for discussion on the second motion.

**Decision:** Direct the AMPA to use the ranking system generated by Policy to approach candidates for participation in the Technical Type Np Prescriptions Workgroup. The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.

In response to a suggestion from the Co-Chairs, Ken Miller moved that Policy direct the AMPA to present the contract scope of work for the Type Np Prescriptions Workgroup to Policy at the September Policy meeting for approval. The motion was seconded. It was suggested that Policy simply review the scope of work and offer comments rather than take an official vote on the document. An amendment was made to the motion.

**Decision:** Direct the AMPA to present the contract scope of work for the Type Np Prescriptions Workgroup to Policy at the September Policy meeting. The Federal caucus and Eastside Tribal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.

**Action:** Mark Hicks, Jim Peters, and Darin Cramer will meet to develop the Type Np Workgroup contract statement of work and compensation plan and present to Policy for comment at the September 5 meeting.

**Action:** Mark Hicks will reach out to candidates for the Type Np Workgroup using the ranking system generated by Policy on August 1, 2019.

**Small Forest Landowner Template Workgroup Update** – The Small Forest Landowner Template Workgroup had a productive meeting on July 31. Marc Engel, DNR and Template Workgroup Co-Chair, shared that the workgroup has funding for notetaking services for the next two meetings, but has five more meetings scheduled in its work plan. Ken Miller, WFFA and Template Workgroup Co-Chair, stated that the Workgroup would welcome Emily Hernandez, DNR, to note take for any of the Workgroup’s meetings that Triangle is not available to support.

Policy discussed the Workgroup’s remaining work plan. Terra Rentz stated that the Budget Workgroup will meet to review the current budget requests pertaining to various items in the MPS and present various funding options and trade-offs to Policy. A Policy representative stated that their caucus is concerned about adding or contributing more time and budget to the Template Workgroup process.

It was noted that the AMPA has some discretion over the AMP budget for minor adjustments. A Policy representative suggested that the AMPA work with the Template Workgroup Co-Chairs to determine a solution for continued notetaking services. Darin Cramer, WFFA, moved to direct the AMPA and DNR to fund note-taking support for three additional meetings of the Small Forest Landowner Template Workgroup. The motion was seconded.

**Decision:** Direct the AMPA and DNR to fund note-taking support for three additional meetings of the Small Forest Landowner Template Workgroup. The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.

**Action:** Mark Hicks will update Triangle’s budget and contract for three additional meetings of the Small Forest Landowner Template Workgroup.

**Action on Buffer-Shade Study** – Policy discussed whether the findings report for the Stream-Associated Amphibian Response to Manipulation of Forest Canopy Shading Study (or Buffer-Shade study) warrants action. Terra provided a visual chart depicting Policy’s decision path. Policy also considered whether the Technical Type Np Prescriptions Workgroup should use this study as a source of information in its work.

Darin Cramer moved that Policy recommend that the Buffer-Shade findings report warrant action. The motion was seconded. Policy discussed the motion. Some representatives stated that they do not feel that the findings of this particular study warrant action, while others expressed discomfort with not recommending action.

Policy took a short break to caucus. Upon return, Policy voted on the following motion: Recommend that the Buffer-Shade findings warrant action. The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; the DNR caucus, Ecology/WDFW caucus, and Westside Tribal caucus voted thumbs down; all other caucuses voted thumbs up. The motion failed.

Chris Conklin moved that Policy recommend that the Buffer-Shade study findings do not warrant action, however the technical implications and recommendations portion of the report warrant action by the AMP. The motion was seconded. Policy discussed the motion. Terra reminded Policy that this decision will be presented to the Board at its November meeting along with a presentation. This means that Policy has the opportunity to bring additional information before the Board.

Policy called to question the above motion. The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; the Counties caucus and Industrial Landowners caucus voted thumbs sideways; the Conservation caucus voted thumbs down; all other caucuses voted thumbs up. The motion failed.

Jim Peters moved that Policy recommend that the Buffer-Shade study findings do not warrant action. The motion was tabled after a brief discussion. Mark Hicks, AMPA, noted that the Board Manual states that the “action” that a findings report might warrant refers to action by the Board. Therefore, Policy’s decision on the Buffer-Shade findings report should depend on whether there is sufficient scientific response to merit action by the Board. Mark noted that only a limited number of points from Policy’s discussion would classify as actions of the Board.

Jim Peters untabled the previous motion. The motion was seconded. It was noted that the Conservation caucus is concerned that the Buffer Shade study provides evidence of a temperature increase with loss of shade, that this reinforces similar evidence of temperature increases from other studies, and that to not recommend action would disregard this evidence of a negative ecological impact.

There was discussion of Policy’s precedence of taking action on study results. It was noted that when Policy presents to the Board, Policy could emphasize that while the Buffer-Shade findings report does not itself warrant Board action according to Policy, Policy recommends that this study be included among others with similar findings for a comprehensive review by the Type Np Workgroup.

Policy then took a vote on the following motion: Recommend that the Buffer-Shade study findings do not warrant action. The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; the Industrial Landowner caucus voted thumbs sideways; the Conservation caucus voted thumbs down; all other caucuses voted thumbs up. The motion failed.

Steve Barnowe-Meyer, WFFFA, moved to reconsider the motion made by Chris Conklin. Policy discussed the language of the motion. Chris suggested that Policy make a follow-up motion to clarify how it wants to address this issue. Steve rescinded the motion in order to make a new motion with amended language. The amended language was moved by Darin Cramer and seconded by Chris Conklin.

**Decision:** Recommend that the Buffer-Shade study findings do not warrant action by the Board at this time, however the technical implications and recommendations portion of the report warrant action by the AMP. Additionally, recommend that the study and findings be provided to the Technical Type Np Prescriptions Workgroup as a source of information. The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; the Conservation caucus voted thumbs sideways; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.

ENREP Questions for CMER – Policy reviewed the memo to CMER regarding the Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness Project (ENREP). Some grammatical edits were made on screen during the discussion. Highlights of the discussion are listed below.

- There was discussion of Policy’s decisions on past studies and the tradeoffs of including or excluding an analysis of underlying mechanisms in the study design. It was noted that Policy should be aware that if the group is not willing to fund the study enough to study underlying

mechanisms, it risks receiving study results that Policy does not feel are informative enough to recommend changes to the rule.

- Terra suggested creating a table outlining Policy's decision space, in order to provide greater clarity about how Policy should approach the information received from CMER.
- A Policy representative asked whether the ENREP budget could be broken down for Policy's understanding. Emily Hernandez, DNR, responded that this could be provided to Policy. Chris Mendoza noted that the study design delineates what information will be gleaned from answering each critical question.
- Emily Hernandez noted that the project team visited the sites in the east Cascades and plans to present an update to the Scientific Advisory Group-Eastside (SAGE) and CMER in August.

Action: Mark Hicks will send the ENREP memo (as amended by Policy on August 1, 2019) to CMER.

Action: Chris Mendoza will provide a breakdown of the study variables the ENREP project to Policy.

Improvements to AMP Process and Communications – Policy began a follow-up discussion to the Protocol and Standards Manual Workshop presented by Ash Roorbach, NWIFC, at the June 6, 2019 Policy meeting. It was suggested that a small, informal group of Policy members review the technical and process recommendations included in the studies that Policy has received in recent years. Chris Conklin, WDFW, offered to lead a group of individuals in preparing for a formal discussion for Policy. Scott Swanson, Jim Peters, and Marc Engel offered to find someone from their caucuses to participate in the ad hoc group. Terra encouraged Chris to reach out to the CMER Co-Chairs for potential involvement of CMER members.

A Policy representative shared that the Board subcommittee working on the anadromous floor is experiencing some challenges in reaching consensus. It was suggested that some of the Board members be invited to this informal group after some anticipated changes in Board membership have taken place. Policy discussed recommending that the Board receive a presentation on the PSM and Board Manual 22.

Marc Engel moved that Policy recommend that the Board receive training on Board Manual Section 22, including the Protocol and Standards Manual. The motion was seconded.

**Decision:** Recommend that the Board receive training on Board Manual Section 22, including the Protocol and Standards Manual. The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.

Action: Chris Conklin (with assistance from Jim Peters, Marc Engel and Scott Swanson) will form a group of AMP participants to review the technical recommendations from recent findings reports received by Policy and identify common themes. The group will consider process improvements within the AMP to address the recommendations.

Next Steps – Policy reviewed the monthly workload document and the meeting schedule for 2019. Timing for other items will be updated in the monthly workload document.

Curt Veldhuisen asked Policy to begin looking for nominees for co-chairs from their caucuses for spring 2020.

Next meeting date: The next Policy meeting will occur on Thursday, September 5<sup>th</sup>, 2019.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.



Attachment 1 – Participants by Caucus at 8/1 Meeting\*

**Conservation Caucus**

\*Alec Brown, WEC

Chris Mendoza, Conservation Caucus and CMER Co-Chair

**County Caucus**

Kendra Smith, Skagit County

\*Scott Swanson, WSAC

**Industrial Timber Landowner Caucus**

\*Darin Cramer, WFPA

Doug Hooks, WFPA

Martha Wehling, WFPA

Megan Tuttle, Weyerhaeuser

Joe Monks, Northwest Hardwoods

**Small Forest Landowner Caucus**

\*Steve Barnowe-Meyer, WFFA

Ken Miller, WFFA

**State Caucus – DNR**

\*Marc Engel, DNR

Emily Hernandez, DNR

Joe Shramek, DNR

Heather Gibbs, DNR

**State Caucus – Ecology & WDFW**

\*Rich Doenges, Ecology

\*Chris Conklin, WDFW

Terra Rentz, WDFW and Co-Chair

Chris Briggs, Ecology

**Tribal Caucus – Westside**

\*Jim Peters, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission

Ash Roorbach, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission

Curt Veldhuisen, Skagit River System Cooperative and Co-Chair

Mark Mobbs, Quinault Indian Nation

\*caucus representative

**Others**

Annalise Ritter, Triangle Associates

Mark Hicks, Adaptive Management Program Administrator

July 11, 2019

TO: Doug Hooks and Chris Mendoza, Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research Committee (CMER) Co-Chairs

FROM: Curt Veldhuisen and Terra Rentz, Policy Co-Chairs

SUBJECT: ENREP Questions relevant for Policy evaluation

---

During the development of the FY20/21 Master Project Schedule, Policy found that the ENREP study was projecting a substantial budget increase, which caused concern regarding the fiscal prudence of the project and the likelihood of eventual findings providing relevant information to inform decision-making. Policy requested a full day workshop in May 2019 to understand why costs increased and where to achieve savings. Additionally, at the June 2019 Forest Practices Board Meeting, the Board indicated a desire for Policy and CMER to take a closer look at projects, specifically ENREP, to ensure that cost efficiencies were met.

Policy's role in science and research is to ensure that the information provided through science and research can inform Policy decisions and to ensure a level of fiduciary responsibility over the Adaptive Management Program (AMP). More specifically, can the science and research provided inform implementation of the HCP and/or inform a rule change, validation, or creation. Policy recognizes the role of CMER in directing the scientific inquiries and research associated with the AMP and is aiming, through this request, to support that role and lean on CMER to help Policy ensure that science and research is, in fact, providing the kind of information that can inform decision-making and adaptive management.

Policy has identified a number of project elements for possible assessment and is requesting CMER's assistance in understanding the scientific tradeoffs of elimination or modification of certain project elements. Specifically, we have the following questions and needs:

1. Please review the Project Team's assessment of the site-review from summer 2019 and provide Policy with CMER's position on the inference ability of the research project as currently sited.
2. Are the secured/proposed paired basins sufficient in order for Policy to infer effects to the whole east side per the original study design? If not, what are the limitations of inference? How does that inference change with elimination of the east Cascades sites or the Coxit site?
3. How can findings related to the following study factors be used to inform the adaptive management process and/or rule making or rule validation? Are there indicators in the HCP or current rule that would provide a basis for decision making for Policy? What are the information tradeoffs to keeping versus removing a study factor? What does this factor cost?
  - a. Macroinvertebrates
  - b. Sediment output
  - c. Disconnected Np streams
4. Are there ways to answer the questions with a less frequent sampling regime?

Policy would like to discuss CMER's response and a presentation from the Principal Investigators regarding recent site evaluation at the October 2019 Policy Meeting. At that time, Policy will determine if budget reductions should be made.