

Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee
December 7, 2017 Meeting Summary

Actions and Decisions from Meeting

Action	Assignment
1. Send CR-102 filing to Claire Chase to be forwarded to TFW Policy Committee.	Randi Thurston/WDFW
2. Review Prioritization Subgroup’s draft criteria and “test drive” MPS project(s); send thoughts/feedback to Claire by COB December 22.	All caucuses
3. Reconvene if necessary between December 27-January 3.	Prioritization Subgroup
4. Reconvene before January 4, if possible.	SFL Template Subgroup
5. Schedule next Unstable Slopes PI Subgroup meeting.	Mary Scurlock
6. Send feedback on draft 2017 Accomplishments page to Claire Chase by December 22.	All caucus representatives
7. Confirm correct HCP document to be included in Policy guidance handbook.	Claire Chase (with Ray Entz)
8. To prepare for January meeting discussion on forest health and wildfires: a. DNR will look at wildfire strategic plan and prepare notes b. AMPA will consider how this issue could be addressed within the AMP c. SFLOs will consider ideas from Patti Playfair’s presentation at Board tour and share notes	Marc Engel Hans Berge Steve Barnowe-Meyer and Ken Miller

Decision	Notes
Accept the Extensive Riparian Vegetation Monitoring Pilot Project Report and Findings Report; take no further action at this time.	Approved with consensus from all caucuses except the absent eastside tribal caucus.

Welcome, Introductions, & Old Business – Scott Swanson, Chair of the Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee (Policy), welcomed participants and led introductions (*please see Attachment 1 for a list of participants*). There were no changes requested for the draft agenda.

Announcement – The Chair noted that at the November Forest Practices Board (Board) meeting, the Upper Columbia United Tribes officially withdrew from the TFW Policy Committee. This affects Ray Entz’s participation both as the eastside tribal caucus representative and the Co-Chair. Ray does intend to follow Policy’s ongoing work and if an agenda item is relevant to the eastside tribal issues, he may attend or phone into a meeting.

Meeting Summary – Policy reviewed the draft November 2, 2017 meeting summary. Several caucuses suggested edits to the summary, which all caucuses approved.

Decision: Policy accepted the revised meeting summary as final; all caucuses voted thumbs up except the eastside tribal and industrial timber landowner caucuses which were absent.

WDFW Hydraulic Permit Application Rulemaking – Randi Thurston from the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife presented about the agency’s proposed changes to the hydraulic permit application (HPA) rulemaking. An overview of the changes:

- The CR-101 was filed in October.
- Three of the changes are to the administrative chapters on procedures and appeals.
- The fourth change is to the chapter on mineral prospecting, and specifically to change the following work windows:
 - Lengthen the window on the Similkameen River by one month (proposed window: June 1 – October 31).
 - Shorten the window on the Sultan River by six months (proposed window: August 1-31). This is due to recent upgrades to the City of Everett’s water diversion structure which now has fish passage facilities. This change would make permanent the existing emergency rule affecting the work window.
 - A minor change is to change one water body name in Okanagan County to a more politically correct name.

Policy members had several questions for Randi, which were answered as follows:

- The tribes in the affected areas have been contacted for their concerns.
- The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) has reviewed the draft changes and found nothing major for forest practices. DNR continues to consult with WDFW for the work window when there are HPAs in the forested environment.
- The changes will be posted to the website once the CR-102 is filed in the new year (likely not until late January at the earliest).
- The mineral prospecting windows are conservative, set up so biologists can create recommendations for each specific permit, based on the different activities. The work windows are meant to capture the whole basin and the needs for all fish within that basin.
- Policy asked Randi to send the CR-102 filing around once it has been filed; Randi will send it to Claire Chase who will forward it to the Policy Committee.

Small Forest Landowners Template Subgroup – Marc Engel and Ken Miller have been leading the efforts for the Small Forest Landowners (SFLs) Template Subgroup. Since the November 2 Policy meeting, the subgroup met more than once to address the westside tribal caucus’s questions and the contractor’s questions. The contractors are satisfied with the responses and will use those to inform their next products to the subgroup. Additionally, in response to a November 2017 request by the Board, the subgroup will revisit two previous templates that the Adaptive Management Program (AMP) had worked on but had not received full approval (conifer restoration template and conifer harvest template for riparian zones). These are separate from the SFLs’ westside low-impact alternate template proposal that the subgroup is already working on. Those previous templates could provide a helpful basis for further discussion about future template(s) that will help SFLs. The Board expects an update from Policy at their February 2018 meeting; DNR informed Policy that the Board will receive a brief update in Feb,

2018DNR shared that they also encouraged Policy and the subgroup to think creatively about how to finalize templates that can work for all caucuses.

Additional discussion included:

- The Department of Ecology representative encouraged Policy to clearly explain what they have been doing to review the template and why they have not reached a conclusion.
- The federal caucus representative encouraged Policy to substantively update the Board in February, without asking the Board for more time to work.
- Several caucuses noted that it would be helpful to provide the Board in February with more than a status update.

Program Priorities – The Prioritization Subgroup has tackled several issues related to identifying draft priorities for the AMP, including drafting criteria that Policy could use in future conversations about the Master Project Schedule. The subgroup shared a written update to Policy that identifies all the areas they came to agreement on; they also have a few outstanding questions they have yet to answer fully, including the idea of scoring or ranking the criteria. The Policy discussion included the following points:

- The subgroup is hoping for Policy feedback sooner than later on their initial set of recommendations because soon Policy and CMER could use them in the early 2018 process to update the Master Project Schedule.
- The industrial timber landowner caucus noted that the priorities and criteria are important because sometimes the Board assigns additional work to Policy and CMER without seeing the repercussions to the budget.
- The Ecology representative suggested that ideally, the criteria would be set without caucuses ensuring that their pet project fares well in the criteria.
- The federal caucus representative stated that definitely answering scientific uncertainties is uncommon and the goal of adaptive management is to reduce uncertainty, so a prioritization criteria focused on definitively answering questions could have the unintended effect of deprioritizing all adaptive management research.
- There was some discussion and disagreement noted about the goals that the criteria should focus on (overall goals of the Forests & Fish Report (FFR) versus goals listed explicitly for the Adaptive Management Program). The AMPA suggested that because the AMP is nested within the FFR, the AMP goals are nested in the FFR goals. Several caucuses shared their perspectives on this topic, including:
 - The federal caucus stated that, through the FFR and HCP, the stakeholders previously agreed that accurately identifying and buffering fish habitat, providing for water quality and fish passage, and avoiding increases in landslide rates are the ways to achieve the overall program goals, including maintaining a viable timber industry and harvestable levels of salmonids. The adaptive management goals, which are distinct from the overall program goals, are solely focused on better achieving the resource objectives. Therefore, the adaptive management objectives and resource objectives define the scope of work for TFW Policy. Policy's tasks are to finish defining resource objectives and recommend the ways to best achieve the resource objectives based on best available science. The Board may decide to balance science-based recommendations with other considerations.
 - The industrial timber landowner caucus stated that the federal caucus' opinion related to TFW Policy's scope of work is not shared by all caucuses.
 - The conservation caucus agreed with the federal caucus' statement about the drivers of the AMP.

- The SFLs caucus representative suggested that the important question is about which projects the AMP funds, not whether to do any one project.
- The westside tribal caucus representative asked if the word “inform” in the criteria is about data or qualitative information. The subgroup will consider that in their future work.
- Several caucuses agreed with the subgroup that scoring or ranking of the criteria will be an important next step to allow a narrowing of the priority projects, knowing that there is an anticipated budget shortfall in the near term.
- The AMPA is already working with the Project Managers to forecast project budgets more accurately, which may help in this ongoing conversation.

Policy agreed to take on a homework assignment before December 22: Review the draft criteria and “test drive” MPS project(s); send thoughts/feedback to Claire Chase. This feedback will then be combined together and shared in the meeting packet for the January 2018 Policy meeting. Ideally, the criteria will be finalized by the February Policy meeting to be used in the CMER budgeting process at their February meeting, and then to be used by Policy at the March budget meeting.

Based on a caucus suggestion, Policy agreed to make their March 2018 meeting a 2-day budget/MPS retreat and spend significant time working with the project leads/Principals Investigators/TWIG groups to better understand the MPS projects, timelines, outputs/outcomes, etc. Policy is always welcome to attend CMER meetings to learn more, and the Policy Chair will work with the AMPA to determine if there should be a concerted effort to invite Policy to the February CMER meeting and/or to invite CMER to the Policy 2-day March meeting. That way, there is more likelihood that all the people working on a project hear the conversation and understand the direction from Policy.

Extensive Riparian Vegetation Monitoring Pilot Project – The AMPA reminded Policy of some previous steps taken on this pilot project:

- This pilot project is essentially phase 1 of a bigger project. The next step is scoping (phase 2), for which Policy previously approved the budget.
- The Findings Report was recently approved by the Riparian Scientific Advisory Group (RSAG) and then approved by CMER.
- The AMP is finalizing the contract with the contractors to do the scoping (phase 2), which should take about four months. After the scoping is complete, it will go to RSAG and then CMER for approval steps, and then to Policy. The scoping will include recommendations for the next step(s) of the process, which will be in time for Policy to use those considerations in the budgeting discussion for the 19/21 biennial budget (which are currently left blank in the MPS).
- It was noted that the process for the different phases of this project is procedurally irregular because Policy is getting the pilot project Findings Report after having approved phase 2. But that means that at this point, Policy is not being asked to make more adjustments to the current budget.

Decision: The industrial timber landowner caucus made a motion to accept the Findings Report & 6 Questions, which was amended by several caucuses to finally read:

Accept the Extensive Riparian Vegetation Monitoring Pilot Project Report and Findings Report; take no further action at this time.

All caucuses approved this motion with thumbs up, except the eastside tribal caucus which was absent. It was also noted that important to this approval is the understanding that Policy will revisit this project and

decision when the scoping of the implementation pilot is brought back to Policy, as was decided previously by Policy in the budgeting process.

Board's 2018 Work Plan – Marc Engel noted that the Board made several changes to their 2018 work plan at their November meeting; DNR will need to transcribe those changes onto a revised work plan and then they can share that with Policy. At this point, he understands the Board's expectation for deliverables from Policy to include:

- Policy's recommendations on forest health and wildfires (process and timing): in February 2018
- Potential Habitat Break (PHB) recommendation: in February 2018
- Hard Rock study recommendations: in August 2018
- Policy's recommendations for 2019 work plan: in August 2018
- SFLs low-impact template recommendation: in November 2018
- Unstable slopes – updates as needed

Additionally, the Board expects work to be done on a few Board Manual sections, including work on forest chemicals and water typing (both the F/N and Np/Ns breaks). DNR will contact all Policy leads in late December 2017 or early January 2018 to invite participants for the stakeholder group to review the water typing rule and guidance. Though the meetings will happen after February 2018, DNR would like to have those meetings scheduled by late January.

Finally, the Board agreed to make their February and August meetings two days instead of one, and will include their regular October field tour.

Potential Habitat Break Technical Work – The AMPA updated Policy about the ongoing technical work to develop criteria for Potential Habitat Breaks (PHBs) for use in the F/N regulatory break. This work falls into two categories:

- Development of PHB criteria
 - The science panel met with stakeholders to discuss potential criteria.
 - The science panel completed the data collation in mid-November and completed the data analysis at the end of November. They anticipate sending a draft report to the stakeholder group on December 8.
 - The science panel will meet again with the stakeholder group on December 14.
 - On January 16, the science panel plans to send their recommendations report to Board members.
- Validation study
 - The science panel expects to present a peer-reviewed study design to the Board in May 2018 (slight change from previous plans). They hope to send a draft study design to the stakeholder group in January.
 - The AMPA hopes that ISAG, CMER, and Policy will look at the study because he anticipates asking the Board to direct CMER to implement the validation study.
- Additionally, the AMPA noted that the PHB criteria developed initially will almost certainly be different than the ideal PHB criteria learned from the validation study.

Policy members had questions, which were answered as follows:

- The field season protocol will be updated when the rule and Board Manual are updated. Input from previous work done by Policy and ad-hoc technical groups are being used as DNR puts together the draft rule and Board Manual to be finalized by the stakeholder group.
- The AMP anticipates finalizing the new water typing rule and Board Manual with interim PHB criteria based on the best information we have in 2018. But the results from the validation study could further change those PHB criteria and that may require another rule change down the road.
- The science panel is still figuring out whether eDNA can be used as part of the validation study (the issue is mostly about costs).

Board Subcommittee on AMP Improvements – The AMPA updated Policy that the Board Subcommittee received 11 proposals and interviewed three highly qualified candidates for the contractor to interview and facilitate the principals, and also work with the Board Subcommittee. They hope to check references soon and expect contract execution by the end of the year. Responses to Policy members' questions included:

- The interviews of principals, Policy members, CMER members, and possibly other AMP players are expected sometime between mid-January to mid-March 2018. The interviews may be in groups or individually, mostly depending on schedules.
- The first principals' meeting would likely be late April or early May 2018.
- The invitation for the caucus principal(s) will likely come from the facilitator to the individual caucus.

Unstable Slopes Proposal Initiation Subgroup – Mary Scurlock, Marc Engel, and Karen Terwilleger are part of this subgroup, which includes Scott Swanson as the Chair observer. The AMP is close to having a proposed research strategy from the Uplands Scientific Advisory Group (UPSAG), so the next step is to review that research strategy at Policy and then likely Policy will delegate further work to the subgroup to ensure the entire Proposal Initiation is addressed. Mary Scurlock agreed to schedule the next Unstable Slopes PI Subgroup meeting.

Hard Rock Study – Howard Haemmerle introduced Bill Ehinger, Marc Hayes, Dave Schuett-Hames, and Aimee McIntyre as some of the Principal Investigators of the Hard Rock study who attended Policy's discussion to clarify answers to Policy's questions. The clarifying responses were as follows:

- The reason cutthroat trout was the uppermost species less than half the time is because many basins that qualified for the study did not have an adequate fish population; they found that the basin size minimum limited the number of qualifying basins. Within the small sample size of six basins, they did not try to evaluate treatment effectiveness. Another complication in the sampling is that at one point the reach below the sampling site went dry.
- The SFLs caucus representative expressed hope that the contractor working on the SFLs template product could use this report to inform their work.
- The temperature changes at different sites that had differing elevations was unrelated to the elevation; at least five of the six sites had still-elevated water temperature as far downstream as they could sample. They saw that the modeled results were different than the field results in some places.
- The industrial timber landowner caucus representative hoped that the Findings Report will include a discussion of the interaction of the different elements.

- Bill Ehinger anticipates sharing the temperature duration curves by July or August 2019. He suggested using the F/N break because it is a common place where temperature is measured.
- CMER could help Policy consider adequate buffer width(s), considering the best technical information including the science from this study.
- So far in post-harvest sampling, they are not seeing significant issues for amphibians but that may change in future sampling years.
- The PIs expected to see more wood enter the streams post-harvest, but one unexpected result is that they found higher densities of amphibians in those wood-dense reaches. This could be positive information but the longer-term impacts have yet to be studied. The PIs also expected the temperature to decrease faster than the post-harvest initial results have shown.

AMP staff updated Policy on the timeline for the five Findings Reports they will receive in early 2018 (chapters 5, 6, 7, 15, and 17). The Findings Report for chapters 7 and 17 have gone through review at the SAG level but not yet to CMER. The plan is to have CMER discuss those at their January meeting with expected CMER approval at their February meeting, meaning that it will be available for the March Policy meeting. The schedule for the Findings Reports for chapters 5, 6, and 15 was unknown at this meeting.

2017 Accomplishments – The Chair put together a set of accomplishments from the 2017 meeting summaries and thanked Policy for the hard work this year. He noted that the process can feel frustrating at times but everyone is working through it, even the eastside tribes who are interested in this work even though they have had to leave the table for the time being. Caucuses were asked to send additional accomplishments to Claire Chase by December 22, and then this draft will be up for Policy approval in January for sending onto the Board.

Next Steps – Policy reviewed potential topics for the January 4, 2018 meeting.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:15pm.

Attachment 1 – Participants by Caucus at 12/7/17 Meeting*

Conservation Caucus

Chris Mendoza, Mendoza Environmental
*Mary Scurlock, M. Scurlock & Associates

County Caucus

*Scott Swanson, Washington State Association
of Counties (Chair)

Federal Caucus

*Marty Acker, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
*Michelle Wilcox, Environmental Protection
Agency

Industrial Timber Landowners Caucus

Doug Hooks, Washington Forest Protection
Association
*Karen Terwilleger, Washington Forest
Protection Association

Small Forest Landowners Caucus

*Steve Barnowe-Meyer, Washington Farm
Forestry Association
*Ken Miller, Washington Farm Forestry
Association

*caucus representative(s)

Others

Hans Berge, Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Bill Ehinger, Ecology
Howard Haemmerle, AMP
Marc Hayes, Ecology
Angela Johnson, DNR
Aimee McIntyre, WDFW
Ted Parker, Snohomish County (phone)
Dave Schuett-Hames, CMER
Randi Thurston, WDFW
Claire Chase, Triangle Associates

State Caucus – DNR

*Marc Engel, Department of Natural Resources
Joe Shramek, Department of Natural Resources

State Caucus – Ecology and Fish & Wildlife

*Mark Hicks, Department of Ecology
*Don Nauer, Washington Department of Fish &
Wildlife

Tribal Caucus – Eastside Tribes

Marc Gauthier, Upper Columbia United Tribes
(phone)

Tribal Caucus – Westside Tribes

*Jim Peters, Northwest Indian Fisheries
Commission
Ash Roorbach, Northwest Indian Fisheries
Commission
*Curt Veldhuisen, Skagit River System
Cooperative (phone)

Attachment 2 – Ongoing Priorities Checklist

Priority	Assignment	Status &Notes
Type N	Policy to Board	Policy agreed by consensus on recommendations to the Board which were presented in November 2017.
Type F	Board & Technical Group	Policy delivered consensus recommendations to the Board in May 2017; the Board determined some areas that needed work by a technical group (primarily on potential habitat break criteria). DNR is developing the rule language.
Small Forest Landowners Westside Template	SFLOs Template Subgroup	Subgroup is meeting separately; co-chaired by Marc Engel and Ken Miller.
Unstable Slopes	Policy	UPSAG hired a contractor to do a glacial deep-seated literature synthesis. Policy presented their perspective on the unstable slopes proposal initiation to the Board in May 2017 and convened an Unstable Slopes PI subgroup to attend to those issues.
Ongoing CMER reports reviewed by Policy	Doug Hooks & Todd Baldwin, CMER Co-Chairs	CMER Co-Chairs give regular written and/or verbal update(s) to Policy.

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

Entity/Group/Subgroup	Next Meeting Date	Notes
TFW Policy Committee	January 4, 2018	
CMER	December 14	
Forest Practices Board	February 7, 2018	
Small Forest Landowners Template Subgroup	TBD	As scheduling allows.
Budget Subgroup	Quarterly meetings with AMPA	Quarterly reports at Policy meetings.