

Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee  
February 28 and March 1, 2018 Meeting Summary

Decisions and Actions from Meeting

| Action   | Responsibility   |
|--|--|
| 1. Break down the costs of both parts of the LiDAR Based Water Typing Model/Physicals Study Design project to compare with the combined project. | Hans Berge   |
| 2. Confirm which projects Cramer Fish Sciences is under contract for and how those projects relate to line items in the MPS.                     | Hans Berge   |
| 3. Break down the budget and project scopes for lines 48, 49, and 50.  | Aimee McIntyre and Howard Haemmerle  |
| 4. Reconvene to develop proposal(s) to balance the FY17/19 biennial budget for the April Policy meeting (see page 14 for direction).             | Budget Subgroup (Rich Doenges, Karen Terwilleger, Mary Scurlock, Terra Rentz, Hans Berge, Scott Swanson, Curt Veldhuisen, Angela Johnson/Howard Haemmerle) |

| Decision   | Notes   |
|--|---|
| 1. Approved direction to CMER and RSAG for completing the Riparian Literature Synthesis (see page 11). | Approval with five caucuses voting thumbs up; the federal and WDFW/Ecology caucuses voting thumbs sideways, and the conservation and eastside caucuses absent |
| 2. Approved direction to CMER and ISAG to start the eDNA proof of concept project (see page 14).       | Approval with five caucuses voting thumbs up; the federal and DNR caucuses voting thumbs sideways, and the conservation and eastside caucuses absent          |

-----Day 1: Wednesday, February 28, 2018-----

**Welcome & Introductions** – Scott Swanson, Chair of the Timber, Fish, & Wildlife (TFW) Policy Committee (Policy), welcomed participants and led introductions (please see Attachment 1 for a list of participants). Jim Peters from the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission (NWIFC) welcomed everyone to the Commission and explained the history of the Commission as fisheries and habitat management support for all western Washington treaty tribes.

*Announcements*

- The small forest landowner caucus representative shared that the Washington legislature is considering funding for the Parcel and Forestland Database; the House currently has this funded in their budget but the Senate does not. He encouraged other caucuses to reach out to their legislative liaisons or directly to state Senators to fund this database which benefits all TFW caucuses.
- The Chair noted that Policy will have an optional get-together this evening at Ken Miller’s house.

**Outcomes of Prioritization Criteria Scoring** – Heather Gibbs reviewed the summary of scores she compiled based on the scores she received from caucuses over the past few weeks. She did not receive scores from WDFW, the conservation caucus, or the eastside tribal caucus. For each project, the summary

sheet included the minimum score, the maximum score, and an average of all the scores received. Based on the average scores, Heather ranked the projects by highest average. Heather noticed that when uncertain about the answer to a criterion, some caucuses scored a project with 4 on the 0-8 scale which may be relatively high.

- The federal caucus representative noted that he is not looking to adopt these criteria as a formal procedure for budget adoption, but is happy to use the summary of scores to informally advise Policy in today's discussion.
- The conservation caucus representative explained their uncertainty in scoring projects and felt that the almost-done projects should not be scored in the same way as other projects.
- The WDFW representative noticed that some projects are really ready to go ("shovel-ready"), while others have good ideas but are not fully scoped out nor ready for immediate implementation. She was nervous about how to rank projects against each other when there are different levels of information among them.
- The federal caucus representative asked that at some point in the budget discussion, Policy consider recommending a budget adequate to cover anticipated costs instead of eliminating studies to maintain a flat budget.

**Review CMER Master Project Schedule** – The Chair thanked all caucuses for testing the criteria and prioritization scores; he encouraged Policy to use the summary of scores as a part of the overall prioritization and budget evaluation of the Master Project Schedule (MPS). Policy's first deliverable to the Board is recommending a balanced FY19 budget by May (which means a Policy decision no later than the April meeting). If Policy is able to make changes in out-years beyond FY19 that help balance those budgets, that will be enormously helpful.

Policy identified seven questions to consider in the process of reviewing projects at this workshop:

1. What is the difference between the lowest and highest score received?
2. What is the most accurate budget number?
3. How does this project affect the long-term budget (e.g. confidence in out-year budget amounts)?
4. What is the impact of delaying this study?
5. What potential is there to phase this study?
6. What is the current status of this project?
7. Does this project relate or impact other studies (e.g. sequencing)?

Policy agreed to work through the MPS, going line-by-line through the projects. The Chair asked to discuss programmatic and staffing parts of the administration at the top of the budget at the meeting the next day.

**Line 18: LiDAR Based Water Typing Model/Physicals Study Design (combined)**

The Adaptive Management Program Administrator (AMPA) explained that the model and the physicals have been combined into the same project, which is to develop and/or evaluate the current physicals and create an operationalized system of LiDAR for the water typing model. This follows the proof of concept presented by Luke Rogers to the Board in August 2016.

- The Forest Practices Board (Board) has clarified they only are interested in getting to a study design and any implementation of the study design would take additional budget which is not currently estimated in the out-years.
- The contract is through Cramer Fish Sciences with numerous Principal Investigators (PIs) through sub-contracts. Luke Rogers with the University of Washington's Precision Forestry Lab

is one of the PIs. At this point, there is no plan to involve the Instream Scientific Advisory Group (ISAG) unless the Board directs the study design into implementation.

- The AMPA updated the budget numbers to be \$60,000 in FY18 and \$116,202 in FY19. Right now, the project is still on track to be complete by the end of this current biennium. However, the AMPA will double-check whether that entire \$176,202 amount is solely for this project or includes other work that Cramer Fish Sciences is under contract for.
- This study design could answer any questions from the ISAG default physicals project (line 42), but the AMPA cautioned against assuming that at this point.
- The AMPA explained that combining the two parts of this project makes sense because one study is looking at the intention of the current physicals and one is looking at how the water typing model predicts fish habitat, so to validate both parts similar measurements would be made in the same places.
- The DNR representative reminded Policy that this is one of the Board-directed projects. The Chair explained that he is happy to remind the Board that there are implications on the overall MPS for new Board-directed projects.
- The conservation caucus representative noted for the Chair that it might make sense to explain to the Board that the idea for this project came up earlier in Policy's deliberations on water typing, and now the potential habitat break (PHB) validation study may be more important.
- The industrial timber landowner caucus representative asked the AMPA if he could show Policy what the cost breakdown is for both parts of this project, to compare to the combined project. The AMPA agreed to provide that for Policy at a later date.
- The federal caucus representative supported this project because it relates directly to the most central Adaptive Management Program (AMP) commitment in the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP).

Line 19: Potential Habitat Break Validation/Evaluation Study

- The science panel is planning to have a draft study design by March 9, and by mid-March they plan to share the draft with the stakeholder practitioner group. Then it will go to ISAG for review, back to the science panel to incorporate changes, and then to Independent Scientific Peer Review (ISPR). They hope to have a final draft for the Board's May 2018 meeting.
- This study has approximately 450 sites, which is why the costs are so high in the out-years. There is \$0 in FY18 because this is one of the projects under the contract with Cramer Fish Sciences, so the work on this in FY18 is accounted for in other line items.

Line 37: UPSAG Deep Seated – Placeholder funding for strategy execution

- Casey Hanell explained that this research strategy is for doing research that will evolve over time. That is why the Uplands Scientific Advisory Group (UPSAG) is recommending that the work primarily be done by staff instead of contractors (for continuity). The research recommended will take a decade or more since this information requires long-term monitoring. UPSAG has estimated \$200,000 each year starting in FY20 which is broken into \$125,000 for a staff person and \$75,000 for additional contractor work.
- The AMPA explained that the CMER geologist has to work on other projects and so Policy should think of this FTE time as additional to the CMER geologist.
- The Ecology representative wondered if some of this work should be considered base-level work for the existing DNR geologists outside the AMP.

- Casey explained that the questions asked of UPSAG so far are complex. UPSAG feels that in order to properly answer those questions, they recommend investing in a true research path which first requires understanding deep-seated landslides. Once they have that information, then they would look at assessing if forest harvests are affecting or creating new deep-seated landslides. At that point (possibly around FY21), there could be a moment where the AMP re-evaluates further investment in this strategy or looking for outside funding and project partners to more broadly look at land use impacts on deep-seated landslides.

Line 40: CWA UPSAG Mass Wasting Landscape-Scale Effectiveness

- The CMER geologist had started this project but has recently moved out of state so there has not been a lot of progress on scoping and feasibility. None of the \$80,000 has been spent so far and likely will not be spent in FY18.
- There is a dispute at UPSAG about how to get a background rate of landslides; they are open to outside ideas about how to get that information. Part of what the CMER geologist was evaluating is whether this is an intractable answer or if LiDAR can help.
- The Ecology representative noted that since this project is part of the Clean Water Act (CWA) assurances and is a Schedule L-1 question, he is not willing to remove this project but is open to discussing whether it is still viable.
- The conservation caucus representative noted that it is still important to do what Policy thinks is right even with incomplete information.
- The federal caucus representative suggested that the study could be temporally designed; a representative of the project team suggested that since shallow landslides are driven by infrequent, high-intensity storms so measuring at intervals may not be very useful.

Line 51: CWA UPSAG Road Sub-Basin-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring – Resample

- This resample is related to the other Roads project (line 34: CWA TWIG Road Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring). Resampling will gather more information but may not inform a lot more than what is known or will be addressed in the other Roads project to create a better way to model.
- The number of sites in this resample is statistically significant and therefore scaling down this project may not be valuable.
- One of the project team members noted that this project should likely start in FY25.

Line 20 WFFA Template PI Technical Assessment

- A new contract is being finalized with Cramer Fish Sciences to continue the work from started by the previous contractor. Policy updated the budget numbers based on the most recent information: \$50,000 in FY18 and \$14,400 in FY19.

Line 22: Riparian Literature Synthesis Project

- The AMPA noted that this project came from the small forest landowners template review. Most projects begin with a literature synthesis and that makes this a lesser priority even though it originally was a Board-directed priority.
- The industrial timber landowner caucus representative noted that there are other recent literature syntheses that are similar to what this sounds like, and maybe could be used. The AMPA agreed that there are recent other syntheses but that do not directly answer the questions from the SFL Template Subgroup.

- The small forest landowner caucus representatives are comfortable with the continued direction recently discussed for this literature synthesis and all work being done for their template review.
- The AMPA explained that this literature synthesis is bigger than what will be used for line 20 (WFFA Template PI Technical Assessment). However, the scope is flexible.
  - The federal caucus representative wondered if this synthesis could just focus on eastside large woody debris and performance targets because that is the relevant uncertainty identified in Schedule L1.
- See discussion and decision in March 1 meeting summary section (page 11) for further Policy discussion and decision.

Line 23: WETSAG Wetlands Mapping tool Validation

- \$75,000 has been spent to date. They now have a proposal from the University of Washington, working with a sub-contractor, to implement phase 2. They likely will spend \$25,000 in FY18 and \$75,000 in FY19.
- Delaying this project would be difficult based on the existing partnership with Ecology for their data.
- This does not relate to the Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project (FWEP), though the information from this project could be helpful to FWEP down the line.

Line 24: Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring – Vegetation, Type F/N, Westside (Remote Sensing)

- This is part of the proof of concept that Monika Moskal presented to Policy in August 2017. She and her team are currently developing the scoping of the implementation project which should be complete by the end of this fiscal year. The budget in FY19 is for any potential work needed past June 2018.
- Once the Riparian Scientific Advisory Group (RSAG) and CMER have had a chance to review, Policy should expect the scope delivered in fall 2018.
- There are new out-year budget amounts for this project.
- The industrial timber landowner caucus representative explained that previously, there were many more extensive monitoring projects on the MPS totaling around \$8 million. Due to the budget constraints, Policy agreed to take those projects off the list if this project stayed on to scope potential new research.

Policy next addressed the six projects on the MPS relating to the Hard Rock Study (lines 25, 28, 29, 30, 47, 48):

Line 25: CWA LWAG Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment in Hard Rock Lithologies – Genetics (Response to ISPR Comments)

- This is the very end of the genetics component of the much larger study and no future work is proposed for this effort.

Line 28: CWA LWAG Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment in Hard Rock Lithologies – Extended (Analysis & Summary Report)

- This is for the analysis and summary report writing for the extended sampling through eight years post-harvest. This includes sampling for amphibians, channel characteristics, riparian vegetation, and wood loading.

- The timeline is likely that the report will be delivered to CMER in fall 2018, then back and forth between reviewers and CMER before going to ISPR.
- The current budget estimate is \$134,000 for FY18 and \$236,000 for FY19.

Line 29: CWA Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project in Hard Rock Lithologies – 1) Monitoring ends June 2017, Report extended date

- This is the same work (analysis and summary report writing) as line 28 except for water temperature extended sampling.
- The timeline is likely that the report will be delivered to CMER in fall 2018, then back and forth between reviewers and CMER before going to ISPR. The primary author added \$50,000 in FY20 just to ensure that the report gets done even if the work extends beyond June 2019.

Line 30: CWA Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project in Hard Rock Lithologies – 2) Monitor into 2019 until references lost

- This is similar to line 29 but this line item is primarily the monitoring while the report-writing happens.

Line 47: Add-On LWAG Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project in Hard Rock Lithologies – Repeating Extended: Amphibians/Channel/Vegetation

- The \$3,200 in FY20 and FY21 is funding for someone to maintain a liaison relationship with the landowners, keeping current with their study sites and their harvest activities.
- LWAG is proposing that if Policy is interested, there is an opportunity to resample the same study sites another seven to eight years after the post-harvest sampling. Because of the amphibians' generations, it does not make sense to shift this project forward in time, though it could be delayed a few years. The resampling would happen in two field seasons (but split across three fiscal years).
- Splitting the sampling regime does not make sense for amphibians because there is so much variability in population estimates.
- The amphibian component is about half of the total field effort; the channel and vegetation components equal about the same amount as the amphibians resampling.

Line 48: Add on Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project in Hard Rock Lithologies – 3) Monitor into 2024 for temperature only / Soft Rock references

- If Policy is interested in additional sampling into 2024, the project team identified that three sites will be lost to harvest. This line item is to use three sites from the Soft Rock Study for the Hard Rock resampling. The study sites double-dip but the budget amounts do not.
- If the extended soft rock sampling does not get approved, it would not make sense to approve this line item.

Policy then addressed the three projects on the MPS relating to the Soft Rock Study (lines 26, 49, 50):

Line 26: CWA Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project – Soft Rock Lithologies 1) Monitoring ends in fall 2017, 2-yr post-harvest

- This line item is for the ongoing monitoring and writing the report, which is planned for completion by the end of this biennium.

Line 49: Add on Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project – Soft Rock Lithologies 2) Extended monitoring through 2020, FY21

- Previously, Policy had decided to extend this monitoring and this is the contingency to monitor until 2020. Policy updated the numbers in this line item: \$50,000 in FY20, \$125,000 in FY21, and \$40,000 in FY22.

Line 50: Line 49: Add on Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project – Soft Rock Lithologies 2) Extended monitoring through 2024, FY21

- This is the contingency to monitor until 2024, similar to line 49.

Line 32: CWA TWIG Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness Project – Combined (ENREP)

- This project started out as one project, then was split into wet and dry reaches because of the different ecosystems. The two TWIGs working on those separate portions requested in fall 2017 to re-combine the portions into a single project due to economies of scale in sampling.
- The TWIG is working on a single study design that has ISPR review and approval, but this product is stuck at CMER and likely will go to dispute resolution. If that happens, there is little possibility that very much work will happen this fiscal year.
- The fundamental disagreement is a policy issue about what treatment to test. The TWIG defaulted to testing the effectiveness of the common practice on the ground, which is within current rules.
- The budget needed to be updated quite a bit since the original MPS did not reflect the combined portions of the study. Roughly \$5.2 million for the entire study, both parts.
- The WDFW representative suggested delaying the start of this project until the next biennium because it does not sound like the project is ready for implementation. Project team members explained that could jeopardize the use of the sites already secured.
- The expense of this project is mostly due to not understanding why things are changing; with other projects there is usually more of an agreed-upon and working hypothesis. Also, this project requires a lot of transportation and use of equipment in snow.

Line 33: TWIG Westside Type F Riparian Prescription Monitoring

- The TWIG has a study design that has been reviewed and approved by ISPR and CMER. All documents will be provided to Policy for the April meeting. Phase 1 of the project is to evaluate information to be used to further evaluate the second phase; Phase 2 is the BACI study. Phase 1 will inform the project team about where to focus, since there has already been a desktop study of FPAs and their prescriptions.
- There's a year of no work because there is a waiting period for review.
- This project only scopes for visiting each site once.
- Using contractors would likely decrease the budget amount, but the question is whether the crew is familiar with the techniques and therefore could work as efficiently.

Line 34: CWA TWIG Road Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring

- The TWIG has a study design that has been reviewed and approved by ISPR and CMER. All documents will be provided to Policy for the April meeting.
- Most of the \$350,000 already spent is on equipment.

- Keeping to the original estimated budget would not answer all the questions and will miss studying one lithology. The estimated budget numbers were identified before the study design was developed. However, there is a potential to only study 40 sites.
- There are two phases of installation: the first is for putting pipes in the ground, the second is to get the equipment on the installed platforms.
- A graduate student has been working with the TWIG and if there are project delays it is likely she would no longer be able to work on this project. The WDFW representative expressed concern about using the AMP funds to support a graduate student.

Line 35: CWA TWIG Unstable Slopes Criteria Evaluation and Development

- The TWIG is developing a study design for the two projects that would compare and contrast different questions. The study design will soon go to ISPR.

Line 36: CWA TWIG Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Study

- The first draft of the study design went to CMER last month and received comments. Now the TWIG is working on revising the study design based on those comments and will send back to CMER soon for approval. After the CMER review is complete, the TWIG will send the study design to ISPR.
- The chronosequence will inform the BACI study but having up to a two-year delay between the chronosequence and the BACI study should not affect the project. If that were done, FY20 and FY21 could be \$75,000/year instead of \$300,000/year.

Line 38: CWA WetSAG Wetlands Management Zone Effectiveness Monitoring

- WetSAG is developing the project team and looking for a PI. The work in FY19 would be for project scoping.
- This is a CWA project so it is harder to delay but there is no sequencing between this project and any others.
- If the wetlands scientist position is not filled by the start of this project, a contractor could do this work but it likely would not change the cost.

Line 41: RSAG Riparian Characteristics and Shade Study

- This project has been scoped and the proposal has been sent to CMER for review. The budget allocated for this project is only in FY18, which is meant to work with a contractor if necessary.
- After this receives CMER approval, it would get added to the MPS and the CMER workplan. Policy noted that would add to the budget constraints in upcoming years.
- This project is complementary to other projects, but not directly linked.

Line 42: ISAG Literature Synthesis: Default Physical Criteria Assessment Project

- This project is part of a set of projects ISAG discussed several years ago about questions on the default physicals.
- The AMPA noted that it is possible that this project and budget could be folded into other projects on the MPS.
  - The industrial timber landowner caucus representative encourage Policy to think about incorporating the line 18 projects into the line 42 project so the work is driven by ISAG, through the normal CMER process.



Line 43: ISAG Literature Synthesis: Fish/Habitat Detection Using eDNA Project

- ISAG recommended to CMER that the literature synthesis is not worthwhile because there are other recent literature syntheses that are useful. Instead, they have proposed using the \$60,000 to do a proof of concept.
- eDNA is part of the PHB validation study but this project would partner with the Pacific Northwest U.S. Geological Survey station on a larger project in Washington and Oregon. This project could inform the PHB validation study but likely not replace it.
- See discussion and decision in March 1 meeting summary section (page 14) for further Policy discussion and decision.

Line 44: SAGE ETHEP

- SAGE has been inviting people to their meetings to help identify possibilities for this project but right now they have no additional budget to support a project.

Line 46: CWA WetSAG Wetlands Intensive Monitoring

- This project depends on numerous projects being completed before this is scoped or addressed.

Line 52: CWA RSAG Watershed Scale Assessment of Cumulative Effects

- This is a placeholder for now and not actively being considered by any TWIG or SAG.

Line 53: Amphibians in Intermittent Streams

- This project was scoped a while ago; because the scope is now somewhat dated, it should be updated. The budget in out-years is to look at recent studies and develop a study plan.
- It is possible that the data collected for Hard Rock could inform this study and would just require different analysis of the same data.

Line 54: Windthrow Data Synthesis

- There was no project proposal in the 1-page summaries but this project is outlined in the CMER workplan.

Line 55: Van Dykes Salamander Project

- The literature review is complete and was sent to ISPR; ISPR comments returned in June 2017 and the author is still revising.
- The only possibility in the near-term is developing a study design. Technical resources noted that a lot is up to Policy about the direction to go for this study.

Line 56: ISAG Literature Synthesis: Recoverable/Restorable Fish Habitat Project

- ISAG has been wrestling with how much literature is available for doing this literature synthesis.

Policy noted that there are various components to their budget approval. Points included:

- Need to provide the Board with a balanced FY19 budget at the May Board meeting.

- Need to provide the Board and DNR with a balanced FY19/21 biennial budget by early September.
- Might be worthwhile to have a separate discussion at a Policy meeting in summer 2018 about all the Hard Rock and Soft Rock study pieces on the budget, to ensure Policy is comfortable with the plans moving ahead.

Throughout the day, Policy also discussed how to make the MPS more consistent in identifying placeholder numbers for out-year budgets for projects that are in initial scoping. See the March 1 meeting summary section for more Policy discussion on this topic.

-----Day 2: Thursday, March 1, 2018-----

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

#### Announcements

- The Adaptive Management Program Administrator (AMPA) updated Policy that the facilitator for the Adaptive Management Program (AMP) improvements effort has begun work. She will meet with the Board Subcommittee on Wednesday, March 7 from 1-4pm. As usual, that will be an open public meeting and Policy members are welcome to observe. The purpose of this Subcommittee meeting is for the Subcommittee and facilitator to discuss the structure of the interviews, which will be the first phase of this effort. The small forest landowner caucus representative requested that if possible, there be a way for the facilitator to interview Claire Chase of Triangle Associates, since she has a unique perspective from working with Policy for over five years. With Claire leaving Triangle soon, it may make sense for the facilitator to interview both Claire and Rachel Aronson, who will replace Claire.
- The Chair and Claire Chase noted that this is Claire's last meeting at Policy. She has worked with Rachel Aronson to be prepared to take over starting March 5. All caucuses are encouraged to contact Rachel with any questions or concerns, just as they would have with Claire.

*February 1, 2018 Draft Meeting Summary* – Policy reviewed the draft meeting summary from the February 1 meeting, and considered a minor edit from the federal caucus.

**Decision:** With the minor edit, Policy approved the meeting summary as final. All caucuses voted thumbs up except the absent eastside tribal caucus.

**Small Forest Landowners' Templates** – The AMPA explained that the contract to continue the work on reviewing the science assessment was finalized on February 28, and will be with Mark Teply from Cramer Fish Sciences. The goal is to have that product complete by December 2018. The AMPA can share copies of the contract with interested caucuses.

The SFL Template Subgroup met in late February to keep momentum moving forward. Now that the review of the science assessment is moving again, the subgroup can focus on other discussions which have been on the back burner for some time, including metrics.

*Discussion*

- The subgroup will consider whether other work can be done this year while waiting for the review of the science assessment, and also while not delaying the review of the science assessment.
- Another product that the subgroup is waiting on is the riparian literature synthesis. The Riparian Scientific Advisory Group (RSAG) has reviewed the initial request but had questions to CMER.
- One of the CMER Co-Chairs asked Policy to make a formal direction to CMER about the literature synthesis, who can then direct RSAG. The small forest landowner caucus made a motion and the industrial timber landowner caucus seconded the motion (see below).
  - The federal caucus representative reminded Policy of his suggestion from the day before that this could be pared down to a synthesis looking just at literature about large woody debris in eastern Washington. Policy discussed that the original request was made for an overall riparian literature synthesis from post-1994 publications.
  - The federal caucus representative expressed concern that this project could lead the AMP into re-analyzing the Habitat Conservation Plan and Biological Opinions without the Endangered Species Act analytical approaches.
  - The westside tribal caucus representative noted that this literature synthesis presumably would not be used for making qualitative or quantitative assessments but to update the AMP's understanding of the literature.
  - The AMPA clarified that there is nothing in the literature that answers the questions developed by the SFL Template Subgroup.
  - The federal caucus representative reminded Policy that federal funds are available for projects that do not directly implement the HCP; the timing and sources of those funds will vary. He and the Ecology representative will connect after the meeting to discuss potential funding sources.

***Decision:*** Five caucuses voted thumbs up; the federal and WDFW/Ecology caucuses voted thumbs sideways, and the conservation and eastside caucuses were absent for the vote.

*Using the existing scope of work to identify questions, Policy asks CMER to complete the riparian literature synthesis with RSAG.*

[Note: The discussion and the decision on this motion were split into different parts of the meeting day.]

**Master Project Schedule Updates** – The Chair and facilitator explained different versions of the Master Project Schedule (MPS) that had been updated from the meeting the day before. Policy considered what would be helpful for the discussion at this meeting, and a new version was created that included each year and a “test” year with different, proposed budget amounts, plus corrected formulas that total each year and biennium.

Two additional project updates that were not given at the meeting the day before:

- Line 57 (LWAG Eastside Amphibian Evaluation): The project proponents recommended moving the \$70,000 into FY21 and adding \$45,000 to FY22. They did note that this project is flexible in timing and is a limited-duration study.
- Line 20 (WFFA Template PI Technical Assessment): Since the contract was just finalized the day before, the budget for this line item was updated to be a total of \$64,400 in the current biennium.

Policy considered their discussion from the day before about the inconsistency of how to address placeholder budget amounts in out-years. Especially for extensive monitoring, the Riparian Characteristics and Shade Study, and the Van Dyke's Salamander Study, Policy noticed that there are different ways the projects have been asked to submit budgets. Some projects have initial scoping on the MPS and nothing else but with the assumption that out-years would have budget for the complete study, and some projects have scoping budgets and budgets for out-years that are placeholder numbers. The Chair thanked Policy for noticing this inconsistency and asked that this be part of the April meeting discussion and decision.

Policy reviewed the administration section of the MPS:

- There will be some savings in FY18 for vacancies in CMER scientist positions, which the AMPA estimated could be \$150,000. That savings could be re-programmed for projects.
- The Kalispel Tribe recently requested that the Board fund an eastside CMER scientist, to be located in eastern Washington (and not at the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission like the other CMER scientists). This is currently in the budget but starting in FY20; Policy discussed how to fill this position starting in FY19.
  - Several caucuses remembered Policy's discussion from early 2017 about this same position, which was that Policy supported the position but then the eastside tribal caucus representative at the time pulled back that request.
  - Policy was in general agreement to fund this position. They discussed whether to split the position across multiple FTEs with diverse expertise or to have one FTE in eastern Washington with one skillset.
  - The Chair noted that the savings from vacant positions in FY18 could help fund the gap of funding in FY19 for this position.
  - The industrial timber landowners caucus representative noted that their caucus may be unable to support the number of CMER scientists but that they could support an eastside CMER scientist. If that happens, they would support reducing the number of FTEs at NWIFC. Their caucus is interested in the breakdown between full-time staff and contractors, though they recognize the human element necessary to move projects forward.
    - It was noted that the CMER scientists located at NWIFC work on statewide issues and projects.
  - Several caucuses also noted that the workload of the eastside CMER scientist is important to consider; they could work on existing projects as well as helping the Eastside Scientific Advisory Group (SAGE) to identify new projects.
- Line 14 (the contingency fund): The AMPA noted that for FY18 and FY19, the Board allocated the contingency fund for the facilitator for AMP improvements.
  - The WDFW and Ecology representatives asked that the AMP improvements facilitation and the regular contingency fund be separated into different lines so it clarifies that there is no contingency fund for projects in the current biennium. The AMPA also reminded Policy that any cost savings from projects in FY18 could help pay for projects in FY18 or FY19 that go over budget (instead of using the contingency fund).
  - The DNR representative reminded Policy that Policy can re-allocate up to 20% of the current fiscal year's budget without Board approval but retroactively updating the Board at their next meeting.
- Lines 15 and 16 (statistician and technical editor):

- The AMPA explained that it is helpful to have the technical editor in a separate line item, separate from individual project budgets, so the editor can be called upon quickly and easily.
- The Ecology representative asked that since most projects do statistics within the project or study design team, the statistician line could be deleted.

Policy next addressed individual project budgets:

- The AMPA clarified that the projects with a preexisting executed contract are those under “Active Research Projects” or several under “Add-ons to Existing Projects”, though he noted that all contracts only go through the biennium (June 2019). Line 22 (the Riparian Literature Synthesis) does not have a contract yet.
  - Several projects have open contracts with contributors for getting to a study design; if those projects go to implementation then a new contract would be executed for that portion.
  - The commitments on the TWIGs is to at least get to a study design for each one. Three have complete study designs and the other two are close but not complete yet.
- Line 32 (ENREP):
  - Policy teased apart the numbers in FY18, better understanding that some money has already been spent before and in FY18. The higher number proposed by the TWIG for FY18 mostly reflects future work and purchase of equipment that potentially could happen in this fiscal year but may not happen due to this project going to dispute resolution within CMER.
  - The different parts of this project, wet and dry reaches, have been combined because the TWIG sees an economy of scale by using the same sites for multiple samplings. They have sites that cover about 80% of eastern Washington and there is a danger of losing those sites if sampling gets delayed too far.
  - The Ecology representative asked if there is any component of the project that could be pulled out or delayed without disrupting the project, but those at the meeting needed to talk with the TWIG before answering that.
  - There is an opportunity to start the west and east sampling at different times but that would not save money, it would only affect the years in which the spending happens.
  - The TWIG could look at not expanding instrumentation at all the sites.
- Line 43 (ISAG Literature Synthesis Fish Habitat Detection Using eDNA Project): ISAG proposed to CMER, who approved and is asking for Policy approval, to re-purpose the \$60,000 this biennium. They suggest that instead of a literature synthesis, they do a proof of concept.
  - The AMPA and ISAG representatives clarified that not getting Policy approval today could jeopardize this project from moving forward at all, since if it is not done this year there is no more opportunity. However, approving the current biennial work does not lock in the out-years’ spending.
  - Policy noted the relationship between this and the PHB validation study. This eDNA project will not inform the PHB validation study but could inform how eDNA is used or how people view eDNA being used in the PHB validation study.
  - The federal caucus representative asked how this study relates to fish detectability and the uppermost point of fish habitat. It was clarified that this project would focus on fish detectability in headwater streams, basically focusing on the areas where it is hardest to detect fish using other tools. It is to help the AMP develop a methodology that could replace or be used as a separate tool for electrofishing.

- Policy discussed whether or not to approve this at this meeting, understanding that a lot of work still needs to happen on the other project budgets to balance the biennial budget.
- The project manager noted that even if Policy approves this study today, it is likely that he will not have a finalized agreement in hand by the April Policy meeting.

***Decision:*** The small forest landowner caucus moved the following motion, and the industrial timber landowner caucus seconded. Policy approved this motion: five caucuses voted thumbs up; the DNR and federal caucuses voted thumbs sideways; and the conservation and eastside tribal caucuses were absent for this vote.

*Approve the re-allocation of the \$60,000 in FY18 and FY19 for ISAG to do a proof of concept for eDNA instead of a literature synthesis. Arrange the budget to have \$40,000 in FY18 and \$20,000 in FY19.*

The Chair asked the Budget Subgroup to reconvene before the April Policy meeting to develop proposal(s) that would balance the FY17/19 biennial budget. If they can identify ideas for balancing future budgets, that is great but not required for the April Policy meeting.

Rich Doenges, Karen Terwilleger, Terra Rentz, and Mary Scurlock agreed to be part of the Budget Subgroup. Curt Veldhuisen and Scott Swanson will share the observer role, and the AMPA with his staff will attend as well. Terra will convene the group and Karen will help find a meeting location.

Policy's direction to the subgroup:

*Consider potential proposal(s) to share with Policy at the April 2018 meeting that allows the current biennium (FY18 & FY19) to balance. To the extent the proposals(s) could include considerations and changes to years after FY19, that's great but not the necessity for Policy's decision at the April 2018 meeting. This could include:*

- *Considering the results from Heather's summary of prioritization scores;*
- *Identifying the projects that might be missing likely out-years for placeholder money; and/or*
- *Understanding phases of TWIGs or other bigger projects.*

**Hard Rock Study: Findings Reports** – The project manager updated Policy that CMER just approved the Findings Report for chapter 17 (the summary chapter) on February 27, for the original Hard Rock Study (not the extended study). All chapters have gone through ISPR and received approval from CMER. The technical editor is about 95% complete with the final study.

Policy also requested four additional Findings Reports for individual chapters: 5, 6, 7, and 15. The authors have started an initial draft of those Findings Reports but there is no new information in those Findings Reports compared to that for the summary chapter. Therefore, the project manager recommended that Policy see the Findings Report for chapter 17 and then decide if they still want to request the Findings Reports for the individual chapters. The AMPA noted that if the chapter 17 Findings Report does not satisfactorily answer Policy's questions on the study, it could be that there is a different format that might be better suited to answering the questions. The project manager also noted that the study does have limitations and may not be able to answer all of Policy's questions without more research.

- The industrial timber landowner caucus indicated that they asked for the additional Findings Reports for additional discussion.

- The Chair asked the caucuses who requested individual Findings Reports whether they are comfortable with seeing the Findings Report for chapter 17 first.
  - The small forest landowner caucus (who requested Findings Reports for chapter 5 and 6 on stand structure, tree mortality, and wood recruitment) is comfortable waiting to first see the Findings Report for chapter 17.
  - The westside tribal caucus (who requested a Findings Report for chapter 7 on water temperature) is comfortable waiting to first see the Findings Report for chapter 17.
  - The industrial timber landowner caucus (who requested Findings Reports for chapter 7 on water temperature and chapter 15 on amphibians) is comfortable waiting to first see the Findings Report for chapter 17.
- The federal caucus representative reminded Policy that it is everyone's responsibility to be familiar with the study and not just the information from the Findings Reports.
- The project manager anticipated sending the Findings Report for chapter 17 to Policy soon.
- Policy also discussed when to "start the clock" for making the decision on the Hard Rock study. Though there were different opinions expressed about whether the individual Findings Reports had to be seen first, Policy agreed to discuss at their April meeting when they will all have reviewed the Findings Report for chapter 17.

**Update from February Board Meeting** – Marc Engel summarized that the Board adopted two rules, one for electronic signatures and one for the fee schedule for public records requests. He also noted that the Board accepted four proposals for the potential habitat breaks evaluation. They will have a special meeting on June 27 in addition to their already-scheduled meetings, and are planning to finally adopt the new water typing rule at their November 2018 meeting.

DNR has reached out to caucuses to establish the stakeholder group for writing Board Manual guidance. They will soon reach out to caucuses to establish the stakeholder group for writing the rule language. This is also where caucuses can learn more about the small business economic impact statement (SBEIS) and the cost benefit analysis.

**Legislative Updates** – There were no legislative updates at this meeting.

### **Next Steps**

Policy reviewed topics for their next meeting, which will largely be focused on finalizing a version of the MPS to forward to the Board. They will also discuss the Findings Report for chapter 17 of the Hard Rock study, and will receive the Fire Salvage Literature Synthesis. There will also be miscellaneous updates.

The April meeting will be at the Puget Sound Energy's Wild Horse Solar & Wind Facility in Vantage. The meeting will start at 9am and caucuses should plan to go until 5pm. There will be an optional tour of the facility since they are not charging Policy for the room reservation.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00pm.

Attachment 1 – Participants by Caucus at 2/28 and 3/1/18 Meeting\*

**Conservation Caucus**

\*Mary Scurlock, M. Scurlock & Associates  
(2/28 meeting only)

**County Caucus**

Kendra Smith, Skagit County  
\*Scott Swanson, WSAC, Chair

**Federal Caucus**

\*Marty Acker, USFWS

**Industrial Timber Landowner Caucus**

Julie Dieu, Rayonier  
Doug Hooks, WFFA  
Jenny Knoth, Green Crow  
\*Karen Terwilleger, WFFA

**Small Forest Landowner Caucus**

\*Steve Barnowe-Meyer, WFFA  
\*Ken Miller, WFFA

**State Caucus – DNR**

\*Marc Engel, DNR  
Casey Hanell, DNR

\*caucus representatives

**Others**

Hans Berge, Adaptive Management Program Administrator  
Heather Gibbs, Adaptive Management Program (DNR)  
Howard Haemmerle, Adaptive Management Program (DNR)  
Angela Johnson, Adaptive Management Program (DNR)  
Teresa Miscovic, Adaptive Management Program (DNR)  
Dave Schuett-Hames, CMER  
Claire Chase, Triangle Associates

Joe Shramek, DNR

**State Caucus – Ecology & WDFW**

\*Rich Doenges, Ecology  
Bill Ehinger, Ecology  
Marc Hayes, WDFW  
\*Mark Hicks, Ecology (caucus representative  
for morning of 2/28)  
Aimee McIntyre, WDFW  
Don Nauer, WDFW  
\*Terra Rentz, WDFW

**Tribal Caucus – Westside**

Mark Mobbs, Quinault Indian Nation  
\*Joseph Pavel, Skokomish Tribe  
\*Jim Peters, Northwest Indian Fisheries  
Commission  
Ash Roorbach, Northwest Indian Fisheries  
Commission  
Curt Veldhuisen, Skagit River System  
Cooperative

**Tribal Caucus – Eastside**

*No representatives present at this meeting*



Attachment 2 – Ongoing Priorities Checklist

| Priority   | Assignment                               | Status & Notes   |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Type N</b>                                    | Policy to Board                          | Policy agreed by consensus on recommendations to the Board which were presented in November 2017.  |
| <b>Type F</b>                                    | 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.                         |
| <b>Small Forest Landowners Westside Template</b> | SFLOs Template Subgroup                  | Subgroup is meeting separately; co-chaired by Marc Engel and Ken Miller. In November 2017, the Board asked the subgroup to also consider the conifer thinning and conifer restoration templates from history.  |
| <b>Unstable Slopes</b>                           | 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. |
| <b>Ongoing CMER reports reviewed by Policy</b>   | Doug Hooks & Jenny Knoth, 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   |
|--|----------------------|---|
| <b>TFW Policy Committee</b>                      | April 5              | In Vantage, WA at the Puget Sound Energy facility |
| <b>CMER</b>                                      | March 27             |   |
| <b>Forest Practices Board</b>                    | May 9                |   |
| <b>Small Forest Landowners Template Subgroup</b> | March 22             |   |
| <b>Budget Subgroup</b>                           | To be scheduled ASAP | Quarterly reports at Policy meetings.             |