

Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee
 December 3, 2015 Meeting Summary

Decisions and Actions from Meeting

Decision	Notes
1. Invite legislative liaisons for January meeting.	Agreement from all caucuses
2. Accepted the October meeting summary as final with one edit.	Agreement from all caucuses
3. Accepted the November meeting summary as final with several edits.	Agreement from all caucuses (federal caucus voted sideways)
4. Requested deadlines from the Electrofishing Technical Group (see page 3).	Agreement from all caucuses
5. Accepted the Type F Westside TWIG's BAS Alternatives Analysis, and directed the TWIG to follow Phase 3 with a check-in after the pilot study is complete.	Agreement from all caucuses

Action	Assignment
1. Invite legislative liaisons for January meeting, 9:15 – 9:45 am (can be by phone).	Each caucus representative
2. Modify meeting summaries in the future to capture specific caucus comments.	Claire Chase
3. Share the Box site for the Electrofishing Technical Group documents.	Howard Haemmerle
4. Draft a request for the Board for using FFSA funds for off-channel habitat technical group participation; talk with each caucus representative about this and bring to January meeting.	Dick Miller
5. Clarify whether or not the off-channel habitat technical group will use technical experts and “on the ground” experts. Bring specific request for this technical group as soon as possible.	Hans Berge
6. Update the Type F matrix to reflect changes to the off-channel habitat row; add recoverable habitat; and add “habitat likely to be used by fish”.	Adrian Miller
7. Package a draft proposal on reviewing default physical criteria for Policy to consider.	Adrian Miller
8. Package and discuss with caucus representatives draft ideas for how to consider recoverable habitat.	Marty Acker
9. Package and discuss with caucus representatives draft ideas for how to consider “habitat likely to be used by fish”.	Terry Jackson, Kendra Smith, & Karen Terwilleger

Welcome, Introductions, & Old Business – Adrian Miller, 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 suggested changes to the draft agenda.

Announcement – Ash Roorbach has been hired as the new Forest Practices Coordinator for the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, replacing Nancy Sturhan.

Updates

Forest Practices Board Meeting – The Forest Practices Board (Board) met on November 10th for their final 2015 meeting. Instead of hearing all the updates scheduled on the agenda, the Board focused most of the meeting on the unstable slopes topic in light of the recently-revised Board Manual Section 16. Therefore, several updates specifically related to Policy did not happen, so will likely happen at the Board's February 2016 meeting. On unstable slopes, the Board asked that the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) prepare a proposal initiation to finalize Section 16, which would require an adaptive management review. While this will not affect Policy's workload between November 2015 – February 2016, the issue may be sent to Policy after the February Board meeting.

The Board heard a petition regarding the western gray squirrel, but the Board denied the petition until at least May 2016 due to the current status review work by the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW). WDFW will present their findings to the Fish & Wildlife Commission in January 2016 and to the Board in February 2016.

Legislative Updates – DNR shared updates on their 2016 budget request as well as updates on the 2016 operating and capital budgets. This includes the Forest Practices Reinvestment, which will help process the increased number of Forest Practices Applications (FPAs) and provide more training on the rules and cultural resource protection. The industrial landowner caucus shared that they are supportive of DNR receiving funding for these purposes, but is not supportive of the funding coming from the Forests & Fish Support Account (FFSA). Their caucus might share more about that during the legislative session.

There were no other legislative updates at this time, but Policy agreed to invite each caucus's legislative liaison for the January meeting for more updates.

SFLOs Template Subgroup – The Small Forest Landowners (SFLOs) Template Subgroup shared that they have had one meeting and the second meeting is scheduled for December 9th. That meeting will focus on clarifying some of the issues or questions that were raised at the first meeting. The subgroup was uncertain on when they might bring a product to Policy for review, but hopes for that to happen in the first quarter of 2016.

Ground Rule of the Month – Kendra Smith quickly reviewed ground rule A.3: "Participants agree that the purpose of the Adaptive Management Program [AMP] is the effective implementation of the Forest Practices Act and rules in order to meet its four goals". She also reviewed the four goals, and talked about the equal importance of each goal.

Meeting Summaries – Policy reviewed the October 2015 draft meeting summary. With one edit, that was accepted as final (agreement by all caucuses). Then Policy reviewed the November 2015 draft meeting summary, which had several edits. With those edits, the summary was accepted as final (thumbs up from every caucus except the federal caucus which voted sideways due to lack of time to review the summary).

Policy also discussed their preference for meeting summaries in the future. They directed the note-taker to specify when a specific caucus makes a comment, but keep the reaction comments without caucus affiliation.

Type F: Electrofishing – The Chair noted that Policy could discuss this topic as much as possible without the Adaptive Management Program Administrator (AMPA) present at this meeting. Several Policy members and the DNR Project Manager shared their perspectives from observing the Technical Group meetings:

- The group seems narrowly focused on best management practices for the use of electrofishing.
- The group spent a significant amount of time at the most recent meeting reviewing the list of questions/documents from Policy and determining whether they are relevant to this group's narrow framework. That narrowed the list of questions/documents, and the group seems confident they have the right people at the table for a streamlined approach to answering those questions instead of doing a formal literature review.
- The group's discussions can be separated into two categories: one on topics related to site-specific conditions (e.g., what conditions exist, how are they evaluated or reviewed, etc.), and one on topics related to optimization (e.g., looking at optimizing the process and determining how to make it more efficient and effective, efficiency of detection, notes to the resource, etc.).
- The federal caucus shared that at this point, it is unclear to them what the group's product will be. The Chair noted that whatever the product, however, it will first go to Policy for review before any further work.
- The DNR Project Manager will share the Box site with Policy caucus representatives so they can view the documents the technical group is using.
- Policy discussed the timeline:
 - At the January 2016 Policy meeting, the technical group hopes to present the list of questions/documents that the group will and will not be addressing.
 - At the February Policy meeting, the technical group hopes to present their fleshed-out work plan that shows how they plan to address all the topics they feel relevant to their task. Parts of the work plan could be incorporated into the Type F matrix at that time.

Type F: Off-Channel Habitat – The Chair noted that the AMPA has begun thinking about how to convene a technical group focused on off-channel habitat. While he is not yet ready to formally solicit volunteers, it was noted that he will likely look for habitat experts plus any other people caucuses suggest to the AMPA. Discussion included:

- The federal caucus encouraged Policy members to help the AMPA as much as possible to help this group move forward considering the AMPA's big workload.
- WDFW asked if the AMPA will be looking for technical experts as well as the practitioners who implement the rules on the ground. That question will be forwarded to the AMPA to answer.

- The nonindustrial landowner caucus asked if some of the surplus funding in the FFSA could be used for soliciting experts to participate in this technical group. DNR responded that it would need to come as a spending request to the Board, and would need more specificity on which experts and which group(s) and how the funding would be accounted for.

Type F: Physicals – The Chair introduced this topic and explained that there are several sub-components of the larger “physicals” conversation. Points included:

- The “last fish” point is an important part of the conversation around the Type F/N break. There are two main tools that foresters use to mark the F/N break: protocol surveys using electrofishing, and default physical criteria.
 - Both tools aim to identify the regulatory break by using different measures: protocol surveys identify “last fish”, and then foresters typically move the regulatory break further upstream. The default physical criteria identify the end of the habitat, thereby identifying the regulatory break without needing to identify “last fish”.
 - Both tools try to be as accurate as possible, but different perspectives agree or disagree with their accuracy. The hope for having the physicals discussion is to determine how they might be used in the permanent water typing system, and to consider if and how they might be refined to improve accuracy, reduce error, and ensure habitat protection.
- The Chair suggested that the physical criteria could be evaluated by using a lot of the data that has been collected over the last several years, much more than when the criteria were established.
 - One way to do this is to make a set of physical criteria based on the results of electrofishing protocol surveys, including the level of certainty. Then compare that to the results of the currently-established physical criteria, and see how different, similar, or biased they are.
 - After doing that comparison, Policy could discuss how the physical criteria could be adjusted to more accurately reflect “habitat likely to be used by fish”.
 - The hope is that by increasing accuracy and confidence in the default physical criteria, the use of electrofishing could be minimized.

Discussion

- The federal caucus shared that they are comfortable evaluating the criteria, though that is not their main concern. In evaluating the criteria, however, they would need to determine if the existing “last fish” data are robust, and includes the data that CMER recommended. The federal caucus would be open to the data collection and analysis being done through the CMER track.
- WDFW shared that their main concern stems from when habitat (determined by default physicals or habitat model) is downgraded to where the last fish point is, as determined by the electrofishing survey protocol. They noted that two tools have different objectives. They also believe that the default physicals are coarse and could be refined to be more accurate. They believe that scientists could help narrow the range of error both ways so that the criteria are more accurate in predicting the end of habitat.
 - The Chair agreed that the physicals criteria are coarse, and suggested that Policy could look at different physical parameters in different regions that better reflect the varying geology around the state. Similarly, the westside tribal caucus shared that this work is similar to work done about 15 years ago by the Instream Scientific Advisory Group

(ISAG) when they developed a physical model. ISAG learned that the model worked well in some areas of the state but not well in others.

- The federal caucus reminded Policy to think about previous discussions related to watershed analysis, and to try to apply that in thinking of how to improve upon earlier work related to water typing.
- The conservation caucus noted that without a specific proposal on the table to change the criteria to something else and with no direction from the Board to evaluate the criteria, there might not be a need to do this work. But another question is about recoverable habitat, and how should people know where to not consider using fish presence in the exercise because that habitat is in a state of recovery.
- The eastside tribal caucus asked all caucuses to confirm if there is agreement that there is a variable distance within a stream above the point of the last fish. With some discussion, all caucuses agreed at least that the end of the habitat can vary anywhere from zero to n feet upstream of the last fish point, and the results are very site-specific. With that confirmation, the eastside tribal caucus expressed comfort in being able to continue these discussions.
- The industrial landowner caucus shared that they will participate in this analysis. Accuracy and balance are both really important to their caucus and must be included in the analysis of the current system along with a discussion about trade-offs. They are also interested to participate in a discussion about recoverable habitat.
 - The federal caucus also noted interest in discussing recoverable habitat but not in a way that would give the perception that the Habitat Conservation Plan goal of recovering fish habitat is being re-negotiated.
- It was noted that the analysis can also help answer questions such as whether the model from the Forest Hydrology Study can help predict a stream width.
- WDFW noted that the group might also consider alternatives for protection within a gray zone between last fish and last habitat. At the upper extent of fish habitat (in higher elevations/gradients), ensuring connectivity or fish passage may be more important than ensuring large Type F buffers.

Decision: To continue this discussion, Policy members agreed to do the following:

1. Adrian Miller will think more about how Policy can address the general topic of “physicals”, and report back at the January Policy meeting.
2. Marty Acker will consider how Policy can address recoverable habitat, and will try to talk with other caucuses about potential ideas before the January meeting as time allows.
3. Terry Jackson, Kendra Smith, and Karen Terwilleger will consider how Policy can address “habitat likely to be used by fish”, and will try to talk with other caucuses about potential ideas before the January meeting as time allows.

Type F: Desk Review of Water Type Modification Forms (WTMFs) – The DNR caucus shared that they have begun thinking about how to do this desk review of WTMFs, but have not done much at this point. Much of their work will need to be about putting together the information clearly and concisely. They are looking at all the data from 2005 until present, and varies based on who filled out the WTMF.

They expect to be able to provide Policy a presentation on the information gathered at the February meeting, with a brief overview and status update at the January meeting.

In addition to information contained within WTMFs, some other forms can also provide some relevant information. The Chair clarified three sources of information:

- Information submitted in WTMFs will help update water typing on the DNR hydrolayer map. This information is submitted with or without a Forest Practices Application (FPA).
- Water type survey results are reported in FPAs but are not used to update the map.
- Information related to the above two sets of information may also be reported through federal or state permits for electrofishing. This information may not be that useful for Policy.
- The eastside tribal caucus suggested that the federal and state agencies consider how to capture more information from their permit records so that Policy can have more information in the future.
- The federal and state agencies explained that their permits are primarily focused on direct harm or risk to fish. Reports do not directly relate to identifying last fish or last habitat.

Westside Type F TWIG Best Available Science (BAS) and Alternatives Analysis – Policy reviewed the BAS and Alternatives Analysis document from the TWIG, which Dave Schuett-Hames presented to Policy at the November meeting on behalf of the TWIG. Dave highlighted the need for two decisions at this meeting: first to accept the document from the TWIG, and second to provide direction to the TWIG on which alternative (and therefore study design) to pursue.

Q&A and Discussion

- The hybrid option suggests that step 1 would be completed in three to four years, and then the BACI design would be seven or eight years after that.
- The TWIG first brought the objectives, problem statement, and critical questions in spring 2014, and then brought a revised set of critical questions in fall 2014 – both times were confirmed by Policy.
- WDFW expressed concerns about why the critical questions were further developed from the three questions that were brought to Policy the very first time in spring 2014, but TWIG members clarified that Policy approved the further-developed questions in fall 2014.
 - WDFW expressed that tying biological response of fish in the stream to prescription effectiveness on a reach scale is challenging and very difficult to determine a cause-effect directly related to forest practices that could help the AMP make decisions.
 - The nonindustrial timber landowner caucus observed that knowing the effect of treatments on fish has been CMER's objective in the last decade. The caucus asked if the Board or Policy needs to know fish response, or if use of surrogates (e.g., stream temperature or sedimentation) is acceptable.
 - Dave explained that the study design will be reviewed by several bodies, including CMER and ISPR, to make sure that the study design really helps answer the critical questions and make linkages to the AMP.
- The federal caucus noted that the study helps answer questions about Desired Future Conditions, as well as responses by macro-invertebrates and other information that can be useful for the AMP. They recommended that, if direct information on instream biotic responses to forest

practices are needed, the focus on macro-invertebrates is the most cost-effective way to get that information, rather than measuring short-term changes in fish numbers, given limited resources and time.

- It was noted that the study design, when being developed, must consider the budget that Policy has already outlined for this line item in the Master Project Schedule.
- Some caucuses preferred a few critical questions over others, and other caucuses preferred all critical questions instead of picking out a few to focus on. The hybrid phased approach seemed the easiest way to address all the caucuses' concerns.
 - The hybrid approach has three steps: steps one and two relate to a pilot study to look at the baseline based on a large sample of recent FPAs. It was noted that the biotic components would not be included until step 3, when the BACI study design is developed.
 - Because the first two steps are associated with the pilot study, the discussion about biotic components could be considered by Policy along with the discussion of results from the pilot study.

Decision: Policy agreed to accept the TWIG's document and directed the TWIG to follow the hybrid phased approach. In addition, Policy asked for the TWIG to report back to Policy after the pilot study is complete (in three to five years) to explain what they did, what they learned and any recommendations, and how the pilot study informs the next step (BACI study). The pilot study, when complete, might go through ISPR because it would address the critical question pertaining to Desired Future Condition. CMER would be the primary decision-maker on whether or not to send the pilot study to ISPR.

CMER Update – Doug Hooks, CMER Co-Chair, provided an update on CMER's latest work:

- The Eastern Washington Riparian Assessment Program (EWRAP) will be presented to Policy at the January meeting, which will need acceptance from Policy.
- The Forest Hydrology Study will be presented to Policy at the January meeting with the Findings Report, which will need acceptance from Policy.
- A subset of CMER is still updating the Protocols & Standards Manual with significant revisions. Policy will get an update when this work is complete.
- The Type N Hard Rock study has finished its field season.
- The Hard Rock study has six chapters currently at ISPR, with two chapters yet to be sent to ISPR.
- The Buffer/Shade (Amphibian) Study is being finalized and CMER is working on completing the study.
- RSAG is moving along with the remote sensing project, and currently has a draft proposal out.
- The Hardwood Conversion Study will conduct re-measurement of hardwood conversion plots in 2016.
- UPSAG released their RFQQ and asked for qualifications by December 4. They hope to hire a contractor soon.
- The Roads BMP TWIG is exploring alternatives and hopes to have something to Policy at the January or February meeting.
- The Forested Wetlands TWIG is incorporating guidance from Policy into their problem statement and questions document. They had some confusion about Policy's guidance and so met with the

Policy Chair to clarify that guidance. They expect to bring the document back to Policy in late winter or early spring.

- The Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness Program (ENREP) TWIG has completed their study design and solicited comments from CMER, which were substantial. The TWIG will meet again on December 10 to determine how to address those comments and if further guidance from Policy is needed.
- CMER has also begun the process of reviewing and updating the workplan. In the future, CMER hopes to spend more time ensuring that the SAGs review the critical questions so that they are all current in the updated workplan.
- Finally, CMER has begun thinking about science sessions. There are a few organizations doing work similar to what Policy is discussing on the water typing topic, so there may be an opportunity for Policy to attend the science session to learn more.
- The CMER Co-Chair noted that both CMER and Policy can improve their work in clarifying direction or questions to each other, including to TWIGs. There might be a need for a template that TWIGs fill out before bringing a document to Policy; and similarly there might be a need for a template that Policy fills out when providing direction to a TWIG or CMER. Policy agreed that whenever they provide guidance, they want it to be clear and useful to the TWIG or CMER.

The CMER Co-Chair also provided Policy with an overview of the changes CMER made to the Lean Process:

- The narrative is where all the changes are captured; the flowchart on the first page is just high level.
- Major changes include:
 - The Initial Writing Team (primarily people from SAGs) will develop the first document instead of the TWIG, which usually includes more people from outside the AMP.
 - Now CMER will formally approve products before they go to Policy instead of providing an informal review to give comments to the TWIG before the document goes to Policy.
- To help reduce confusion, CMER will try to update the CMER workplan so they can give Policy more specific expectations about upcoming projects.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45pm.

Attachment 1 – Participants by Caucus at 12/3/15 Meeting

Conservation Caucus

Chris Mendoza, Mendoza Environmental, LLC
*Mary Scurlock, Scurlock & Associates

County Caucus

*Kendra Smith, Skagit County

Federal Caucus

*Marty Acker, USFWS
Tim Romanski, USFWS

Industrial Timber Landowners

Eric Beach, Green Diamond
Doug Hooks, WFPA
Adrian Miller, Olympic Resource Management,
Co-Chair
*Karen Terwilleger, WFPA

Non-Industrial Timber Landowners

*Dick Miller, WFFA

Others

Howard Haemmerle, DNR/AMP
Claire Chase, Triangle Associates

State Caucus – DNR

*Marc Engel, DNR
Jim Heuring, DNR
Marc Ratcliff, DNR

State Caucus – Ecology and Fish & Wildlife

*Rich Doenges, Ecology
Mark Hicks, Ecology
*Terry Jackson, WDFW
Don Nauer, WDFW

Tribal Caucus – Eastside

*Ray Entz, Kalispel (phone)
Marc Gauthier, UCUT (phone)

Tribal Caucus – Westside

Joseph Pavel
Ash Roorbach, NWIFC
Mark Mobbs, Quinault Nation
*Curt Veldhuisen, Skagit River System
Cooperative (phone)

Attachment 2 – Ongoing Priorities Checklist

Priority	Assignment	Status & Notes
Type N	Type N policy subgroup	Caucuses are encouraged to talk offline about the wet season default methodology.
Type F	Policy	At regular meetings, Policy is working towards responding to the February 2014 Board motions (specific to off-channel habitat and electrofishing) in addition to other related water typing issues (such as default physical criteria, recovery, habitat, etc.).
Small Forest Landowners Westside Template	SFLOs Template Subgroup	Subgroup is meeting offline; next meeting is December 9.
Unstable Slopes	Policy	Board accepted Policy's recommendations; now DNR and UPSAG are working on implementing those recommendations. UPSAG is hiring a contractor to do a literature synthesis.
Ongoing CMER reports reviewed by Policy	Doug Hooks & Todd Baldwin, CMER Co-Chairs	CMER Co-Chairs to give update(s) as needed at Policy meetings; AMPA to give quarterly reports for when CMER studies to come to Policy

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

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

Entity/Group/Subgroup	Next Meeting Date	Notes
TFW Policy Committee	January 7, 2016	
CMER	December 15	
Type N Policy Subgroup	TBD	
Type F		To be addressed at regular Policy meetings.
Forest Practices Board	February 10, 2016	
Small Forest Landowners Template Subgroup	December 9	As workload allows.