

Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee  
 March 4, 2016 Meeting Summary

Decisions and Actions from Meeting

Decision	Notes
1. Accepted the February draft meeting summary as final, with edits.	Consensus from every caucus
2. Informally agreed with CMER that all the references to “link to adaptive management” in the CMER work plan can be put into an appendix.	
3. Approved the Roads BMP TWIG’s Best Available Science & Alternatives Analysis, and approved the TWIG to move forward with developing a study design for Alternative #4.	Consensus from every caucus
4. Approved taking no action on the Forest Hydrology Study and Findings Report.	Consensus from every caucus

Action	Assignment
1. By March 9, confirm attendance or phone participation for the May 4 & 5 meeting in Spokane.	Caucus representatives
2. Only if any changes to your caucus’s prioritization of electrofishing questions, send re-prioritized questions to the AMPA and Chair.	Caucus representatives (if appropriate)
3. Informal subgroup to meet before the April Policy meeting to discuss the strategy to pull all Type F components together for the November 2016 deadline.	Scott Swanson, Terry Jackson, Karen Terwilleger, Joseph Pavel, Mary Scurlock, Marc Engel
4. By the April meeting, identify any questions or overall comments on DNR’s water typing data spreadsheet.	All caucus representatives
5. Revise the TWIG Tracker and communications cover sheets based on input from Policy at 3/4 meeting.	Hans Berge, Howard Haemmerle, Claire Chase
6. Send any ideas on specific literature reviews to do in the short term.	Caucus representatives, if appropriate

**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 attendees*). Lucy Edmondson introduced herself as the interim Environmental Protection Agency representative. She is the new director of the EPA’s Washington Operations Office, and will be the EPA representative to Policy until a permanent EPA representative is sorted out. Lucy asked Policy to identify their over-arching goal as a Committee, and several members responded that Policy is focused on implementing the Habitat Conservation Plan and forest practices rules. They noted that Policy sets priorities through the budget, but there is a firewall between Policy and the Cooperative Monitoring,

Evaluation, and Research Committee (CMER), whose science informs rule-making, further research, and recommendations to the Forest Practices Board.

*March 4, 2016 Draft Meeting Summary* – Policy reviewed the draft meeting summary and the conservation, federal, and WDFW representatives suggested edits. With those edits, Policy accepted the draft as final. The industrial timber landowner caucus requested that “final” be added to the top of each approved meeting summary accessible via the DNR website.

**Ground Rule of the Month** – Karen Terwilleger, representative for the industrial timber landowner caucus, reviewed ground rule C.2: “Participants commit to listen carefully, ask questions to understand, and make statements to explain or educate”. She highlighted this ground rule because to her it serves as one of the most fundamental. Along with highlighting the ground rule, she also passed out copies of the TFW “primer” that was created a few years ago by TFW participants, along with the Adaptive Management Program (AMP) schematic that highlights the science and policy pieces, and where they should and should not interact.

**CMER Update** – Doug Hooks, CMER Co-Chair, updated Policy on the latest work from CMER:

- CMER is finalizing an overhaul to the work plan, and hope to have that updated work plan ready to present to Policy at the April meeting.
  - The work plan was updated a few years ago to include a piece in each section for outlining the link to adaptive management as a communication tool to Policy about how to use that science. CMER thought it would be helpful to move all those references into an appendix as a more streamlined read for Policy members. Policy agreed that would be helpful.
  - Policy also discussed the idea of creating a template for each project within the work plan, so there is a standardized format. If this is created, a caucus suggested showing in the template whether a project is on schedule, behind, or there is a concern. CMER will consider this at their March meeting.
- CMER discussed the re-formation of an Instream Scientific Advisory Group (ISAG), without identifying any decisions.
- CMER also discussed the Van Dykes Salamander study, and gave approval for the scope of work to match what Policy has approved in the Master Project Schedule. There will be an opportunity to check in with Policy before the study is finalized, but that will not happen for a while.
- The Remote Sensing Pilot Project has sufficient LiDAR data and has a complete analysis, but they realized they are missing some culvert locations which may make the data analysis otherwise incorrect. They are looking for sources of information that will provide more accurate locations of culverts to incorporate into the model, which will more precisely map stream locations and flow.
- ENREP will bring a memo to CMER at their March meeting for how to proceed in the study design.

**Forest Practices Board Update** – Marc Engel and the Adaptive Management Program Administrator (AMPA) provided an update to Policy about the February 10<sup>th</sup> Board meeting. Two topics are of particular relevance to Policy, noted below.

*Unstable Slopes Proposal Initiation* – The Board received a proposal initiation to continue work on unstable slopes and public safety, following the approval of the Board Manual Section 16 in late 2015. The Board asked the AMPA to provide Policy with recommendations on how to proceed, which Policy should expect at the April meeting. The Board also requested a report back at their May meeting from Policy about how to address the proposal initiation. Policy noted that this additional topic will add to their already full workload, and may require re-prioritization. It is up to Policy to recommend to the Board how this topic fits in with the current priorities.

*Budget Approval* – The Board approved the AMPA’s authority to allocate budget to projects outside the approved budget, though at a maximum of 10% of the approved budget. The budget allocation authority will still need to go through the AMP, but this change will allow the AMP to act more quickly on budget issues rather than waiting to get approval from the Board, which only meets quarterly.

**Roads Best Management Practices TWIG Best Available Science & Alternatives Analysis** – Policy was ready to make a decision without any further discussion after the presentation at the February meeting.

**Decision:** Policy approved the Best Available Science (BAS) and Alternatives Analysis as drafted by the Technical Writing and Implementation Group (TWIG), and approved the TWIG to develop a study design for Alternative #4, “empirical research of BMP on high-traffic, near-stream roads and utilize new and existing data to improve existing models”.

**Type F: Physicals** – The Chair noted that a small group has started to identify an approach for evaluating the default physical criteria. Karen Terwilleger, part of that small group, explained that they are starting with historical information, including the 1996 discussions at the original TFW table and the Board’s emergency regulation adopted in November 1996.

Given this information and discussions with the small group, the industrial timber landowner caucus has agreed to draft a proposal initiation on how to evaluate the default physical criteria, and hopes to present to Policy at the April meeting. This will not need Policy approval at that time, but gives Policy members an opportunity to give input to the caucus that will ultimately submit the proposal initiation to the AMPA.

The Chair also noted that in April and May Policy will begin to see products from the Electrofishing Technical Group, and soon after that from the Off-Channel Habitat Technical Group. Along with the physicals proposal initiation, it might become more obvious soon how all the pieces fit together into one set of recommendations to deliver to the Board in November 2016. Regardless, the Chair will report to the Board at both the May and August meetings, which he will do so by highlighting the current status of Policy’s work.

**Type F: Electrofishing** – The Electrofishing Technical Group has been meeting once every two weeks, and they divided into subgroups to address specific questions. They will pull all the pieces together soon into a summary report, and then present that to Policy at the May meeting. Several caucuses thanked the

AMPA and Howard Haemmerle for their leadership with this group. Other questions and comments included:

- A concern by some of the technical participants that Policy may not be as knowledgeable about these topics as they should be, so Policy is encouraged to self-educate by visiting DNR's Box site that includes all the documents that the technical group is using. However, Policy is not required to review every document on the Box site since the summary product will highlight the most important ideas as identified by the technical group.
- At the February meeting, Policy identified four questions about seasonality that this technical group will end up addressing, which will not impact their timeline for delivery to Policy. If after review of the group's summary product Policy still has questions about seasonality, the AMPA hopes caucuses will raise those so Policy can think about how to address unanswered questions. This means that the authority Policy gave the AMPA at the February meeting to convene a separate group and use up to \$75,000 to answer the seasonality questions is not needed at this time.
- The Chair and AMPA agreed to work on a draft of how to address the remaining questions originally identified by Policy about electrofishing, and once the summary product is delivered to Policy then Policy can discuss next steps.

**Type F: Recovery and "Habitat Likely to be Used by Fish"** – The Chair noted that both of these sub-elements which had had small groups working on them at one point are both dormant for now. These topics may be addressed by the products coming soon to Policy on electrofishing and off-channel habitat, so Policy should re-evaluate in the coming months what more could be done to address these sub-elements.

**Off-Channel Habitat Technical Group** – The AMPA explained that the group has been convened, led by Phil Roni. Their first meeting will be April 8, and the plan is to have them bring a presentation and draft report to the June Policy meeting. The AMPA made sure that the contract with the participants allows Policy to continue to draw on their experience after June, as needed.

Policy members asked if they will be allowed to observe the meetings for self-education. The AMPA noted concern for having Policy members in the room which could stifle high-level discussions. He is happy to create a Box site for this group that all Policy members could access. At least one caucus noted disappointment that Policy members will not be allowed to observe, even if they are not allowed to speak.

**Type F: Model/Map Update** – The AMPA recently met with the Precision Forestry group at the University of Washington to look at the watershed analysis units, and to begin working together on the water typing components. More work to come.

**Type F: Subgroup Management** – The Chair noted that the need for subgroups comes up occasionally, and there may be a need for some support to the subgroup(s) to keep them as efficient as possible. The conservation caucus suggested convening a subgroup to start thinking about how to pull all the components together for a set of recommendations to the Board, despite not having all the information yet. Policy referred to this as a conversation about "where to hang the F/N break flag". While caucuses

had differing opinions on how helpful this would be at this stage in the process, several members agreed to participate in this subgroup and meet at least once before the April meeting.

**Type F: Desk Review of Water Type Modification Forms (WTMFs)** – Donelle Mahan, Aaron Perry, and Marc Engel from DNR presented their spreadsheet of compiled WTMF data. Questions and discussion included:

- The DNR hydrolayer map/model includes numerous layers, and this information only includes the data for streams, and the data is only as up to date as December 31, 2015.
- This information does not yet include data from 303(d) listings, which Policy could ask for and would require using Ecology's data.
- The data analysis is imperfect because some data is older than other, and DNR does not have access to all the historical forms that were used as model inputs. There was no meta-data they could use in this analysis.
- Some data show that the model might have listed a stream as a Type N, but then DNR manually switched it to a Type F because the original TFW agreement asked that all streams field-verified as Type F before they ran the model would stay a Type F.
- The data cannot be broken down into streams that were identified by an Interdisciplinary Team (ID Team), versus a visual observation.

Since Policy only received the updated spreadsheet at the meeting in hard copy, an electronic version will be shared after the meeting and Policy can follow up with more questions at the next meeting. One idea that Policy might wish to follow up about is that some of the stream miles noted in the spreadsheet are not on the forested landscape, and Policy may wish to focus on just those streams on forested lands.

**eDNA Metabarcoding Pilot Study** – The AMPA sent a revised proposal for this pilot study, which outlined a study about eDNA metabarcoding that the AMP could participate in. Metabarcoding looks at multiple species simultaneously, which could be helpful to the AMP in training and validating the model without the use of electrofishing. Questions and discussion included:

- Some caucuses expressed concern that while this could be a good tool, they wanted a review first from CMER or a technical group before Policy approved spending on this. The AMPA noted that there is no natural vetting group within CMER to do so (such as ISAG). The westside tribal caucus noted that even though there is no ISAG currently, Policy could choose to contribute to this pilot study, and once the pilot study has a product that might be the time to bring to a technical group such as ISAG.
- A fish carcass or analog could give a false positive in this study, but working with landowners, Policy could reduce those uncertainties.
- The industrial timber landowner caucus suggested the following motion: "TFW Policy direct the AMPA to work with CMER to develop an eDNA proposal and bring back to Policy for further action. Meetings will be open to any interested caucus."
  - The AMPA noted that this could affect the timeframe since the pilot study hoped to be in the field by April 1.
  - Both tribal caucuses supported the idea of including CMER in evaluating this proposal.

- The westside tribal caucus noted that this is unlikely to be feasible since the AMPA already identified a technique of finding the last fish. The AMPA explained that this could help with the barriers.

**Decision:** Policy was not in consensus on any idea of how to move forward.

- The AMPA's original proposal: The eastside tribal, non-industrial timber landowners, conservation, counties, and WDFW/Ecology caucuses voted yes; the federal, westside tribal, and DNR caucuses voted sideways; and the industrial timber landowners voted no.
- The industrial timber landowner caucus's motion to have CMER evaluate before approving the spending: The industrial timber landowners and counties caucuses voted yes; the federal, westside tribal, and DNR caucuses voted sideways; and the eastside tribal, non-industrial timber landowners, conservation, and WDFW/Ecology caucuses voted no.
- The eastside tribal caucus's motion to bring to CMER but not let that delay the response to USGS in being a part of the pilot study: The federal, eastside tribal, non-industrial timber landowner, conservation, DNR, and WDFW/Ecology caucuses voted yes; the westside tribal and counties caucuses voted sideways; and the industrial timber landowner caucus voted no.

Without consensus on any option, the pilot study was not approved and no next steps were identified.

**Forest Hydrology Study and Findings Report** – Despite some confusing communication about Policy's decision at this meeting, Policy was ready to make a decision.

**Decision:** Upon receipt of the Forest Hydrology Study and Findings Report, Policy agreed with full consensus to recommend that the Board take no action on this study. This will be reported to the Board at their May meeting.

### **TWIG Communication at Policy**

#### *TWIG Tracker*

Policy reviewed the TWIG Tracker, a document summarizing each of the five TWIGs and their individual status. Suggestions included:

- Add a column for "status", and include in it the number in the Lean Process where the TWIG currently is. This is also where notes such as "behind schedule" could be added, if appropriate.
- If there are specific comments upon approval to the Problem Statement, Objectives, and Critical Questions, note "with other specific comments" in the column.

#### *Cover Sheets*

Policy reviewed the cover sheets that can be used when TWIGs bring products to Policy, and when Policy has made decisions on TWIG products. Suggestions included:

- Make sure that the response from Policy cover sheet reflects the process, and does not give Policy an opportunity to give more feedback than they are allowed in the process.
- Several caucuses thought these would improve the process.
- Policy discussed how much individual caucuses should be communicating to TWIGs or a TWIG member, versus Policy as a whole communicating with the TWIG as a whole, through the AMPA or project manager. Hans, Howard, and Claire agreed to confirm the Lean Process and reflect it accurately on the forms.

- Add the corresponding number from the Lean Process in each cover sheet.

**CMER Budget** – The AMPA shared an updated version of the budget, which he has updated with help from the eastside tribal caucus representative. The eDNA project was shown in the budget but with non-consensus earlier at this meeting, that line item will be removed. The AMPA has some ideas for how to spend projected unspent funds, which he will bring to Policy at the April meeting. It was noted that if the legislature changes the AMP's budget, the budget for next fiscal year could be reduced by as much as \$500,000.

The AMPA suggested that there could be more than one project on the Master Project Schedule that could use a literature synthesis to get the project started. If Policy identifies one or more project that could use a literature synthesis in the coming years, perhaps this is another way to spend down some of the projected fund balance in this fiscal year. Comments included:

- There are some topic areas or goals that are better served by a literature synthesis, so it is important to choose a topic that is ideal for a literature synthesis.
- The AMPA hopes that if Policy generally likes this idea, he can have the SAGs and CMER identify potential projects to do literature syntheses for.
- Several caucuses seemed interested in this idea, especially for projects that are coming up soon on the Master Project Schedule and are already articulated as a priority for the AMP.

**Next Steps** – The Chair and facilitator reviewed action items from this meeting and the potential topics for the April meeting. There are a lot of topics for the April meeting so Policy may need more than the one day meeting to get everything accomplished in April. The Chair and facilitator will send more information about that.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:50pm.

Attachment 1 – Participants by Caucus at 3/4/16 Meeting

**Conservation Caucus**

Peter Goldman, WFLC  
Chris Mendoza, Mendoza Environmental, LLC  
\*Mary Scurlock, Scurlock & Associates

**County Caucus**

Kendra Smith, Skagit County  
\*Scott Swanson, WSAC

**Federal Caucus**

\*Marty Acker, USFWS  
\*Lucy Edmondson, EPA

**Industrial Timber Landowners**

Eric Beach, Green Diamond  
Doug Hooks, WFPA  
Brian Fransen, Weyerhaeuser  
Adrian Miller, Olympic Resource Management,  
Chair  
\*Karen Terwilleger, WFPA

**Others**

Hans Berge, AMPA  
Julie Dieu, Rayonier  
Howard Haemmerle, DNR/AMP  
Donelle Mahan, DNR  
Aaron Perry, DNR  
Claire Chase, Triangle Associates

**Non-Industrial Timber Landowners**

\*Dick Miller, WFFA

**State Caucus – DNR**

\*Marc Engel, DNR  
Marc Ratcliff, DNR  
Joe Shramek, DNR

**State Caucus – Ecology and Fish & Wildlife**

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

**Tribal Caucus – Eastside**

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

**Tribal Caucus – Westside**

Joseph Pavel, Skokomish Tribe  
Jim Peters, NWIFC  
Ash Roorbach, NWIFC

Attachment 2 – Ongoing Priorities Checklist

Priority	Assignment	Status & Notes
<b>Type N</b>	Type N policy subgroup	Caucuses are encouraged to talk offline about the wet season default methodology.
<b>Type F</b>	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.).
<b>Small Forest Landowners Westside Template</b>	SFLOs Template Subgroup	Subgroup is meeting separately; co-chaired by Marc Engel and Dick Miller.
<b>Unstable Slopes</b>	Policy	Board accepted Policy's recommendations; now DNR and UPSAG are working on implementing those recommendations. UPSAG has hired a contractor to do a literature synthesis.
<b>Ongoing CMER reports reviewed by Policy</b>	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
<b>TFW Policy Committee</b>	April 7	
<b>CMER</b>	March 22	
<b>Type N Policy Subgroup</b>	TBD	
<b>Type F</b>		To be addressed at regular Policy meetings.
<b>Forest Practices Board</b>	May 11, 2016	
<b>Small Forest Landowners Template Subgroup</b>		As workload allows.