

Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee
 April 7, 2016 Meeting Summary

Decisions and Actions from Meeting

Decision	Notes
1. Accepted the March meeting summary as final with two edits.	Full consensus of all caucuses
2. In FY16 budget, approved spending for: --\$50,000 for remote sensing equipment; --\$35,000 for temperature dataloggers; --\$200,000 for roads BMP project equipment; and --\$345,000 on the ENREP equipment spent between FY16 and FY17, as the GFS budget constraints dictate.	Full consensus of all caucuses
3. In FY17 budget, added \$136,500 in both a Type F placeholder line and an unstable slopes placeholder line.	Full consensus of all caucuses

Action	Assignment
1. Identify next steps on the AMPA's unstable slopes recommendations and bring to the May Policy meeting.	Mary Scurlock and others
2. Send comments to Karen Terwilleger on the draft Physicals Proposal Initiation by April 15. Also note if your caucus would like to co-submit the PI with the landowners caucus.	Caucus representatives
3. Send questions on DNR's hydro-layer spreadsheet to Claire Chase by April 29.	Caucus representatives
4. Think about Co-Chair options.	Caucus representatives

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*). The only change to the draft agenda was that the CMER work plan topic was not a decision item.

Announcements – The Chair noted that the need for replacing the vacant Co-Chair will be addressed at the May meeting. He hopes that at that time, Policy can discuss the Co-Chair role and brainstorm ways to address the absence. Ideas could include finding an interim Co-Chair, hiring a facilitator to act as Co-Chair, or having multiple caucus representatives serve as Co-Chair on an individual issue.

March 4, 2016 Draft Meeting Summary – There were two minor edits to the meeting summary which were approved by Policy. There was also a question about how the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) will convene a stakeholder meeting on the hydro-layer spreadsheet, which was addressed later in the meeting. With the two edits to the meeting summary, the draft was accepted as final.

Ground Rule of the Month – Marc Engel shared the importance of ground rule A.4, “Participants provide sufficient attention, staffing, and other resources”; he noted that there is a lot on Policy’s workload right now and that requires a commitment from each caucus in order to get the work done.

CMER Work Plan – The Chair highlighted several pieces that Policy is responsible for reviewing and approving:

1. Reconcile the FY16 budget so that any projected unspent funds can be identified for other spending;
2. Revise the FY17 budget;
3. Approve the FY18/19 biennial budget; and
4. Review the Master Project Schedule including FY18 and FY19 and out through 2030.

In order to get to each of these decision points, the Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research Committee (CMER) will estimate the project budgets for FY17 and FY18/19 biennium so that each line item is as accurate as possible. In order to have all documents ready to present to the Forest Practices Board at their May meeting, the Chair and the Adaptive Management Program Administrator (AMPA) anticipate needing a special, short Policy meeting to go through the Master Project Schedule (including the FY18/19 biennial budget) after CMER has updated it at their April 26th meeting. The CMER work plan is usually accepted by Policy at the April meeting of odd-numbered years; though that did not happen in April 2015 there is no need to have Policy’s acceptance of the CMER work plan again until April 2017. The CMER work plan is mostly a tool for the technical participants, and Policy interacts with it every two years mostly to think about which projects to fund and when.

Doug Hooks, CMER Co-Chair, highlighted the main changes to the work plan that CMER made this year. Questions and discussion from Policy included:

- There are some new ideas in this work plan, which usually have been identified by a Scientific Advisory Group (SAG) and then brought to CMER to incorporate into the work plan. This means that there are some ideas for studies that Policy has not yet heard about. CMER can put any project in the work plan as long as it receives consensus at CMER, and then it is up to Policy to identify if, when, and how to fund that study along with the existing, planned studies.
 - The Eastside Type Ns Effectiveness Project is an example of one of these brand new ideas from CMER; Policy has not seen this project before.
 - The WDFW representative and non-industrial timber landowners caucus representative had concerns with this approach and noted that historically the studies included in the CMER Work Plan had been previously vetted in a CMER/Policy prioritization process.
- The Buffer Shade Characterization Project is a separate project from the Buffer Shade project focused on amphibians, though they have very similar names.
- The appendix would be the best place for Policy members to see which projects have prior approval and which have pending approval.
- CMER will keep Policy updated on a science session that will happen in late summer 2016 which is focused on pesticides, since several Policy members expressed interest in the work the Wetlands Scientific Advisory Group (WETSAG) is doing about pesticides.

Remaining FY16 and FY17 Budgets – The AMPA reviewed the updated FY16 and FY17 budgets.

FY16 Budget

In the FY16 budget, the AMPA is projecting \$646,000 in unspent funds based on projects or other line items (such as CMER staff) spending less than anticipated. With those projected unspent funds, the AMPA largely suggests spending that on equipment that would be owned by the Adaptive Management Program (AMP) and that would be used for a few projects in the near term.

Additionally, the legislature did a fund shift upon the Office of Financial Management (OFM) finding additional funding in the Forests & Fish Support Account (FFSA). This would replace some of the General Fund-State (GFS) budget with FFSA monies. The importance of the fund shift is that having a budget with more FFSA monies instead of GFS monies means that more can be carried over into FY17. The fund shift would allow Policy to carry over up to \$557,000 in FFSA funds, if that much was unspent.

Questions and Discussion

- The proposed \$200,000 for equipment for the Roads project would be in addition to the \$125,000 equipment in the existing budget.
- ENREP would likely need their equipment no earlier than the summer of 2017.
- Policy discussed how to anticipate under-spending in other line items, and how to maximize the spending efficiency without compromising the FY16 or FY17 budgets.
- There was general agreement to use projected unspent funds on equipment because it is a discrete spending activity and will be needed soon enough.
- The westside tribal caucus reminded Policy that while FFSA seems more flexible because the funding can be used at any time and carried over into new fiscal years, it also is dependent on the timber market.
- The FFSA funding can be used for any type of spending, while the GFS funding can only be used for research projects (not even direct staffing for projects).

Decision: With full consensus of all caucuses, Policy approved spending for:

--\$50,000 for remote sensing equipment;

--\$35,000 for temperature dataloggers;

--\$200,000 for roads BMP project equipment; and

--\$345,000 on the ENREP equipment spent between FY16 and FY17, as the GFS budget constraints dictate. This is up to the AMPA's discretion to determine how much to spend in FY16 versus in FY17.

FY17 Budget

The AMPA highlighted updates to the FY17 budget, including:

- The off-channel habitat technical review line item continues in FY17 so that two of the four Off-Channel Habitat Technical Group members are available through the next year to support Policy in the Type F work.
- The Riparian Function Literature Synthesis is back on the budget with the full amount; it had been reduced due to the thinking that WDFW's Priority Habitats & Species work could provide some information for this line item, but the timing no longer matches up so it is best to budget for the full amount.

- The Wetlands Management Zone Effectiveness Monitoring was brought forward by WETSAG, though it is a project that they had already been planning on doing.
- Several caucuses agreed that placeholder funding for Type F and unstable slopes work should go under the “new projects” category.
- An additional \$100,000 was added to finish up the Riparian Hardwood Conversion project because it is no longer going to be done by the CMER staff.
- Policy brainstormed ideas to use project unspent funding in FY17, including:
 - Bull trout habitat predictive model tools (which was determined not relevant to fit into the FY17 budget);
 - Type F; and
 - Unstable slopes.
- The DNR caucus asked the AMPA to clarify all totals and assumptions in the budget so that it is really clear for the Board to review.
- The industrial timber landowner caucus representative committed to working with the AMPA after the fund shift is signed by the Governor to know what the final FFSA amount will be for FY17.

Decision: With full consensus of all caucuses, Policy approved the motion to accept changes based on the updated FY16 budget and add \$136,500 in both a Type F placeholder line and an unstable slopes placeholder line. This can be confirmed at the April 29th special Policy meeting when Policy reviews the full Master Project Schedule.

DNR Hydro-Layer Spreadsheet – Marc Engel reviewed an update from DNR since they presented the hydro-layer spreadsheet at the March meeting. DNR is better equipped to convene a stakeholder meeting for anyone interested in spending more time understanding the information in the spreadsheet, instead of taking time at a Policy meeting or working one-on-one with the caucuses. DNR asked caucuses to send any questions about the spreadsheet to Claire Chase by April 29th, and then DNR will compile the questions, formulate responses, and convene a meeting to review the answers together. There was some discussion about how relevant these answers would be for the deliverable Policy is preparing for the Board in November 2016, but it was still agreed that this would happen.

Two questions identified at this meeting for DNR to answer:

1. Clarify the statement incorrectly captured at the March meeting: “A permanent change on the water typing map through a Water Type Modification Form (WTMF) can only be made by a protocol survey for upgrading from a Type N to a Type F. Otherwise, other methods can be used to move the stream from a Type F to a Type N.”
2. Is there a way for DNR to get more detailed information from the tribal data that was incorporated into the maps, since DNR didn’t initially receive any forms with that data?

SFLOs Template Subgroup – Marc Engel and Dick Miller shared a progress update with Policy from the Small Forest Landowners’ (SFLOs) Template Subgroup. The group has reviewed 13 prescriptions related to the template proposal, and the next step is to formulate recommendations to bring to Policy. The hope is the subgroup will further analyze the substance of the prescriptions to determine whether any meets the criteria for an alternate template.

Questions and Discussion

- The federal caucus expressed concern about how long this process is taking at the subgroup level. Marc Engel explained that the most amount of time is spent on breaking down the prescriptions to their simplest form, and generally simplifying the proposal so it is more straightforward for a Policy review.
- The conservation caucus noted that while this has been an unusual review process, it has been a very collaborative effort and they hope that the subgroup can recommend alternate approaches around the template but also to address expectations around promises made to the SFLOs.
- The industrial timber landowner caucus shared that they feel the subgroup is making progress because they have started to identify prescriptions that could be successful in a template.
- The westside tribal caucus was concerned that this alternate template would allow for more ways to lessen resource protections, and they are no longer willing to compromise because they have seen protections weakened and lessened over time.
- An Ecology representative noted that the proposal is not based on best available science.
- Marc Engel is prepared to report to the Board at the May meeting about the subgroup's progress, but also noted that Policy should not expect a recommendation from the subgroup for a while.

Unstable Slopes Proposal Initiation – The AMPA reviewed his recommendations relating to the Unstable Slopes Proposal Initiation submitted by the DNR caucus based on the Board's direction.

Questions and discussion included:

- The AMPA noted that the timeframes within the recommendations are just an amount of time he estimates the task would take, but not time-bound. Also, the tasks are not necessary to do all at once, or all together – they can be done however Policy sees fit.
- The conservation caucus suggested that Policy ask CMER (or the Uplands Scientific Advisory Group, UPSAG) to weigh in about the requests to UPSAG in the AMPA's recommendations and how realistic the requests are given existing workload and the timeframe.
- DNR reminded Policy to consider how these recommendations fit with the Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides Literature Review that should be coming to Policy in July 2016.
- The AMPA recommendations include a need for a Policy subgroup, but when there needs to be an interaction with UPSAG then he suggested doing so with full Policy.
- The conservation caucus volunteered to look at the AMPA's recommendations with whichever caucuses are interested, before the May meeting, to write a question to CMER and UPSAG about what work is realistic. For example, they could clarify that there are various literature reviews referenced in the recommendations, and some are the same in different references and some are different literature reviews.
- The Board asked to have a report out at the May meeting about the next steps that Policy agrees are necessary to addressing the proposal initiation.
- The conservation caucus and other caucuses will work on the recommendations before the May meeting and Policy will discuss more at that meeting before the Board's May 11 meeting.

Type F: Physicals Proposal Initiation – The industrial timber landowner caucus drafted a proposal initiation (PI) about how to evaluate the default physical criteria, and shared with the caucuses before

their planned submittal to the AMPA. They have not yet submitted the PI to the AMPA, but are sharing it with the other caucuses now to see how other caucuses would refine this draft. Once it is submitted to the AMPA, he would draft his recommendations for how to work through the PI, and then those would be submitted to Policy for review and approval/change/rejection.

Karen Terwilleger reviewed the draft PI:

- The PI is mostly to review how the default physical criteria were developed. This would include a thorough review of the information in 1994 and 1996 that was presented to the Board about the water typing system and fish protections.
- The proposal for the emergency rule in 1996 included four components:
 - Criteria (including but not limited to 2 feet and 20% gradient);
 - Physical criteria adopted with the protocol surveys for multiple options for determining the regulatory break;
 - Implementation guidance for DNR to assist landowners in understanding the rule; and
 - A commitment among participants to begin a process to improve the program (which started the Forests & Fish conversations that led to the Forests & Fish Report).
- This PI hopes to use the existing data in 1996 and determine if the criteria can be refined to minimize error, now that we have more data 20 years later.
- The AMPA suggested that the PI clarify how looking at competing data sets moves the program forward towards resolution.
- The westside tribal caucus noted that the PI is focused on fish use instead of fish habitat. The industrial timber landowner caucus sees this PI as a way to understand the history behind determining fish use and then understand how that fits into a conversation about protecting fish habitat.
- The westside tribal caucus is also concerned about fish abundance numbers.
- The federal caucus suggested that Policy queue up the tasks that fit into the current context most appropriately.
- The WDFW representative suggested that when looking at fish use, fish presence/absence, and fish habitat, it will be important to understand the definitions of those overlapping terms and think about what they are intended to represent. She also asked if the PI can help Policy understand if basin size/width is being used in the default criteria.

Other suggestions, questions, or concerns should be sent directly to Karen Terwilleger by April 15 so she can finalize the PI and submit to the AMPA.

Type F: Off-Channel Habitat Technical Group – The first meeting of this group will be April 8. The Chair and AMPA have spoken at length about Policy members' observation of this group with the Board Chair and stakeholders. There are competing needs to allow Policy members to listen and learn if that is helpful, but also not constraining the technical experts to have open conversations. The Chair's suggestion to Policy is, if helpful to the caucus, to observe the meetings but not to advocate to any of the technical experts during the meetings, during the breaks, or in between meetings. The AMPA will also be at the meetings, and he can help moderate behavior if need be, though each caucus is asked to self-regulate their behavior. The AMPA noted that while Policy members' observation is allowed, the purpose of the technical group is to get to a product that will be presented to Policy so all Policy members will get the

same presentation, so it is not required for Policy caucus representatives to track the discussions of the technical group until they have arrived at a product. Despite divergent perspectives on observation, no vote was taken and it will go forward as the Chair suggested.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:30pm.

Attachment 1 – Participants at 4/7/16 Meeting

Conservation Caucus

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

County Caucus

Kendra Smith, Skagit County

Federal Caucus

*Marty Acker, USFWS

Industrial Timber Landowner Caucus

Adrian Miller, Olympic Resource Management,
Chair
*Karen Terwilleger, WFPA

Non-Industrial Landowner Caucus

*Dick Miller, WFFA

State Caucus – DNR

*Marc Engel, DNR

State Caucus – Ecology and Fish & Wildlife

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

Tribal Caucus – Eastside

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

Tribal Caucus - Westside

Mark Mobbs, Quinault Tribe
*Jim Peters, NWIFC
Ash Roorbach, NWIFC
Curt Veldhuisen, Skagit River System
Cooperative

Others

Hans Berge, AMPA
Claire Chase, Triangle Associates

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 separately; co-chaired by Marc Engel and Dick Miller.
Unstable Slopes	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. Policy is also considering how to respond to the AMPA’s recommendations on the unstable slopes proposal initiation, presented to the Board in February 2016.
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	May 4 & 5	Spokane
CMER	April 26	
Type N Policy Subgroup	TBD	
Type F		To be addressed at regular Policy meetings.
Forest Practices Board	May 11, 2016	
Small Forest Landowners Template Subgroup		As workload allows.