

Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee Meeting
 October 5, 2017 Meeting Summary

Actions and Decisions from Meeting

Action	Assignment
1. By Friday, October 13, send questions to Claire related the Hard Rock study. Howard will work with the study authors to answer the questions for the November Policy meeting.	All caucus representatives
2. Ask Bill Ehinger to start developing a Findings Report & 6 Questions for Chapter 7 of the Hard Rock study (Temperature).	Hans Berge
3. By COB Wednesday, October 11, write questions for the SFLs Template Subgroup to answer at November Policy meeting.	Westside Tribal Caucus

Decision	Notes
1. Requested a Findings report & 6 Questions for Chapters 7 (Temperature) and 17 (Discussion) of the Hard Rock Study.	Consensus by all caucuses
2. Deferred response to Questions 7, 8, and 9 until after the Findings Report & 6 Questions is delivered to Policy on Hard Rock Study Chapter 17.	Consensus by all caucuses
3. Agreed upon next steps for the SFL Template Subgroup (see page 5).	
4. Received the Non-Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides Literature Synthesis	Consensus (8 caucuses thumbs up, federal caucus thumbs sideways)
5. Approved next steps for the development of Board Manual Section 23.	Consensus (8 caucuses thumbs up, federal caucus thumbs sideways)

Welcome & Introductions – The Co-Chairs welcomed participants and led introductions (*please see Attachment 1 for a list of participants*).

Hard Rock Study Chapter Presentations – Howard Haemmerle, project manager for the Hard Rock study, introduced the presenters which included some but not all of the study authors. The authors reviewed several presentations:

- History and introduction
- Riparian stand and wood recruitment
- Stream riparian vegetation and wood loading
- Stream temperature and shade
- Discharge
- Nutrients, suspended sediment export, and sediment processes
- Stream channel characteristics
- Biofilm and periphyton
- Litterfall inputs, detritus and macroinvertebrate exports

- Downstream fish
- Stream-associated amphibians

The summary included:

- Metrics associated with decreased buffer length:
 - Increased tree mortality (for 100% and FP treatments)
 - Decreased shade
 - Increased stream temperature (throughout stream for most of the year)
 - Increased discharge (with greater basin area harvested)
 - Increased nitrogen export
- Patterns of response with decreased buffer length:
 - Decreased large wood recruitment and recruitment potential
 - Increased stored sediment
- Metrics for which response was the same for all buffer treatments:
 - Increased wood density (total/functional large, functional small)
 - Increased phosphorous export
 - Increased pool length
- Metrics for which the response varied by treatment:
 - Increased total small wood (100% = FP < 0%)
 - Increased stream length obstructed by slash/windthrow (FP = 0%)
 - Decreased wetted and bankfull widths/proportion step rise (0% only)
 - Decreased litterfall input (0% only)
 - Decreased detritus export (0% only)
 - Increased tailed frog post-metamorph (0% only)
 - Increased tailed frog larvae (100% = FP)
 - Decreased giant salamanders (FP only)
- Metrics for which there was a lack of response:
 - Sediment input and export
 - Biofilm and periphyton production
 - Total macroinvertebrate export and functional feeding groups
- Two overall comments:
 - A response that differed from the reference was evidence of a harvest effect
 - Magnitudes of change were frequently greatest in the 0% treatment

The Policy Committee agreed to collect questions on the study by Friday, October 13 which will then be batched for Howard, who will work with the study authors to have responses back to Policy at the November meeting. Policy caucus representatives can request a presentation and/or a Findings Report on an individual chapter after those responses are delivered.

The Findings Report & 6 Questions on Chapter 17 (the discussions chapter) has been drafted and is currently with two Scientific Advisory Groups (SAGs) for their comments by October 9. Then the draft will go to the Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research Committee (CMER) for review and approval. Then the AMPA will package the final version for Policy, which will likely be delivered at the December 2017 or January 2018 Policy meeting.

Decision: Policy unanimously approved this motion:

Defer response to Questions 7, 8, 9 and Policy action on the Hard Rock Study until the Findings Report & 6 Questions is delivered to Policy (e.g. to start the decision timeline). Additionally, the westside tribal caucus requested a Findings Report & 6 Questions for Chapter 7 (Temperature).

The AMPA clarified that there is an affirmative action required to start the decision timeline; thereby giving all Policy caucus representatives an opportunity to ask for a Findings Report and/or presentation on an individual chapter before making a decision on accepting the entire study.

Announcements

- Terry Jackson introduced Stacy Polkowske, who will take Terry's place as the TFW Policy Committee representative for WDFW once Terry retires at the end of the month. Stacy has been with WDFW for almost three years and is currently serving as the acting Division Manager for Ecosystem Services. Despite current budget constraints, WDFW hopes to hire Terry's position in six months and expects that person to be the permanent caucus representative for WDFW at TFW Policy Committee.
- Co-Chairs' Updates
 - Ray Entz noted that he will package the collection of documents shared in mid-September for the Forest Practices Board (Board) as the Policy guidance handbook. He also hopes to package one hard copy binder for each caucus so that caucuses can add anything they feel relevant for their caucus members. The hope is that this handbook will serve all new Policy caucus representatives in addition to completing the assignment from the Board.
 - Several caucuses thanked Ray for collecting the documents and one caucus asked for a table of contents.
 - In addition to the documents in this collection, the Co-Chairs also worked on two additional documents: guidance for subgroups and a revised Master Project Schedule and budget timeline. The Co-Chairs will take comments on these documents over the next week or so, but hope to have a final version to include in the package to the Board soon. They also recognize that this handbook is also meant to be "living", and therefore can be updated whenever necessary.
 - The Co-Chairs also plan to work over the next several months for how Policy can implement the AMPA's recommendations for AMP improvements, rather than wait for the Board to direct Policy to make those improvements.
 - The Co-Chairs requested that Policy use the December meeting to partly address business and partly to celebrate the accomplishments from this year. There will be some time for mingling and some time for being together, hopefully at a restaurant nearby.

August 31, 2017 Draft Meeting Summary – Policy reviewed several edits to the draft meeting summary. With those edits, Policy unanimously accepted that version as final. Additionally, the DNR caucus representative clarified that in 2005, the Board directed DNR to develop a Board Manual on the Uppermost Point of Perennial Flow (UMPPF), but only a dry season methodology.

CMER Update – There were no additions given verbally to complement the written summaries provided in the meeting packet.

Potential Habitat Break (PHB) Technical Group Update – The AMPA gave the following update regarding the technical group tasked with recommending criteria for potential habitat breaks to be used in the permanent water typing system:

- The science panel is working on data that will be more transparent. This will include random selection of points by ecoregion and eastside points.
- Right now, the group is collating the data, then it will QA/QC the data. Next, it will develop a report analyzing the data, which will go to the Board in mid-January.
- In the interim, there will be meetings between the science panel and the broader stakeholder technical group (the next meeting is scheduled for November 14).
- The science panel is also developing a study design; a questionnaire sent out already asked others to help inform that study design.
- The panel hopes to have a draft study design before November 14 so the stakeholders have time to review before the joint meeting on November 14. Then the study design will go to ISPR and the AMPA hopes it will be ready for the Board's February 2018 meeting.

The federal caucus representative asked about ongoing work for practitioner certification, but the AMPA explained that work is for the new rule but not related to the PHB work. DNR noted that they are planning to bring stakeholders into the work on certification and training for the new rule.

Small Forest Landowners' (SFLs) Template Subgroup Update – Marc Engel and Ken Miller updated Policy that this subgroup started meeting again after a hiatus. Their first subgroup meeting went into the history of the subgroup, mostly for the benefit of Ken Miller and Steve Barnowe-Meyer, who replaced Dick Miller on the subgroup after the first year(s) of the subgroup's work.

The subgroup has a draft of a contractor's prescriptions review report, and the subgroup asked for more clarity, rigor, and detail. Comments on the draft review report were forwarded to the contractor; the subgroup expects a revised version of the review report and the literature review. One question the group considered was whether one or both of these documents should go to ISPR.

Policy discussed the next steps for the subgroup and the implications on Policy's upcoming work. Discussion included:

- The subgroup agrees that it would be useful to have the contractor's assessment go through ISPR.
- The eastside tribal caucus representative suggested that the individual author of the template science assessment within the proposal being allowed to provide questions to the reviewers was a process foul. The small landowners caucus representative explained that the feedback from the author was minimal and about 90% of the feedback from affiliates of the Washington Farm Forestry Association came from others.
- The AMPA reminded Policy that the current step of the process is between the subgroup and the contractor.
- The WDFW representative explained that this product has some significant implications to future riparian rules and riparian protection. There is concern that it is getting rushed through a limited review process that would typically have a more thorough review if it had gone through the CMER and SAG review process prior to ISPR. They expressed that this product needs more work before going to ISPR.
- The Ecology representative explained that the subgroup seems unclear on the process they agreed to. He hopes for clarity on what the process is going to be, going forward.

- The conservation caucus representative encouraged Policy to memorialize lessons learned from this process about what to do or not do in commissioning third-party science so that mistakes made here are not repeated.
- The WDFW/Ecology caucus made a motion that included a step for the caucuses that are not a part of the subgroup to have an opportunity to provide a technical review of the revised draft document before going to ISPR. The westside tribal caucus seconded the motion.
 - Policy voted on the motion; it passed by all caucuses voting thumbs up except the DNR, federal, and eastside tribal caucuses voting thumbs sideways.
- The AMPA clarified that the ISPR is completely separated from the rest of the Adaptive Management Program's work, and is disappointed that Policy went this direction.

The eastside tribal caucus then asked that if possible, his vote be recorded as thumbs down, thereby not allowing the motion to pass. Policy further discussed the next steps for the subgroup, and then the industrial timber landowners caucus representative suggested edits to the motion, followed by some friendly amendments by the WDFW caucus representative.

After a caucus, the westside tribal caucus asked whether the subgroup could answer a number of questions and if Policy could table the motion until those questions are answered by the subgroup at the November meeting. The AMPA suggested that the questions go to the subgroup before October 12 because that is when the subgroup will meet with the contractor. This is also when the westside tribal caucus could participate in the subgroup. The westside tribal caucus clarified that this request does not stop the subgroup's work on products in the month of October; the answers to their questions will help their caucus understand if ISPR is the appropriate next step.

The Ecology representative stated that their support for the decision was based on ensuring that the meeting notes reflect the assurances given by the AMPA at the meeting that the contractor report would not be sent to ISPR until the subgroup agreed it is ready for outside peer review. He further noted that they were willing to move on to other agenda topics assuming that the next Policy meeting would include a decision on the second part of the motion (which directs peer review of the literature synthesis document).

Decision: The previous motion was withdrawn and Policy agreed that the next steps will be:

- DNR asked the Westside Tribal Caucus to write and send their questions on the SFLs Template Subgroup and work to date by COB October 11, 2017.
 - DNR also asked the Westside Tribal Caucus to attend the SFLs Template Subgroup meeting on October 12, if possible (and bring their questions).
- Policy asked the SFLs Template Subgroup to give a verbal update at the November 2, 2017 Policy meeting, including the responses to the Westside Tribal Caucus's questions.
 - This may include a discussion/decision about sending the contractor's literature synthesis to ISPR.
- The SFLs Template Subgroup will continue to work on products throughout October.

Program Priorities – The Prioritization Subgroup passed around a written update. Due to time constraints at this meeting, they did not give any verbal updates and will have a full update at the November Policy meeting. There was no group discussion.

Budget Review Update – Due to time constraints at this meeting, the Budget Subgroup will update Policy at the November meeting.

Non-Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides Literature Synthesis – There were no questions on the Findings Report & 6 Questions delivered to Policy in the meeting packet. Several caucuses noted that the contractor and UPSAG have done a good job with the literature synthesis and Findings Report. Policy expects that UPSAG will use this product to work on their research strategy. The conservation caucus representative asked that in November, Policy consider potential reasons to consider re-opening Board Manual Section 16 based on the literature synthesis.

The industrial timber landowners' caucus representative moved to accept the literature synthesis and the DNR caucus representative seconded.

Decision: Policy approved this motion except the federal caucus, which voted thumbs sideways: *Policy has received the Non-Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides Literature Synthesis and are engaged in recommendations to the Board.*

Re-Engaging the Type N Strategy – As the caucus that seconded the motion tabled from the August 31 meeting, the industrial timber landowners caucus proposed a friendly amendment to the motion. The eastside tribal caucus accepted the friendly amendment.

The conservation caucus representative noted that while they support the motion, they would have strongly preferred that Policy stress the need for language on the need for drought methods, but are able to support the motion because it will still be necessary for these issues to be addressed by the DNR stakeholder group developing the Board Manual.

Decision: Policy approved this motion with all caucuses voting thumbs up except the federal caucus, which voted thumbs sideways: *Policy recommends that the next step toward the resolution of the Type Np/Ns break methodology would be for DNR to initiate a stakeholder process for development of Board Manual Section 23, which will include in-field and remote method(s), as needed, for accurately locating the uppermost point of perennial flow (UMPPF). If during the development of Board Manual 23, elements are identified that Policy should consider recommending to the Board for further rulemaking, Policy requests that DNR report that information back to Policy.*

Next Steps – The facilitator will work with the Co-Chairs and AMPA to set up the November agenda with several topics from this meeting. Policy also reviewed logistical details for the field tour the following day.

The Co-Chairs adjourned the meeting at 4:45pm.

Attachment 1 – Attendance by Caucus at the 10/5/17 Meeting

Conservation Caucus

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

County Caucus

Kendra Smith, Skagit County
*Scott Swanson, WSAC, Co-Chair

Federal Caucus

*Marty Acker, USFWS
Teresa Kubo, EPA (phone)
Peter Leinenbach, EPA

Industrial Timber Landowners Caucus

Brian Fransen, WFPA
Doug Hooks, WFPA
*Karen Terwilleger, WFPA

Small Forest Landowners Caucus

*Ken Miller, WFFA

Others

Hans Berge, Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Howard Haemmerle, AMP
Angela Johnson, AMP
Claire Chase, Triangle Associates

Hard Rock Study Authors/Presenters

Bill Ehinger, Ecology
Stehanie Estrella, Ecology
Marc Hayes, WDFW
Aimee McIntyre, WDFW
Reed Ojala-Barbour, WDFW
Tim Quinn, WDFW
Greg Stewart, CMER
Jason Walter, Weyerhaeuser

State Caucus – DNR

*Marc Engel, DNR
Marc Ratcliff, DNR

State Caucus – WDFW/Ecology

*Mark Hicks, Ecology
*Terry Jackson, WDFW
Don Nauer, WDFW
Stacy Polkowske, WDFW

Tribal Caucus – Eastside

*Ray Entz, Kalispel Tribe, Co-Chair
Marc Gauthier, UCUT

Tribal Caucus – Westside

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

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 and in mediation, 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 Ken Miller.
Unstable Slopes	Policy	UPSAG hired a contractor to do a glacial deep-seated literature synthesis. Policy will present their perspective on the unstable slopes proposal initiation to the Board in May 2017.
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	November 2	October 6 for field tour.
CMER	October 24	
Type N Policy Subgroup		
Type F		The water typing mediation is complete and the AMPA and Co-Chairs presented the outcome to the Board at the May meeting. Additional technical work is ongoing.
Forest Practices Board	November 7	
Small Forest Landowners Template Subgroup	TBD	As workload allows.