

Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee
 September 6, 2018 Meeting Summary
 v. 9.26.18

Action	Responsibility
Incorporate Small Forest Landowner edits into the template subcommittee notes document and send to Rachel Aronson. Complete document subcommittee accomplishments	Ken Miller and Marc Engel
Reconvene template workgroup and get updated membership information to co-chairs by September 13	Ken Miller and Marc Engel
Provide draft of charter for Small Forest Landowner Template workgroup	Terra Rentz
Send charter and timeline to Terra by October mailing date	Template workgroup
Send charter and timeline to co-chairs by October mailing date	Hard Rock workgroup
Register workgroup meetings as public meetings	Rachel and Marc Ratcliff
Add follow up item on implications of climate change for policy for the October meeting	Co-Chairs
Pursue next steps with CMER on climate change discussions	Co-Chairs
Let Terra know status on budget workgroup by September 10	TFW Policy members
Convene budget workgroup	Terra Rentz
Send out scheduler for December 6 meeting, including hold for December 5	Rachel Aronson

Decision	Notes
Approve the August meeting summary with edits	The east side tribal caucus and Federal caucus was absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.

Welcome, Introductions, & Old Business – Policy Co-Chairs Terra Rentz and Curt Veldhuisen opened the meeting.

Terra announced that facilitation services by Triangle Associates have expanded. Rachel Aronson will be facilitating monthly Policy meetings and Annalise Ritter will provide logistical support and notetaking. Rachel will also be available to support subcommittee meetings as needed.

Policy reviewed the August draft meeting summary. Some edits were made to the body of the summary. The meeting summary was approved.

CMER update- Jenny Knoth, CMER Co-Chair, informed Policy that the Scientific Advisory Group is on schedule with its tasks. CMER's next meeting will take place in Spokane and include a field trip.

Extended Monitoring Charge from the Board – There was a brief discussion of extended monitoring for the program. The Board asked the Policy Co-Chairs and CMER Co-Chairs about developing a systematic approach to extended monitoring. Terra suggested that the four Co-Chairs will organize a workgroup, which will create and submit a proposal to the Board by May 2019. Considerations may include criteria for when extended monitoring is necessary, what triggers it, where should the request come from, and what is the resulting process.

The Co-Chairs will bring further thoughts and recommendations to the October meeting for Policy to discuss and approve a process for this group. The work group will likely start its process in the winter after other items have calmed down.

Water Typing Rulemaking and Forest Practices Board Updates – Marc Engel, DNR, reported that the Board's budget request to the legislature was approved. The Board also discussed the Water Typing System Rule. Development of the rulemaking packet has intentionally slowed down pending further clarification on Potential Habitat Breaks (PHBs). Once this step is complete, the Rulemaking Stakeholder Group will reconvene.

Marc stated that the Board found an economist to perform the economic analysis. This individual will start on September 17. Marc will then inform Policy of the name and organization of the individual. Analysis will begin once the PHBs are confirmed.

Questions:

- Has DNR submitted its budget to the Office of Financial Management (OFM)? Is it possible to share the Forest Practices Board request?
 - DNR is in the final stages of prioritizing budget items. Marc will share the budget proposals once they have been submitted.
- Are GIS data and analyses completed and available?
 - Given the changes in PHBs, the data is not complete. It will be shared with Policy once complete.
- What is the status of the Principals' meeting?
 - Marc stated that there are three sets of two-day meetings arranged for the Principals. Terra noted that the first meeting may be moved to after the election. There is also discussion of who, other than Principals, may attend as observers.
- Several caucus members voiced concern over delayed communications from the Board about Principals meetings and resulting difficulty in preparation. Marc Engel will relay these concerns to the Board. He reported that DNR is working to improve timeliness in providing materials and information via their contracted service.

Scoping of Riparian Extensive Monitoring Pilot Study – Andrew Cook and Monika Moskal, University of Washington, presented on the feasibility of applying remote sensing monitoring to riparian stands. Past work includes a literature review and pilot study. See slides for further detail of presented material.

The presenters reported that three technologies seemed promising: Aerial Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR), High Resolution Satellite, and the National Agriculture Imagery Program (NAIP). NAIP is widely available and affordable and may be a good alternative to the costlier options.

LiDAR data gathering is usually undertaken as a collaborative effort, as multiple organizations or agencies use the data for different purposes. LiDAR data that is older than five years should be considered outdated.

The report recommends establishment of two study sites, one in the east and one in the west of the state. The cost estimate is \$400,000-600,000 per study site, and would take two years total.

Questions:

- Is it possible to narrow the range of costs?
 - This may be possible once new metrics are incorporated, and sites are selected.
- Are flight timings standardized in terms of leaf-on and leaf-off?
 - Much of LiDAR is acquired for landslide studies, therefore most is flown during leaf-off. The industry is trying to get around it by throwing more pulses on the ground from different angles, as well as adjusting how the pulse of the laser exits the sensor. A longer pulse will be able to interact with the canopy more and still hit the ground. Equipment is rented from LiDAR companies on a 6- to 12-month basis. While services have increased, costs have as well. Eventually, efficiencies may bring costs down, but Monica does not anticipate this within the decade.
- Is species composition important in this study?
 - Monica responded that the committee should decide whether species composition is important to them. It will be easier to distinguish hardwood versus softwood.
- Is the distinction between tall and dense versus short and sparse sufficient, or do you need to know the actual height of the trees?
 - The simpler the metrics, the simpler the field data collection. The most expensive part of field data collection is getting to the plot. The standard collection capacity is two to three plots per day. NAIP can tell you whether things are dense and tall versus short and sparse.
- We are not sure what level of natural regeneration we will get from the forest environment in the Chehalis area. How could this information inform riparian management?
 - You could substitute space for time. If you see restorative conditions on a landscape, measure structural components of the landscape and then look back in time to see how stream has changed. Then, you can potentially predict a regeneration path for the landscape.
 - Deciduous versus conifer stands can be separated by LiDAR. Understory is difficult to do with any remote sensing, including LiDAR. It also depends on topography; mountainous ground is more difficult. This makes riparian forests hard to study.
 - It is possible to detect channeling with LiDAR.

Small Forest Landowner Template – Marc Engel, DNR and Template Workgroup Co-Chair, gave an overview of the Small Forest Landowner Template. The workgroup met earlier in the week to look at the proposed template from the Policy track perspective. The workgroup prepared a chronological summary document. The document was shared at the meeting.

Marc reviewed the history of the Template workgroup. In February 2015, the Forest Practices Board accepted WFFA’s proposal and then directed the Adaptive Management Program (AMP) to review the product to determine if it met template criteria. The AMPA reviewed the entire proposal initiation, answered questions, and brought forward recommendations to Policy on how to address the Board’s request. The template was brought to Policy, which accepted all of the AMPA’s recommendations. A subcommittee was formed. The AMPA reported to the Board that the AMP had accepted the assignment through a motion. The Board followed with a motion to determine whether the template meets criteria and determine strategies for moving forward. The resulting three-step action plan was summarized as follows:

1. Review whether the alternate plan template proposal meets the criteria for alternate plans.
2. Perform a literature synthesis, conducted through CMER, to provide context for the review and future proposals.
3. Provide a written response with formal recommendations for Policy.

Policy will then prepare a full set of recommendations to present to the Board at the May 2019 meeting.

At the meeting on September 4, the workgroup voted on the following question: Do these template prescriptions, as a whole, meet resource objectives to meet common situations repeatedly addressed in alternate plans? The results were two thumbs sideways, two down, and one up. There was no consensus.

Ken Miller, Washington Farms and Forest Association (WFFA) and Template workgroup Co-Chair, shared talking points. During the workgroup meeting, the small forest landowner caucus heard concerns of the other caucuses. Having confirmed its decision space with WFFA Policy, the small forest landowner caucus hopes to facilitate a collaborative path forward and to proceed in a timely manner. Please see Ken’s attached talking points.

Caucus Response:

- Caucuses in the Template Workgroup acknowledged Ken’s points and committed to moving forward with the review process.
- Jim Peters, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission (NWIFC), stated that the westside tribes offer to assist in collecting culvert data, completing inventory, and obtaining funding.
- Caucuses expressed concerns over the following:
 - The definition of “low-impact”
 - Water quality standards
 - Site-specificity of the template
 - Smaller buffers for all landowners
 - Overlapping efforts with the Small Forest Landowner Advisory Committee

There was discussion of whether subcommittees should remain below quorum. The Co-Chairs stated that subcommittees can decide for themselves whether their forums need to be non-public.

The Co-Chairs offered to help build out a charter for the Template Workgroup, given pertinent information regarding attendance and roles. The subcommittee's next task will be to approve the charter.

Presentation on Climate Change and Policy – Lynn Helbrecht, WDFW, Dan Siemann, DNR, Jenny Knoth, Green Crow and CMER Co-Chair, Eliza Ghitis, NWIFC, and Elaine Oneil, WFFA, presented an overview of climate change vulnerability to begin an ongoing discussion of how Policy will address climate change. They discussed projected climate impacts as relevant for forested systems in Washington and how climate change affects the ability of the AMP to achieve its objectives. Please see slides for details.

The presenters shared data describing projected climate impacts, including such factors as extreme weather events, seasonal variability, stream temperatures, ocean acidification, and more. They concluded from this review that there is opportunity to enhance the resilience of forested ecosystems to these impacts and extreme climate events. Additionally, they stated that the variability inherent in modeling climate change should not preclude including climate consideration into resource objectives of the Forests and Fish Agreement.

The presenters suggested two guiding questions and associated considerations:

- How might climate change affect our ability to achieve the objectives of the AMP?
 - See slides for a list of how each resource objective may be impacted by a changing climate.
- What options exist to better understand and address climate risks to the AMP?
 - See slides for flowcharts detailing options to integrate climate change considerations at each step of Policy's decision-making process and CMER's research process.
 - AMP programs provide opportunity to affect the management of Washington forests.

Questions and comments:

- Are there any potential positive impacts of climate change in the region?
 - Washington will become more valuable for agriculture, which may compete with forest land. Trees may grow faster with more CO₂ fertilization, but overall this will not have a large positive impact.
- How localized are the impacts of climate change, such as increased storm events?
 - The answer depends on the impact and the factors that affect it.
 - Scientists will often provide multiple models that can be aggregated. Management decisions should be made by watershed, rather than by region.
- How does the reality of changing conditions affect the validity or usefulness of previously gathered data? How do we define success given a rapidly changing baseline?
- Chris Conklin, WDFW, stressed the importance of discussing forest health treatments aside from commercial forestry. How do we manage habitats to increase their resilience to climate change?
 - Chris will present on forest health in Coeur D'Alene in February 2019. He expressed interest in working with the climate change presenters in incorporating information on climate change vulnerability into his presenters.

Caucuses expressed support for continuing to explore the integration of climate change into TFW policymaking processes.

Type N Hard Rock Study – The Co-Chairs reviewed the Type N Hard Rock workgroup timeline and decision space. Policy discussed the workgroup’s structure and norms, including the following topics:

- Public meetings and associated management and administration
- Guest presentations as agreed upon by Workgroup

Terra noted that the alternatives will be sent out in the November meeting packet.

Budget Update – Hans Berge, AMPA, discussed the state of the AMP budget. The budget carrying into 2019 is about \$1.3 million. This includes a surplus from 2018, due to several projects that did not proceed as expected:

- The Roads Prescription Scale Effectiveness Project was delayed due to needs to go through a public works bid process. The implementation sites planned for fall 2018 will instead be completed in spring 2019, for a total of 80 sites. Hans expects increased costs for this project compared to original projections.
- The Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness Project (ENREP) has seen the addition of additional sites. There are three treatments and three controls near Spokane, at which flumes are being installed. Another set of six sites is needed in the northeast region. Hans expects cost savings in ENREP compared to original projections.

The Budget Workgroup will meet following the close of Fiscal Year 2018 to discuss next steps. Its current members are Terra Rentz; Curt Veldhuisen; Alec Brown, Washington Environmental Council (WEC); Scott Swanson, Washington State Association of Counties (WSAC); Karen Terwilleger, Washington Forest Protection Association (WFPA); and Rich Doenges, Department of Ecology.

Terra asked that anyone interested in joining or leaving the Budget Workgroup let her know of their intent by the end of Monday, September 10. The next meeting will meet in September and October as necessary in order to bring a proposal to Policy at the November meeting. The Budget Workgroup will not be making decisions. Rachel and Annalise of Triangle Associates will not be involved in the Budget workgroup.

Next Steps – The next Policy meeting will be held on October 5 at the NWIFC conference room. The Vancouver field trip was postponed. Opportunities for field trips will be considered for future meetings.

The Forest Practices Board will meet in November. Ken Miller will host a field visit on November 13. Ken will present and demonstrate a template proposal for participants and answer questions from the Board. Ken encouraged Policy members to attend to gain familiarity with the template.

The Co-Chairs discussed the option of a two-day meeting in December. Policy members were asked to hold December 5 and 6 on their calendars.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Attachment 1 – Participants by Caucus at 9/6 Meeting*

Conservation Caucus

*Alec Brown

County Caucus

Kendra Smith, Skagit County

*Scott Swanson, WSAC

Industrial Timber Landowner Caucus

*Karen Terwilliger, WFPA

Doug Hooks, WFPA and CMER Co-Chair

Jenny Knoth, Green Crow and CMER Co-Chair

Joseph Murray, WFPA

Megan Tuttle, Weyerhaeuser

Small Forest Landowner Caucus

*Steve Barnowe-Meyer, WFFA

*Ken Miller, WFFA

Elaine Oneil, WFFA

State Caucus – DNR

*Marc Engel, DNR

Dan Siemann, DNR

Dave Klingbiel, DNR

State Caucus – Ecology & WDFW

Mark Hicks, Ecology

*Chris Conklin, WDFW

Terra Rentz, WDFW and Co-Chair

Lynn Helbrecht, WDFW

Tribal Caucus – Westside

*Jim Peters, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission

Ash Roorbach, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission

Curt Veldhuisen, Skagit River System Cooperative and Co-Chair

Eliza Ghitis, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission

Mark Mobbs, Quinault Indian Nation

*caucus representative

Others

Hans Berge, Adaptive Management Program Administrator

Rachel Aronson, Triangle Associates

Annalise Ritter, Triangle Associates

Monika Moskal, University of Washington

Andrew Cooke, University of Washington