The following is a re-formatted task list that a subgroup of Policy revised based on input from the full Committee at the May 2016 meeting.

**Task List**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ongoing Tasks (priority levels: high; medium; low)</th>
<th>Tasks To Do</th>
<th>Completed Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task:</strong> Review and respond to the AMPA’s <strong>Recommendations for Implementing the Unstable Slopes Proposal Initiation</strong> (deep-seated and shallow-rapid landslides) <strong>Owner:</strong> Policy Committee <strong>Priority:</strong> High</td>
<td><strong>Task:</strong> Develop an action plan to complete implementation of Type N strategy with respect to UMPPF location. <strong>Owner:</strong> Policy Committee</td>
<td><strong>Task:</strong> Develop a Wetlands Research Strategy <strong>Owner:</strong> WETSAG/CMER/Policy <strong>Date complete:</strong> January 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task:</strong> SFLOs Westside Alternate Template <strong>Owner:</strong> SFLOs Template Subgroup <strong>Priority:</strong> Medium</td>
<td><strong>Task:</strong> Review by rule group the relevant L-1 questions, resource objectives, thresholds, and critical questions, then revisit as projects come up for approval. Type N and Wetlands rule groups are done. Review the remaining in this order: Unstable Slopes, Type F, Roads, Fish Passage, Pesticides, and CMZs. <strong>Owner:</strong> Policy Committee</td>
<td><strong>Task:</strong> Groundwater recharge areas <strong>Owner:</strong> UPSAG <strong>Date complete:</strong> November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task:</strong> Revisit the mass wasting research strategy with UPSAG. Include a review of the L-1 questions. <strong>Owner:</strong> Policy/UPSAG</td>
<td><strong>Task:</strong> Determine Type F/N regulatory break; implement permanent water typing rules; identify fish habitat <strong>Owner:</strong> Policy Committee; various subgroups (both technical and policy) <strong>Date complete:</strong> May 2017 <strong>Note:</strong> While technical work is ongoing on this topic, Policy’s role is complete.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task:</strong> Review Hard Rock study chapters. <strong>Owner:</strong> Policy, once chapters are ready from CMER.</td>
<td><strong>Task:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Task:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Parking Lot

(strikeouts = recommendations from subgroup to remove from parking lot)

- CMER streamlining, including:
  - How to maintain science/policy firewall (discussion with CMER and Policy).
  - LEAN process – consider how to increase efficiency and speed up timeline.
  - Increase CMER’s capacity and/or efficiency to do more projects, especially with the additional funding in 2015-17 biennium.
- How to make a stronger coalition for environmental issues that includes diverse stakeholder groups (like the Washington Watershed Restoration Initiative).
- Review how Policy decides to move an informal conversation into a formal process/discussion (like with off-channel habitat discussion).
- Discuss risk tolerance and how much Policy decides to tolerate.
- Consider how to incorporate and improve forest health and fire prevention.
- Develop and implement an AMP communications and outreach strategy for important decisions.
- Economic impact analysis. Define and discuss need for economic impact analyses, including what, when, why, by who, etc.
- Eastside performance targets.
- Review how to proceed with extensiveness monitoring related to fish passage.
- Climate change – consider if and how climate change should be considered in the AMP.
- Determine timing and coordination between compliance monitoring and effectiveness monitoring projects. Compliance monitoring is a DNR program, not part of the AMP, yet still has implications on the work of the AMP.
- Two tasks for DNR, not Policy:
  - Board Manual review/revisions
  - Conduct an independent review every 10 years of the structure, process, and performance of the AMP. To be done by an independent 3rd-party research organization and to include considerations such as: structure and function for technical performance, fiscal efficiency, and overall accountability; performance and efficiency of the consensus-based decision process; the rigor of CMER science and responsiveness of CMER to body of Pacific Northwest science; and the interactions of science and policy.