

Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee
February 1, 2018 Meeting Summary

Decisions and Actions from Meeting

Action	Assignment
1. By COB February 15, send to Heather Gibbs any names of technical resources you recommend inviting to the February 28 budget workshop.	Caucus representatives, as interested
2. By COB February 21, send to Heather Gibbs your scores in the worksheet for each MPS project.	Each caucus representative
3. Send out the latest CMER workplan to Policy caucuses.	Hans Berge
4. Update the biennial budget to show a total column for rows 20-58, and group the water typing projects further down (physicals, PHB study, etc.).	Hans Berge
5. Update the criteria scoring worksheet to mirror the latest MPS (e.g. include the validation study); send to Policy caucuses.	Heather Gibbs
6. Meet as soon as possible after February 14.	SFLs Template Subgroup (Marc Engel)
7. Think about locations and/or topics for the October field tour in Vancouver area; send ideas to Scott Swanson.	Caucus representatives, as interested

Decision	Notes
1. Approved direction to the SFLs Template Subgroup (see page 5).	Approved by all caucuses except absent eastside tribal caucus.
2. Approved homework for all caucuses to complete by February 21 in advance of the budget discussion at the February 28/March 1 meeting (see page 6).	Approved by all caucuses except absent eastside tribal caucus.

Welcome, Introductions, & Old Business – Scott Swanson, Chair of the Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee (Policy), welcomed participants and led introductions (*please see Attachment 1 for a list of participants*). Scott explained that Hans Berge, the Adaptive Management Program Administrator (AMPA), and Claire Chase, the facilitator, would lead this meeting as Scott had to participate remotely. The westside tribal caucus representative requested that the agenda be modified to include legislative updates, which will be on future agendas through the legislative session.

Announcements

- The Chair explained that Curt Veldhuisen will join him as Co-Chair, starting in the fall. The Chair encouraged caucuses to still think about a temporary Co-Chair position to help Scott before Curt becomes the second Co-Chair.

- Terra Rentz introduced herself as the new caucus representative for the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW). She comes to Washington most recently from the Wildlife Society in Washington, D.C. She is the new Ecosystem Services Division Manager and hopes to soon fill the Forest Section Manager position.
- The Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission will host the next Policy meeting, which will be two days on February 28 and March 1. All caucuses will receive information about how to participate in that meeting remotely through the new audio/video conferencing system.
- The small forest landowner caucus representative extended the invitation to all caucuses for the annual Washington Farm Forestry Association (WFFA) meeting, which will be Sunday, May 20 in Winthrop.

Legislative Updates

- The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) submitted a bill assigned as Senate Bill 6235, which would memorialize pre-applications in statute. The next hearing is February 1 at 1:30, and it is possible the bill will not make it out of committee before the deadline on Friday, February 2.
 - The westside tribal caucus representative noted that the tribes have been requesting to be included in the notification of pre-applications and therefore see this bill as a positive step toward better coordination.
 - The small forest landowner caucus representative shared that if this bill passes, he hopes this will be an opportunity for small forest landowners to help, especially delineating steep and unstable slopes.
 - The industrial timber landowner caucus representative shared that they did not know about this agency legislation until three days before the session started. She requested that when agencies or other caucuses have legislation, they share it with all caucuses with more advance notice, in the spirit of the TFW Agreement.
 - Several caucuses agreed that in the past, Policy has had a topic on the agenda in the late fall to allow legislative liaisons to come to the Policy meeting and share legislative updates. This will be added to the October and November 2018 potential agendas.
- SB 6123 would dedicate all capital monies towards intended projects, and agencies would have to fund the administration of capital projects out of operating budgets. DNR is watching this bill because it could create additional challenges.
- HB 2902 would provide additional funding for fish passage barrier removals from a defined funding source (General Fund-State dollars), administered through the Fish Passage Removal Board. It is possible this could also enhance the Family Forest Fish Passage Program. The small forest landowner caucus representative explained that WFFA appreciates that this bill also showcases what industry has done for improving fish passage.
- SB 6203 is the Governor's carbon bill that would have a nexus to DNR for forest health and fire prevention that would create a fund to help landowners and use conservation easements to sequester carbon. The westside tribal caucus representative explained that the tribes are coordinating with a conservation group to consider doing an initiative on this same issue next year if none of the carbon-related bills pass forward.

January 4, 2018 Meeting Summary – Policy reviewed suggested edits to the draft meeting summary. With those edits, the meeting summary was approved as final.

Decision: Approved the January 4, 2018 meeting summary with edits. All caucuses voted thumbs up except the absent eastside tribal caucus.

CMER Update – Doug Hooks, Co-Chair of the Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research (CMER) Committee, shared these updates:

- The Type F Riparian Prescription Monitoring Pilot Project Technical Writing and Implementation Group (TWIG) is working on the study design. Per the TWIG Lean Process, the study design will not go to Policy for approval but will be included in the list of projects for budget approval. The TWIG members are happy to talk with any interested Policy member prior to the budget meeting on March 1.
- The Instream Scientific Advisory Group (ISAG) was planning to develop a literature synthesis that would lead to a study design of eDNA. However, ISAG determined there is no need for a new literature synthesis so they have requested to re-allocate their budget for a proof of method proposal, which means they need to have a new approval of this spending. CMER recently approved that and now CMER is reviewing the proof of method proposal.
- CMER discussed the Hard Rock Extended report and agreed to have one report instead of a series of chapters. This report will not include redundancy from the previous Hard Rock report but because there are different methods used to analyze the extended data, CMER determined the need to send this report through Independent Scientific Peer Review (ISPR). After ISPR, the report will go back to CMER for review by October 2018, then back to ISPR and finally back to CMER for a final review with the Findings Report. The goal is to present the report and Findings Report to Policy by June 2019.
- The CMER Co-Chair noted that many studies are entering the implementation stage which often is more expensive than alternatives analysis and study design. As Policy funds those implementation stages, CMER is using the recently-approved Chapter 7 of their Protocols & Standards Manual which means more coordination between the AMPA, CMER Co-Chairs, and Project Managers. The AMPA noted that Chapter 7 was being developed at the same time he was writing his recommendations for Adaptive Management Program (AMP) improvements, so there is similarity in those two products.
- The draft unstable slopes research strategy is in CMER review but also available for Policy's Unstable Slopes Proposal Initiation Subgroup as they prepare for budget discussions at the March and April Policy meetings.
- The federal caucus representative noted lack of detail around several points on the CMER and SAG/TWIG summaries, and hopes to get clarity from the AMPA after this meeting. In the future, the CMER update at the Policy meeting should be used to clarify any such confusion.

Small Forest Landowners' Templates

- Policy reviewed the multiple products for the low-impact alternate template proposed by the small forest landowner caucus, including:
 - The science track includes two products:
 - Science assessment of scientific justification for the proposal initiation.
 - Literature synthesis.
 - The policy track is meant to answer whether the proposal initiation meets the definition of an alternate template.
- The AMPA noted that the Board expects a report on this topic at their August 2018 meeting. In the meantime, Policy should determine whether this proposal meets the definition of a template.
- The DNR representative reminded Policy that the Board recognized an opportunity that while the Policy subgroup is waiting for the results from the science track products, the subgroup could pull out the conifer thinning and conifer restoration draft templates to see if either could provide any

additional help. He noted that neither template is meant to take the place of the proposed low-impact template proposal.

- The AMPA explained that the science is not necessary if the proposed template does not meet the definition of a template. Some caucuses noted disagreement with that.
- The small forest landowner caucus representative explained that the January 23 subgroup meeting included:
 - Reviewing the WACs and RCWs about the definition of “low impact”;
 - Discussing if and how to replace the contractor who was working on the science assessment and literature review; and
 - Discussing whether this proposal qualifies as a template.
- The small forest landowner caucus meant for their proposal to meet the definition of a template and therefore feels that further discussion is unnecessary. However, they are willing to have that conversation but feel the subgroup will need the products from the science track.
- The industrial timber landowner caucus representative shared that there are two ways she understands how to define a template: looking at common threads across previously-approved alternate plans, and looking at strategies for simplifying language.
- The Department of Ecology technical representative indicated that the subgroup will not get to agreement on whether the proposal meets the definition of a template, which is related to different interpretations of the RCWs and WACs.
- The AMPA laid out different options:
 - Hire a new contractor to answer the same set of questions the first contractor was working on.
 - Take the template as it is with the supporting documentation and have an evaluation done on the science.
 - Send the template as it is with the supporting documentation to ISPR, though this might be a bigger request of ISPR because they may need to run models and analyze results.
- The small forest landowner caucus representative strongly encouraged Policy and the Policy subgroup to hire a replacement contractor and continue the work building on the body of work already done.
- The Ecology technical representative suggested having the literature review completed first, then the science assessment, because that would help everyone see decisions made on best available science. However, he also recognized the short timeframe and therefore is willing to have both done concurrently. The conservation caucus representative agreed and explained the larger product is going to be important in having a common understanding of the science.
- The industrial timber landowner caucus representative asked a series of questions to the AMPA, the answers of which included:
 - The previous contractor did provide preliminary products of some value.
 - ISPR could effectively assess the science for the template without doing the literature review first.
 - The literature review could be separated into a smaller initial task which could be done in a few months, while the larger tasks that the Riparian Scientific Advisory Group (RSAG) does will not be necessary to evaluate the template.
- Through this discussion, Policy agreed to written next steps meant to guide and focus the Policy subgroup. This direction from Policy was meant for the subgroup to build from, not limit their future work. This also does not preclude the subgroup’s work on the other two conifer templates, though those should not be viewed in lieu of the original proposed template.

Decision: The DNR representative made a motion of the following direction to the Policy subgroup. All caucuses voted thumbs up except the absent eastside tribal caucus.

1. *Continue on Science Track through these efforts:*

- *Riparian Function Literature Synthesis to RSAG, using contractor and CMER process to be used as Best Available Science for AMP.*
- *A technical evaluation of the proposed WFFA template that uses best available science to determine if the proposal meets resource objectives. Results of the analysis needs to include an evaluation of supporting science included by WFFA as well as a discussion of the results in context of other relevant research (timeline = 3-4 months). Subcommittee meet as soon after the Feb 13/14 Board meeting as possible; will determine how existing questions get incorporated into the contract.*
- *Hire a new contractor to continue with the science assessment the subcommittee is currently conducting (timeline = depends)*

2. *(Request from the Board, outside the work on the PI) Discuss two templates as requested by the Board (Conifer Thinning and Conifer Restoration). May be concurrent to #1 but should not delay #1.*

3. *Discuss Policy track questions:*

- *Consider whether the proposed template meets the definition of a template.*
- *Discuss meaning of “relatively low-impact”.*

Note: This is intended as guidance to the SFLs Template Subgroup.

Program Priorities – The Prioritization Subgroup updated Policy on their recent work, explaining the worksheet and criteria document they provided for this meeting:

- The worksheet could be used with a 0-3 or a 0-8 scoring scale; the subgroup did not have a specific recommendation because they saw advantages and disadvantages to both scales.
- The subgroup hopes that Policy will direct each caucus to use the worksheet to score each project on the Master Project Schedule (MPS) prior to the February 28/March 1 Policy meeting. This will require Policy to identify what is known and unknown about each project and be more prepared for discussion at the March budget meeting.
- Seeing aggregated and individual scores at the March meeting could help Policy identify where to focus discussion (e.g. the projects that had wide-ranging scores may need more discussion compared to the projects with similar scores across all caucuses).
- This is likely a test year but the criteria and scoring will become even more important in 2019 when Policy will need to create a new biennial budget for the Board.

Policy discussed the subgroup’s work and potential next steps:

- The conservation caucus representative suggested Policy test drive the criteria and worksheet in 2018 before formally adopting the criteria for use in 2019 and beyond. She also suggested Policy consider weighting some priorities, such as Clean Water Act assurances. (The Department of Ecology technical representative noted that the subgroup considered that in earlier iterations of the criteria but ultimately decided that would double-count some criteria inaccurately.)
- The WDFW representative suggested that scoring projects before more technical information is shared at the February 28 workshop may not be very helpful. The Chair explained that testing the tool will require Policy members to get knowledgeable about the MPS projects and CMER

workplan, and highlighting where Policy needs discussion at the March meeting. He also noted that Policy does not need to make their decision until their April meeting, in order to present the MPS at the May Board meeting.

- The industrial timber landowner caucus representative added that among other things, this scoring tool is meant to make it easier for Policy to respond to the Board when the Board wants to add something to the workload and budget.
- Policy considered who to invite to the February 28 budget workshop. The AMPA confirmed that he and the project managers will be there, so Policy should consider if they need more technical resources. The AMPA also cautioned against inviting technical resources who will solely campaign for one project. The Chair asked Policy members to consider technical resources to invite to the February 28 meeting, and to send those names to Heather Gibbs by February 15.

Decision: Policy agreed to the following assignment, approved with thumbs up from all caucuses except the absent eastside tribal caucus.

To test the criteria, use the worksheet from draft prioritization criteria to score each MPS project on the 0-8 scale. Send your scores in the worksheet format (no changes, please) to Heather Gibbs by COB February 21. (heather.gibbs@dnr.wa.gov)

[AMPA to send out latest CMER workplan and project info sheets ASAP, to be used in caucuses' scoring before February 21.]

Quarterly Budget Update – The AMPA included the latest version of the biennial budget in the packet for this meeting. He and the project managers are prepared to speak to each project at the February 28/March 1 Policy meeting in response to any Policy questions at that meeting. That includes any question on TWIGs and SAGs. If relevant, the project managers can also speak to research strategy development.

Policy noticed that the potential habitat break (PHB) validation study should be added to the prioritization worksheet. Policy also asked the AMPA to add a total column for rows 20-58, to show total cost for each project. Finally, Policy requested that the PHB validation study and physicals be grouped in later rows rather than up top. The AMPA and his staff will make those changes.

The AMPA reminded Policy that the sooner they can start thinking about total expense of each project and potential budget shortfalls in future years, the better. That could mean delaying some projects.

Updates

PHB Technical Work

- The AMPA noted that the final version of the report is what is posted in the Board meeting materials dated January 26 (not January 16 as was originally emailed out).
- The science panel will present to the Board at the February 13 meeting, with time for public comments.

Board Subcommittee for AMP Improvements

- The contractor has been hired and started working. She will start with a meeting with the Board Subcommittee; this will be a public meeting and likely between February 22 – March 9.
- Each caucus should expect to be contacted for interviews, likely including several people from each caucus. It was unknown at this time how many interviews will be groups of people or

individuals. The interviews will likely be more than one hour and based on how long it takes to share all the information caucuses want the contractors to have.

- It will be important for caucuses to identify their principal(s) as well as others within their caucus who are helpful to interview.
- The first principals' meeting will be informed by the interviews. At this point it is uncertain how long or when that meeting will be but likely around the May Board meeting.
- The AMPA is available for any other questions caucuses have about this process.

Forest Practices Board February 2018 Meeting

Agenda

The DNR representative noted that the draft agenda currently available online will likely be changed to:

- First day, February 13: PHBs presentation from science panel; compliance monitoring report; some staff reports.
- Second day, February 14: Board discussion on PHBs with potential motions on next steps; staff summaries of the elements that the Board has already approved for inclusion in the rule and guidance for water typing.

Approved Water Typing Elements

Marc Ratcliff reviewed the documents and information DNR is using to inform rulemaking and guidance forthcoming. Marc also shared a simplified document that outlines these components.

- For the new permanent rule:
 - DNR will use the conceptual idea of combining 030 and 031 like the black/gray/red document DNR staff have previously used with the Board.
 - For off-channel habitat, DNR staff will move forward with the Board-approved idea that bankfull width will be used for channelized waters and ordinary high water line will be used for unchannelized waters.
- For Board Manual guidance will include:
 - The fish habitat assessment method (FHAM).
 - Electrofishing best management practices.
 - Indicators or descriptions for how to identify off-channel habitat.
- For process, which could go into rule or Board Manual:
 - Previously-submitted Water Type Modification Forms (WTMFs) will be used as regulatory break. The existing modeled F/N breaks will be starting point for the FHAM.
 - Physicals can be used for Forest Practices Applications but not to make a permanent change with a WTMF.
 - Practitioner certification process.

Discussion

- The conservation caucus representative encouraged DNR to remind the Board of what they have already decided.
- The industrial timber landowner caucus representative noted that there may not be enough time on the Board agenda on either day to fully discuss PHBs and how to move forward.
- The WDFW technical representative noted that this change in process, especially around identifying PHBs, may set up technical staff to have difficult discussions in the field. He was concerned that in some instances, it may be challenging to make a compelling argument when the PHB does not make sense in the field.

- DNR still needs to hear from a few caucuses about who their representative will be for the stakeholder group to write the rule and Board Manual guidance. Caucuses were encouraged to send those names soon to Marc Ratcliff.

Incorporating Climate Variability into AMP Improvements – This topic was one of the recommendations from the AMPA to the Board about potential improvements to the entire program. The Policy Chair and AMPA thought it would be prudent of Policy to start this discussion now before the Board directs Policy to do anything specific. The CMER Co-Chair also noted that CMER has had some preliminary discussions on this topic or related topics, but never this formal.

Discussion

- The AMPA noted that the previous AMPA convened a similar discussion about five or more years ago. However, he understood that discussion to be different; the discussion now is about considering climate variability more formally in potential rule changes or discussions of forest health, wildfire, or drought. He suggested the Findings Reports could include a specific piece about considering long-term consequence of potential changes, particularly considering climate.
- The westside tribal caucus representative noted that there are many groups already working directly on climate change studies and adaptations, and the AMP could work with those groups. The Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission (NWIFC) has a climate scientist who may be a helpful person for Policy to start with. He also shared an executive summary on a NWIFC study on climate change and cultural resources.
- The WDFW representative agreed that there are groups already working on climate science, including an inter-agency climate adaptability network. She also mentioned that the University of Washington is working on tools related to climate science and adaptability. She suggested that the AMP could build specific language into planning that opens up the door for science. WDFW has a climate coordinator who could brief Policy on how to integrate climate variability and preparedness.
- The conservation caucus representative agreed with the suggestion to incorporate a question into the 6 Questions about climate variability.
- The small forest landowner caucus representative asked whether this is a consideration that might reduce the number of private forest managers, or an incentive to grow the industry. He suggested that one way to help mitigate the changing climate is to keep forestland forested through carbon sequestration, though it seems to be a dying industry as the younger generations are uninterested in managing forestland.
- The Ecology representative noted that climate change presents real issues with water quality (increased temperatures, flashier flows, lower flows, etc.). He suggested that that makes managers focus on protecting streams in critical periods.
- The westside tribal caucus representative noted that climate change scares the tribes because there is so much unknown about how the changes will negatively affect the landscape, particularly the tribes' ability to harvest salmon (or not harvest).
- As the federal caucus representatives had left the meeting by this point, a paragraph was circulated on their behalf. The paragraph is specific to climate change and is from the Habitat Conservation Plan.
- The CMER Co-Chair read a paragraph from the other CMER Co-Chair who could not attend this meeting; her points specified that the AMP would be wise to keep current with the latest predictions for change and work to lessen the impact of human activity.

- The AMPA reminded Policy that the Eastside Scientific Advisory Group (SAGE) is working on timber habitat types, and that information could be helpful in this conversation at some point.
- The DNR representative noted that changing hydrology could mean changes particularly for the roads program.

Next steps: The Chair will work with the climate scientists from NWIFC and WDFW, along with the CMER Co-Chair if she's interested, to think about a presentation to Policy that would be relevant to the AMP and budget. The focus would not be on doing more science but how to incorporate outside climate science into the AMP projects and policy-level planning. The goal is to consider how to manage forests to get to more resilient landscapes.

Next Steps

The facilitator reviewed:

- The action items from this meeting.
- The next Policy meeting will be February 28 and March 1, both days at the NWIFC conference room in Lacey.
- Based on the results of the doodle poll, the October Policy two-day meeting will be October 3 and 4, in Vancouver. One of those days will be a field tour; caucuses were encouraged to send ideas for the field tour to the Chair.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05pm.

Attachment 1 – Participants by Caucus at 2/1/18 Meeting*

Conservation Caucus

*Mary Scurlock, Scurlock & Associates

County Caucus

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

Federal Caucus

*Marty Acker, USFWS

Industrial Timber Landowners Caucus

Doug Hooks, WFPA
*Karen Terwilleger, WFPA
Jason Walter, Weyerhaeuser (phone)

Small Forest Landowners Caucus

*Steve Barnowe-Meyer, WFFA (phone)
*Ken Miller, WFFA

State Caucus – DNR

*Marc Engel, DNR
Marc Ratcliff, DNR

State Caucus – Ecology & WDFW

*Rich Doenges, Ecology
Mark Hicks, Ecology
Don Nauer, WDFW
Brett Raunig, Ecology
*Terra Rentz, WDFW

Tribal Caucus – Westside

Mark Mobbs, Quinault Indian Nation
*Jim Peters, NWIFC
Ash Roorbach, NWIFC

Tribal Caucus – Eastside

Marc Gauthier, UCUT (phone)

*caucus representatives

Others

Hans Berge, Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Frank Hanson, Olympic Natural Resource Center and University of Washington, (phone)
Teresa Miskovic, Adaptive Management Program
Claire Chase, Triangle Associates

Attachment 2 – Ongoing Priorities Checklist

Priority	Assignment	Status & Notes
Type N	Policy to Board	Policy agreed by consensus on recommendations to the Board which were presented in November 2017.
Type F	Board & Technical Group	Policy delivered consensus recommendations to the Board in May 2017; the Board determined some areas that needed work by a technical group (primarily on potential habitat break criteria). DNR is developing the rule language.
Small Forest Landowners Westside Template	SFLOs Template Subgroup	Subgroup is meeting separately; co-chaired by Marc Engel and Ken Miller. In November 2017, the Board asked the subgroup to also consider the conifer thinning and conifer restoration templates from history.
Unstable Slopes	Policy	UPSAG hired a contractor to do a glacial deep-seated literature synthesis. Policy presented their perspective on the unstable slopes proposal initiation to the Board in May 2017 and convened an Unstable Slopes PI subgroup to attend to those issues.
Ongoing CMER reports reviewed by Policy	Doug Hooks & Jenny Knoth, CMER Co-Chairs	CMER Co-Chairs give regular written and/or verbal update(s) to Policy.

Attachment 3 – Entities, Groups, or Subgroups: Schedule and Notes

Entity/Group/Subgroup	Next Meeting Date	Notes
TFW Policy Committee	February 28 & March 1	Two-day meeting; at NWIFC
CMER	February 27	
Forest Practices Board	February 13-14	
Small Forest Landowners Template Subgroup	TBD	
Budget Subgroup	Quarterly meetings with AMPA	Quarterly reports at Policy meetings.