

Draft Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee
Thursday, June 3, 2021 // 9:00 am -4:19 pm
Remotely held using Zoom

Motions for June 3, 2021	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
<p>May Meeting Notes</p> <p>Motion 1</p> <p>Steve Barnowe-Meyer (<i>SFLO</i>) moved to approve the May Meeting Notes with amendments.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded by: Chris Conklin (<i>State Caucus</i>)</p> <p>Up: Alec Brown, Brandon Austin, Chris Conklin, Court Stanley, Darin Cramer, Jim Peters, Marc Engel, Ray Entz, Steve Barnowe-Meyer</p> <p>Absent: Federal Caucus</p>
<p>ETHEP Scoping Document</p> <p>Motion 2</p> <p>Jim Peters (<i>Westside Tribal Caucus</i>), moved to approve the ETHEP scoping document using the SAGE recommendation of alternative 2.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded by: Alec Brown (<i>Conservative Caucus</i>)</p> <p>Up: Court Stanley, Alec Brown, Jim Peters, Marc Engel, Ray Entz, Brandon Austin, Chris Conklin, Darin Cramer, Steve Barnowe-Meyer</p> <p>Absent: Federal Caucus</p>
<p>Extensive Monitoring Workgroup</p> <p>Motion 3</p> <p>Darin Cramer (<i>Large Industrial Landowner Caucus</i>) moved to accept the workgroup recommendation</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded by: Brandon Austin (<i>State Caucus</i>)</p> <p>Up: Court Stanley, Alec Brown, Jim Peters, Marc Engel, Ray Entz, Brandon Austin, Chris Conklin, Darin Cramer, Steve Barnowe-Meyer</p> <p>Absent: Federal Caucus</p>
<p>Type Np buffer Workgroup Report</p> <p>Motion 4</p> <p>Darin Cramer (<i>Large Industrial Landowner Caucus</i>) moved to accept the Np workgroup report, and define the Policy vetting process/timeline which will include consideration of HR II and SR.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded by: Brandon Austin (<i>State Caucus</i>)</p> <p>Up: Court Stanley, Jim Peters, Marc Engel, Ray Entz, Brandon Austin, Chris Conklin, Darin Cramer, Steve Barnowe-Meyer</p> <p>Sideways: Alec Brown</p> <p>Absent: Federal Caucus</p>

Action Items for June 3, 2021	
Action Items	Responsibility
<p>Action Item 1 - Type Np PI Stage 1 Dispute Resolution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy co-chairs to prepare a memo to outline the dispute. • Poll caucuses to determine timeframe. • Meetings to be set up on Zoom with Breakout rooms. • Questions to be sent out to caucuses with a timeline for answering. 	<p>Policy co-chairs Caucuses</p> <p><u>Workgroup Volunteers:</u> Court Stanley (<i>County Caucus</i>), Kendra Smith (<i>County Caucus</i>), Brandon Austin (<i>State Caucus</i>), Darin Cramer (<i>Large Industrial Landowner Caucus</i>), Alec Brown (<i>Conservative Caucus</i>), Jim Peters (<i>Westside Tribal Caucus</i>), Steve Barnowe-Meyer (<i>SFLO</i>) - with backup</p>

<p>Action Item 2 - Extensive Monitoring Workgroup</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy to develop a strategy for the Extensive Monitoring Workgroup to be presented at the July meeting. 	<p>Co-chairs</p>
<p>Action Item 3 - Hard Rock Project Phase II</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Send out updated HR Phase II documents with July meeting materials. 	<p>Heather Gibbs (<i>DNR</i>)</p>
<p>Action Item 4 - Phase 2 Wetland Intrinsic Potential</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Send out WIP documents for review. 	<p>Eszter Munes (<i>DNR</i>)</p>
<p>Action Item 5 - Process Resolution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A meeting to discuss the Eastside Tribes' issues with Hard Rock Phase III in preparation for the July agenda items. 	<p>Workgroup to include: Meghan Tuttle (<i>Policy co-chair</i>), Marc Engel (<i>Policy co-chair</i>), Darin Cramer (<i>Large Industrial Landowner Caucus</i>) and Ray Entz (<i>Eastside Tribal Caucus</i>).</p>
<p>Action Item 6 - Np Buffer Discussions Policy Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional ½ day Policy meeting created for the Type Np buffer discussions on the afternoon June 17nd to frame a pathway (<i>a single agenda item</i>). • The monthly Policy Meeting in July 1st remains as scheduled with the exception of the start time beginning at 8am. • New ZOOM Policy invites to go out. 	<p>Policy Members</p>
<p>Action Item 7 - CPEACE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set up a follow up meeting to discuss and incorporate CPEACE Training before July Policy Meeting 	<p>Type Np buffer discussions</p>

Welcome, Introductions, & Old Business

Introductions

Lori Clark introduced herself as the new Supervisor for the AMP Project Manager team.

Eastside Riparian Forest Health Strategy Group

Teresa Miskovic (*DNR*) gave a background of how the group was formed. The group includes Todd Baldwin (*Kalispel Tribe*), Jenny Knoth (*CMER co-chair*), Darin Cramer (*Large Industrial Landowner Caucus*) and Brandon Austin (*State Caucus*). Teresa noted that an invitation has been extended to CMER members.

Co-Chair Update

- The Policy workgroup that was formed to look at future Policy locations, technology and timelines will meet before the July meeting. The group consists of Meghan Tuttle (*Policy co-chair*), Marc Engel (*Policy co-chair*), Steve Barnowe-Meyer (*SFLO*), Brandon Austin (*State Caucus*), and Ray Entz (*Eastside Tribal Caucus*).
- Policy has their own ZOOM account and all new meetings will be on the new account. New invitations to the Policy meetings will be sent out.

Caucus Updates

- Chris Conklin (*State Caucus*) introduced Tom O'Brien as a new member of the State Caucus. He added that Tom will eventually fill in for him at the Policy meetings. Chris also noted that they are recruiting for his position as Forest Habitat Section Manager. Tom introduced himself to the group.
- Ash Roorbach will be setting up a meeting with DNR to determine how the older FPARS's will get transferred to the new NWIFC system and if there will be any issues.
- Steve Barnowe-Meyer (*SFLO*) noted that his caucus will participate in the Eastside Riparian Forest Health Strategy Group.

Additional Agenda Topics

Heather Gibbs (*DNR*) was on the agenda twice and this was changed.

May Meeting Notes:

Decision: Steve Barnowe-Meyer (*SFLO*) moved to approve May meeting notes as amended. Meeting Minutes were amended to read Meeting Notes.

The motion passed.

CMER Update

Chris Mendoza and Jenny Knoth (CMER co-chairs)

Chris Mendoza gave an update:

- Wetlands Intrinsic Potential Tool – WIP the Final Report and the Six Questions Document has been approved by CMER.
- WFPA Smart Buffer Design – there was a presentation to CMER in May by Doug Martin (*WFPA*), the author of the study, reviewing the LiDAR-derived model for estimating shade. This is still

under CMER review. CMER is working with a subgroup to discuss remaining concerns and possibility of an outside technical review.

- eDNA Pilot Study – The Pilot Report, Findings Report and Six Questions were approved by CMER in May.
- Hard Rock Phase II – The Six Questions document is under CMER review.
- Small Forest Landowner PI - The workgroup will provide a review of this document by June 11th and additional work and discussion will take place at a meeting in mid-late June. The answers to the Six Questions should be completed by July and brought back to CMER.

ETHEP SCOPING DOCUMENT

Teresa Miskovic (DNR)

Teresa noted that CMER approved the ETHEP Scoping Document and the preliminary Six Questions document at the May meeting.

Jim Peters (*Westside Tribal Caucus*) moved to approve the ETHEP scoping document using the SAGE recommendation of alternative 2.

The motion passed.

Type Np PI Stage 1 Dispute Resolution

Darin Cramer (Large Industrial Landowner)

Darin reviewed the description of the dispute for WFPA's Np basin FPA analysis proposal initiation (PI) and the purpose.

Alec Brown (*WEC*) asked for clarification on how this dispute works and if this is a dispute on the scope of inference. He also asked whether the study needed to be worked on by CMER. Darin responded that the important question is the scope of inference and they were trying to demonstrate that there is a potential issue with this work.

Meghan Tuttle asked if there are any additional questions on how to frame this. Ray Entz (*Eastside Tribes*) asked if the dispute is about the scope of inference, shouldn't we handle that discussion before the final Np workgroup document. He asked whether the dispute was premature since we haven't had the discussion yet. He added we have the WFPA information on the perspective on the scope of inference but will the dispute continue to have an analysis for the CMER staff to perform? He asked which one is it and how do we want to proceed? Darin responded that is it ready and he was trying to provide some context before it goes into a rulemaking process. He added there are other ways to get at this information but the Board will need this information if they are going to be making rules on this process.

Ray Entz (*Eastside Tribes*) asked if having the assignment and data is important to do prior to entering into discussion on filing the Np final report. He added we voted "no" based on assigning this to staff to go through it now as it was described. Darin responded by stating if we agree that the dispute is relevant, then we need to agree on how to get to an understanding before we hand it off to the Board.

Brandon Austin (*State Caucus*) noted that he believed that this was a consensus recommendation from Policy to the Board to accept the HR Study and move it forward. He asked why is this being revisited if the concerns were part of the recommendations made. Darin answered that they are following up on the concerns in the HR study and what the Np workgroup picked up on.

Jim Peters (*Westside Tribal Caucus*) noted Policy created this workgroup because the current standard was not meeting temperature standards at some of the sites. He added that his caucus feels this discussion needed to take place to meet the conditions that Ecology put forward two years ago. He added that we are working on recommendations from the Type Np Workgroup and he hoped that Ecology would grant an extension to do so.

Chris Conklin (*State Caucus*) noted from the chat box:

2-8. SCOPE OF INFERENCE

Scope of inference is limited by the site selection criteria listed. Inference can only be made to Type N basins located in second-growth forests on lands managed for timber production, dominated by competent lithologies, located in western Washington (including the Olympic, Willapa Hills, and South Cascade (south of the Cowlitz River) physiographic regions), and consistent with our other selection criteria (size, gradient, etc.).

Court Stanley (*County Caucus*) asked for clarification on whether this dispute came about because there is concern that the HR study is rare on the landscape on how companies harvest in the basin. He added your answer to this question was to do a desk top study which was voted down, and are you now asking that the dispute go to CMER? Darin responded that is correct. Darin added that when you apply the selection criteria in actual harvesting only 2% meet those criteria. Court then asked do you feel going through a desk top study would be more beneficial than having the Np workgroup follow through on their own.

Ken Miller (*SFLO*) asked for clarification, Ken noted he was hearing there was concern that Darin's proposal would slow down the Np workgroup report but asked if Darin was saying that this work would be done at the same time and bring more information to the project and not delay it. Steve Barnowe-Meyer (*SFLO*) noted that as a member of the type Np workgroup and a Policy member he read both the HR study and the inferences and did an analysis on the economic impact. He added he used FPA's to do this but had trouble finding FPA studies that looked like HR and the issue to identify more basins that needs be explored.

Marc Engel (*Policy co-chair*) clarified that part of the reason this was voted down was due to the timing issue and further questions that needed to be answered rather than the premise of looking at harvest practices. Marc added that he sees the desk top study and the NP workgroup discussion as two separate projects and that the desk top is not a prerequisite before proceeding to deliberation. He added that there is a need to deliberate Np current practices on the ground but if Darin still wants to move forward with the dispute resolution, we need to clarify what we are disputing on in order to come up with a solution. Darin noted that they don't see these as separate issues and added that we need to do the work because the Board can't manage a project like this.

There was further discussion on how the process moves forward following protocol and procedure and at the same time protecting resources where the current standard is not. There was also discussion on how

they involve CMER in the study documents. Court Stanley (*County Caucus*) asked that considering we don't want to slow down the Np study, is there a way to move forward having CMER do a desktop analysis and figure out the scope so we don't have to go through a dispute resolution.

Meghan Tuttle (*Policy co-chair*) noted that this discussion has raised bigger questions that need additional time and asked for volunteers to meet at another meeting so that we can move forward to Stage 1 of the dispute resolution process. Marc Engel proposed that a cover memo be created to outline the dispute and suggested that a meeting be set up with the volunteers and we need to agree today on the frequency and the timeline of these dispute resolution meetings. He added that he and Meghan will create a document to articulate the issues and concerns through questions to the caucuses. The workgroup volunteers that will look at the full dispute resolution process are to include Court Stanley (*County Caucus*), Kendra Smith (*County Caucus*), Brandon Austin (*State Caucus*), Darin Cramer (*Large Industrial Landowner Caucus*), Alec Brown (*Conservative Caucus*), Jim Peters (*Westside Tribal Caucus*), and Steve Barnowe-Meyer (*SFLO*) with backup.

The frequency of these meetings will be decided by the results of the doddle poll being sent out.

Extensive Monitoring Workgroup

Brandon Austin (State Caucus)

Brandon noted that he met with Court Stanley (*County Caucus*) and Darin Cramer (*Large Industrial Landowner Caucus*) to create the Extensive Monitoring Workgroup document. He added that as a result of the discussions in the workshop they are recommending that Policy move forward with developing an Extensive Monitoring Project and that they wanted approval from Policy. He added that they are recommending the project be included on the next MPS and that there is still work to be completed by the workgroup before they make recommendations to Policy. Marc Engel (*Policy co-chair*) noted that the next steps would be to review this at the next Policy meeting in July and develop a strategy and at that time decide if a new workgroup is to be created. Darin Cramer (*Large Industrial Landowner Caucus*) and Ray Entz (*Eastside Tribal Caucus*) suggested Policy vote on this today. Jim Peters (*Westside Tribal Caucus*) noted that this wasn't a motion we were deciding on today and therefore we weren't following procedure.

Darin Cramer made a motion to accept the Extensive Monitoring Workgroup recommendation.

The motion passed.

SFLO – Dispute Resolution

Meghan Tuttle/Marc Engel (Policy co-chairs)

Meghan asked if there were any additional thoughts on the mediated process and the Fulcrum Report. She added that for the next steps we agreed to pause on the minority dispute resolution report until we had the answers to the Six Questions. She noted that the earliest that the final dispute resolution report to the Board would be ready is November.

Ken Miller (*SFLO*) noted that he had made came up with several suggestions to the mediators and they accepted some of the minor ones. Ken added he thought the mediators were 80% off topic and that they had to spend a lot of time defining the dispute resolution and yet the mediators didn't spend much time

on this. He thanked Ray Entz (*Eastside Tribal Caucus*) and Court Stanley (*County Caucus*) for their proposals. He added that they were frustrated that the mediators didn't understand the AMP and that they had to spend time bringing them up to speed on this process. Ken suggested using the same mediators for future dispute resolutions to save time.

Steve Barnowe-Meyer (*SFLO*) noted that when a 3rd party is hired for future dispute resolutions it would be beneficial to also hire a subject matter expert to bring the mediators up to speed on forestry and the dispute.

Marc Engel noted they were not mediators but facilitators. Meghan Tuttle thanked everyone who participated in this dispute resolution process and the commitment to the program.

Hard Rock Project Phase II & Phase III

Heather Gibbs (DNR)

Heather gave an update on the Hard Rock Phase II Project:

- The HR project has been approved by both ISPR and CMER.
- The executive summary was completed for the 9 chapters and that was approved by CMER in May and was forwarded to ISPR for final approval. If there are no edits from ISPR, then it is approved.
- The Six Questions and Findings Report are under CMER review and if approved the whole project will go to Policy in the fall with the exception of the addendum.
- The addendum will not be complete until winter but she noted that we could have Bill Ehinger give his presentation on the addendum and then have this added as an appendix if Policy approves. This would not go to ISPR.

Meghan Tuttle (*Policy co-chair*) noted that they have had requests from Policy that as the HR Phase II components are finished they be included in the Policy mailing materials. Heather agreed that the components can be sent out in the mailings.

Heather gave an update on the Hard Rock Phase III Project:

- The MPS was approved by Board in May and funding starts June 1st.
- The first steps will include a charter and project management plan.
- We will be buying equipment and field work should begin in March.

Ray Entz (*Eastside Tribal Caucus*) asked why they had not seen a charter or scoping document and what the process would be if the charter doesn't get approved by Policy. Heather responded that the scoping document and study design were approved in 2004-2005 before charters were required for each project. Ray noted he has a problem with the fact that since the scoping document and study design were approved in 2004 that this charter was not included in the original documents.

Hard Rock Phase III (continued after the lunch break)

Heather Gibbs (*DNR*) asked if a project has already been approved is there a process for a dispute resolution. Mark Hicks (*AMPA*) responded by stating that even if you are in the final steps of a project,

you can go into dispute if it has a majority vote. He added that the MPS that was just approved by the Board included the HR Phase III. A group was formed at the meeting to address the eastside tribes concerns with the HR Phase III process to include Meghan Tuttle (*Policy co-chair*), Marc Engel (*Policy co-chair*), Darin Cramer (*Large Industrial Landowner Caucus*) and Ray Entz (*Eastside Tribal Caucus*). The group will meet before the July Policy meeting. Heather noted that they are working on the Charter and should be at Policy at the end of summer or early fall and then it will go to CMER.

Soft Rock

Eszter Munes (*DNR*) gave an update on the Soft Rock Project:

- The authors made revisions to the Final Report recently which was sent to ISPR and we have just received the responses. Some chapters have been approved. Chapter 5 “stream discharge” has been removed from the report after the authors reviewed the comments from ISPR.
- When all the chapters are approved by ISPR, an executive summary will be drafted which will need ISPR approval.
- The Six Questions are to be completed and hopefully approved this fall.
- CMER needs to vote on how they want the extending monitoring data to be reported in October.

Wetland Intrinsic Potential Tool (WIP) Report

Meghan Halabisky /Eszter Munes (DNR)

Eszter introduced Meghan Halabisky from the University of Washington and noted that CMER will have training on how to use the WIP tool that detects wetlands in forested and non-forested areas.

Meghan gave a presentation on the Wetland Intrinsic Potential Tool that included:

- Defining the problem that wetland inventories have high errors of omission in Washington State,
- Outlining the project goals and objectives that allows for identifying wetlands in forested areas that are missed on other wetland maps.
- Explaining the broader project in two phases, Phase I – developing a tool to mapping hydrological and geomorphological controls on wetland occurrence and Phase 2 - using field data on wetland locations to evaluate methods developed in Phase I.
- Outlining the methods which included setting parameters on the random forest model, input datasets and training data.
- An overview of the WIP tool which has a 9.6 overall accuracy.
- The limitations of the WIP tool which outlined that it does not include soils data, cannot identify rare wetlands or underground drains and pipes and has trouble in very dense canopy areas.
- A summary which detailed how the WIP tool identifies wetlands missed in existing wetland inventories and can be used for improving sampling efficiency and screening for potential wetlands.

Questions:

Ken Miller (*SFLO*) noted that currently when a wetland is potentially identified, the county requires a specialist to confirm the wetland exists, which is expensive. He asked if this tool is accepted as being more accurate could it be used as the final answer instead of speculating if a wetland is there and the requirement of hiring a specialist? He asked do you envision this process to reach that level of confidence so it doesn't require ground proofing? Meghan noted that the tool can be used to determine

wetlands with a high level of confidence and potentially determine what sites need to be visited, but it would be a county decision if a specialist is needed.

Eszter Munes (*DNR*) noted that they will post the final report on the DNR website this month. Mark Hicks (*AMPA*) noted that the next steps would include further add-ons, further studies and the need for more field testing and calibration in different parts of the region. He added that Policy needs to decide how they want to use this tool. Meghan Tuttle (*Policy co-chair*) noted that process would allow for review of the document and any action or follow up would be in July with a potential Board recommendation in August.

CPEACE

Meghan Tuttle/ Marc Engel (Policy co-chairs)

Meghan noted that Francine, the moderator for the CPEACE training has quit. She asked that today Policy look at the progress that has been made, why we are in this position and how can we use the CPEACE tools to make our space better.

Marc Engel asked for testimonials of the training.

Comments:

Ken Miller (*SFLO*) mentioned he enjoyed the training but was disappointed that they didn't dive into the caucuses bias issues more. Ash Roorbach (*Westside Tribal Caucus*) noted he would have liked to delve more into the financial issues for projects at the training. Meghan highlighted the additional items on the agenda for CPEACE that included conversations on strategy and relationships, alternatives to issue by issue negotiations, onboarding process and the TFW spirit tune-up. She noted in regards to the TFW spirit tune-up, Policy might consider having the subcommittee look at topics involving in person workshops, moving our meetings around the state and/or having field trips. Court Stanley (*County Caucus*) noted that one of the key principals of Policy is to solve each other's problems and that we should strive to work on this. He added that the Policy meetings deal primarily with tactical issues and we need to spend more time building relationships and working on our vision and goals. Ray Entz (*Eastside Tribal Caucus*) mentioned that we have helped solve problems in the past and used the SFLO dispute as an example but also noted that we get stuck in the words and the numbers. Jim Peters (*Westside Tribal Caucus*) noted that having in person meetings with accountability to discuss individual issues and interpretations would be helpful.

Type Np Workgroup

Darin Cramer (Large Industrial Landowner Caucus), / Jim Peters (Westside Tribal Caucus), /Jeremy Groom (Np Workgroup)/ and John Richardson (Np Workgroup)

Jeremy Groom noted that appendix B in the document that was in the Policy mailing includes the questions posed to the workgroup from the caucuses and the workgroups responses. He noted that they gave serious consideration to the questions and made numerous edits. John Richardson noted that they considered this unchartered territory and this is theoretical work that needs to be tested in the field. Jeremy mentioned that there were numerous questions on the weighting used to come up with their recommendations and that a lot of the weightings were subjective based on economic cost, environmental and temperature impact to see how they played off of each other.

Ray Entz (*Eastside Tribal Caucus*) thanked everyone in the workgroup for applying their expertise to the problem.

Type Np Workgroup Timeline

Meghan Tuttle/Marc Engel (Policy co-chairs)

Meghan Tuttle (*Policy co-chair*) noted that we would like to lay out a timeline for recommendations of how to proceed with the Np Technical Workgroup Report and the answers to the questions, with the intent of approving the report at the July meeting. She added that they would like to walk everyone through the language from the Policy Committee Process to develop recommendations (*Stage 4 of part 3.4 of Board Manual Section 22*). Marc Engel (*Policy co-chair*) noted that they presented the timeline outlined in the Board Manual to the FP Board in the May meeting with the caveat that Policy has not received the final Np report. He noted however, that how the timeline would fall out was based on the Board Manual. He added that it is important to consider in this case we have a rule (*WAC 222-12-045*) which lays out elements that Policy needs to follow to bring forward as our recommendation to the Board.

Alec Brown (*Conservative Caucus*) asked Marc to clarify the language being shown “*upon receipt the Policy Committee has to develop a decision and then make a recommendation to the Board*”. Marc Engel responded that the Board Manual is to provide guidance so you will meet the requirements of the rule and these are accepted timelines for Policy to develop each element. Alec noted that we have completed this timeline in 2018 and it was delivered to the Board in the spring of 2019, so why are we repeating the process? Ray Entz (*Eastside Tribal Caucus*) asked why there needed to be a new timeline since the action has occurred and we have already laid out our plan to the Board so do we now start over with Hard Rock and Soft Rock? He added that we can approve the Np document today. Ken Miller (*SFLO*) asked are we deciding if we are going to accept the report or are we asking how we are going to move forward with the report? Meghan responded that a decision to approve the document is on the July agenda and today was our opportunity to discuss the timeline and what we are going to do next.

Darin Cramer (*Large Industrial Landowner Caucus*) noted that this report needs to go through a Policy vetting process before it is presented to the Board. He added that the additional reports need to come into that process before we complete it.

Marc Engel noted that Policy intended to follow the process as outlined in the rules. He added that we knew there was more than one study for the Np and a number of studies needed to be completed to look at the full effects in western Washington. He added that the Np workgroup looked at potential buffer configurations to assist Policy in making the decision on what actions needed to be taken. He added that we notified the Board that we wanted to combine all the reports into one recommendation and this is the time to begin the process to develop recommendations. He added that the HR and SF studies will need to be completed before we bring a recommendation to the Board and when the AMPA shares the results of those other CMER studies, then Policy can make recommendations based on the full body of the studies.

Ray Entz (*Eastside Tribal Caucus*) suggested we accept the Np workgroup report and start to frame the discussion to identify issues and concerns, realizing that we will have to wait until the rest of the documents come in to form the final recommendations.

Darin Cramer (*Large Industrial Landowner Caucus*) moved to accept the Np workgroup report.

Marc Engel noted that it is acceptable for the proposal to be voted on today. Marc added that we need to take a look at the timeline to identify the work we have to do and then decide how many meetings and the frequency of those meetings. He added that we also need to determine how long it will take to finish those elements.

Ray Entz (*Eastside Tribal Caucus*) noted that a timeline consideration that incorporates the inclusions of the next two studies should be added to the motion.

Darin Cramer moved to accept the Np workgroup report and define the Policy vetting process/timeline which will include consideration of HR II and SR.

The motion passed.

An additional ½ day meeting was created to discuss the Type Np Workgroup recommendations on Thursday afternoon June 17nd to frame a pathway (*a single agenda item*).

The monthly Policy meeting on July 1st remains as scheduled with the change for the start time from 9am to 8am.

CPEACE (*continued*)

Jim Peters asked if there was going to be a doddle poll on getting together for a separate meeting to discuss how the caucuses are dealing with issues. Meghan responded there has been discussion about assigning some of the items for CPEACE and creating a subgroup but they were also sensitive to the work load scheduled on member's calendars. Meghan suggested we set up a time at the beginning of our first "in person" Policy meeting to do some team building.

Ken Miller (*SFLO*) noted that his group at CPEACE came up with a few suggestions for reinvigoration that would help onboarding of new members and provide a refresher for all of us. He noted his group suggested a 2 or 3 day annual meeting could be held to review the origins and benefits of adaptive management and to include a review the ground rules, conflict training and allow an opportunity for each caucus to present their bias. He added that the group thought it would be beneficial to also have an annual joint meeting between the CMER and Policy members.

Ray Entz (*Eastside Tribal Caucus*) noted he thought he would like to see Policy members be appointed and have a protocol and standards manual like CMER. He added that it would be a good idea to meet and reestablish our values and concerns and foster the relationships.

Mark Hicks (*AMPA*) noted that losing Francine impacted the SAO timeline. He also noted that SAO focused on getting the big picture voting issues resolved first and that the SAO recommendations only deal with our existing process. He added that the HR project has been a primary study for 17 years and has cost over 10 million dollars. He added that as stakeholders Policy members actually get to take hold of the product and it is time to start to work more as a team. He noted that SAO is a great starting point but Policy needs to go much further.

Conclusions/Policy Work Plan

Marc Engel (Policy co-chairs)

Individual Policy members acknowledged appreciation for Mark Hick's contribution to the program and wished him well on his retirement.

Marc noted that the Work Plan will include ongoing projects and timelines which will be reviewed at each Policy meeting and adjustments can be made at that time.

The action items were reviewed, after which the meeting was adjourned.

Conservation Caucus

*Alec Brown (WEC)
Chris Mendoza (CMER co-chair)

County Caucus

*Court Stanley
Kendra Smith (Skagit)

Large Industrial Landowner Caucus

*Darin Cramer (WFPA)
Doug Hooks (WFPA)
Meghan Tuttle (Weyerhaeuser/ co-chair)
Joe Murray (WFPA)
AJ Kroll (Weyerhaeuser)

Small Forest Landowner

*Steve Barnowe-Meyer (WFFA)
*Ken Miller (WFFA)
Jenny Knoth (WFFA/CMER co-chair)

Other Attendees:

John Richardson (Type Np Workgroup)
Jeremy Groom (Type Np Workgroup)
Meghan Halabisky (University of Washington)

State Caucus

*Brandon Austin (ECY)
*Chris Conklin (WDFW)
*Marc Engel (DNR/co-chair)
Tom O'Brien
Marc Ratcliff

Westside Tribal Caucus

*Jim Peters (NWIFC)
Ash Roorbach (NWIFC)
Curt Veldhuisen (SRSC)
Joseph Pavel (Suquamish)

Eastside Tribal Caucus

*Ray Entz (Kalispel)
John Sirois (UCUT)

Adaptive Management Program/CMER Staff

Mark Hicks (AMPA)
Lori Clark (DNR)
Eszter Munes (DNR)
Teresa Miskovic (DNR)
Malia Volke (DNR)
Mary Colton (DNR)