



Timber, Fish & Wildlife Policy Committee

Policy Co-Chairs:

Adrian Miller, Olympic Resource Management

Chris Hanlon-Meyer, Department of Natural resources

July 21, 2015

TO: Forest Practices Board

FROM: Adrian Miller, Co-Chair
Chris Hanlon-Meyer, interim Co-Chair

SUBJECT: Policy Committee Type F Progress and Path Forward

The Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee (Policy) continues to manage an increasing workload driven by both internal process deadlines as well as priorities directed by the Forest Practices Board. To accomplish this, Policy continues to rely on additional meetings, email communications between meetings and the creation of technical and policy subgroups to address specific issues and meet deadlines.

Policy developed an initial plan in early 2014 to accomplish the Board's motions from February 2014. Soon after, the tragedy at Oso occurred leading to a re-focusing of Policy's attention to respond to the Board's motions regarding unstable slopes. It was not until late November 2014 that Policy was able to come back to Type F. As Policy refocused its efforts to respond to Board motions on Type F, we completed the following:

Policy's accomplishments in response to Board motions:

Conducted Electro-fishing workshop – January 30, 2015

Conducted off-channel habitat field trips – March 2015 (westside) and April 2015 (eastside).

TFW Policy participants continue to recognize that the existing direction from the Forest Practice Board does not comprehensively address all caucus' issues surrounding water typing. At the same time, there is a recognition that the focus on the discrete issues of "off channel habitat" and "the use of electrofishing in conducting protocol surveys" has been helpful in moving the overarching issue forward. There remains a certain amount of uncertainty about how the specific policy responses to the FPB motion will tie together as part of a comprehensive resolution on water typing.

In an attempt to assuage this uncertainty, the Co-Chairs have developed a matrix (attached) that attempts to accomplish three tasks. First, it establishes a crosswalk between discrete elements of the Forest Practice Board's motion and specific TFW Policy actions. Second, it attempts to illustrate the specific process steps that are or will be taken to implement these TFW Policy actions, including timeframes. Third, serves as a tool to capture any additional issues not specifically addressed in the Forest Practice Board's motion, and to illustrate how those issues might be integrated into a more comprehensive

solution. This is not intended to be a static document, and will be updated as TFW Policy makes decisions.

The Co-chairs will provide a verbal update on progress while presenting a newly developed Type F Matrix at the Board meeting in August and anticipate using this document as a means to demonstrate progress to TFW Policy Caucus' as well as the Forest Practice Board.

There has been a procedural issue raised with TFW Policy related to where we are at in our process and if we are still operating under a consensus decision making process. The Co-Chairs are assuming that since the Forest Practice Board directed TFW Policy to undertake the elements identified in the Board's motion, that this constituted initiation of Adaptive Management. Thus, we are operating consistently with the Adaptive Management Program's process, including decision making by consensus.

TFW Policy workload is heavy, yet we must remain sensitive to the changes in various timelines and to new issues as they come up. The capacity for Policy to accept any new work as assigned by the Forest Practices Board, or taken on for other reasons, could affect our progress toward Type F conclusion. Even more, the existing priorities may require scheduling additional Policy meetings. Currently, TFW Policy is not spending focused meeting time on the following issues, although individual caucuses are working on these issues outside formal meetings to varying degrees. If these conversations result in agreements that have the potential to move a specific issue forward or when CMER projects are forwarded to TFW Policy, we will consider how to integrate those issues into our workload priorities.

- The Policy monthly workplan for 2015 includes the review and action related to CMER studies. While we are unsure exactly when these studies will come to Policy, we expect the very large Type N Hard Rock Study to be submitted in December.
- The remaining element of completing our work on Type N surrounds the development of "wet season defaults" for identifying the upper most point of perennial flow.
- TFW Policy has formed a subgroup to respond to the proposal initiation related to a westside template for small forest landowners. This work is being conducted outside of TFW Policy meetings, however, we are receiving updates as a group.

Type F Matrix - Board Motion to Completion

Board Motion Language	Board Motion/Task	Status/Plan/Assignee	Target Date	Intermediate Task/Assignee	Target Date	Outcome/Product/Decision maker	Process Informed	Target Date	Final Policy Recommendations	Target Date	
1. Policy is directed to complete recommendations for options on a permanent water typing rule, beginning with two tasks to be completed and reported to the Board at the May, 2014 meeting:	I.a. Development of "best practices" recommendations regarding protocol survey electrofishing, including an evaluation of relevant literature, minimizing potential site-specific impacts to Incidental Take Permit covered species, and options for reducing the overall extent of the surveys' use.	Protocol E-fishing lit synthesis	Aug-15	Cochairs and AMPA present technical group product to Policy to include identification of any gaps in science and any areas of suggested focus in order to identify or address BMPs, methods to minimize survey's use and site specific impacts to ITP species.	Dec-15	Policy take action to propose rule change (may include a proposal initiation that results in new research, a look past research findings, or a policy analysis); guidance change (may include a change in guidance on protocol surveys or how e-fishing is used) or create new training.	Potential: Policy and/or science track (Proposal Initiation response from AMPA); Board Manual changes; training development				
		Evaluation of Lit Synthesis	Sep-15	Policy reviews a draft technical group workplan which will include a list of the documents that the technical group will review/consider and also those suggested by Policy that they consider irrelevant. Policy will approve the technical group's workplan with any edits necessary.	Feb-16						
		Protocol Survey E-Fishing BMPs									
		Minimize potential site specific impacts to ITP species									
		Options for reducing overall extent of survey's use	Feb-15	Conduct a TFW Policy electrofishing workshop to understand the current use of protocol surveys and how electrofishing is being used.							
Understanding the use of protocol surveys/Electro Fishing	Jul-15	WDFW, USFWS, NOAA present the current scientific collection permit process and how E-fishing is permitted.	Oct-15	AMPA work with WDFW, USFWS, NOAA identify potential data sharing opportunities and process to get data from scientific collection permit reports to help develop, confirm, inform model, map and protocol development/assessment							
I.a.i Not Part of Board Motion - Confirm Physical criteria as habitat and define Recoverable Habitat using physicals	Assess the accuracy and limitations of physical habitat defaults in predicting fish use	Create new technical workgroup; conduct literature review and field discussions as needed	Nov-15	Identify potential data or research gaps; propose further action to fill gaps to Policy		Policy determine if physical criteria needs to change; determine if rule or Board Manual need to change;					
1.b. An evaluation of the current rule process to identify off-channel habitat (OCH) under the interim water typing rule, including recommended clarifications in field implementation guidance, or rule language. The evaluation must be based, in part, on field review of approved FPAs and WTMFs.	Evaluate current rule process to id OCH	Policy field tours on westside and eastside to see OCH protection in practice;	Apr-15	DNR has developed a proposal review packet with discussion and input from Policy, to move OCH discussions into a formal procedure with timelines.		Policy conducts stage 2: development by track; administrator assessment and synthesis; Policy recommendations; Identify any need to initiate additional scientific review; Determine which proposed changes are unaffected by the need for additional scientific review and which require the creation of a TWIG to propose approach to answering specific Policy questions					
	Recommend clarifications in field implementation, guidance and/or rule	Policy review the existing guiding language in Act, Rule, and FFR establishing bankfull width and depth to calculate the edge of the stream and OCH, and the start of the riparian management zone	Oct-15								
	Field review of approved FPAs and WTMFs.	Perform field reviews of approved FPAs and water type mod. forms; visits to determine if this description adequately covers off channel habitat as currently described in rule.	Apr-15								
		Review the existing science based definitions of OCH connected at bankfull elevation as intended in the forest practices rules and the FFR	Oct-15								
		Review OCH description developed during Policy field site visits to determine if it adequately covers OCH as described in rule	Apr-15								
2. AMPA to scope and initiate a pilot project to re-run the existing hydrologic model using LiDAR data, including at least two watersheds (west and east). Objectives include:	2.a. Develop quantitative information about the "footprint" of the interim rule;	Execute a contract that compares the original water type model (10 m DEM) to a 2 m LiDAR based DEM in two basins (east and west).	Oct-15			Create Draft GIS hydrography map (based on an updated model) using best available data.	As determined: Develop, revise, and/or update a water-typing model in accordance with the HCP and on which to base the rule of identifying Type F waters.				
	2.b. Compare model-based water type designations to on-the-ground FPAs and WTMFs;	Work with GIS experts to develop a scope of work to compare a 10 m DEM and a 2 m DEM that is LiDAR based to evaluate potential improvements of a water typing model.	Execute a contract that compares the original model (10 m DEM) and LiDAR based 2 m DEM (see above) with biological survey results from WTMFs.	Oct-15							Identify the technical issues related to the use of the model and map. Twig/Technical group review of model/map issues.
	2.c. Investigate additional model utility, such as detection of OCH, ability to predict physicals and assess footprint effects from using different physicals;	Collate electrofishing work and model results to evaluate options to inform an approach for water typing.	Following the pilot LiDAR evaluation and electrofishing BMP work, a group of practitioners and scientists will need to make recommendations to TFW Policy for review of options for the Board.	May-16							Determine if further changes are needed to the Water Typing System.
	2.d. Provide information that can inform the Board's basic administrative choices among "map-as-rule" vs. "guidance map with field adjustments".										

For each element moving through the adaptive management process, TFW Policy will have to decide first if we want to take action in response to the information provided by the adaptive management process. Presuming that TFW Policy agrees to take action in response to that information; this could include recommending rule changes, board manual guidance, agency process changes (with concurrence from the agency), additional scientific review, or any combination thereof. TFW Policy may also identify additional issues related to this topic outside of the scope of the original Board motion and will be developing a workplan for those issues consistent with the adaptive management program.