

Prepared by Daring Cramer for Policy Discussion:

Primer questions for our 10/19 meeting - most of these questions apply to any of our riparian related studies. Policy engagement in understanding and helping to answer these questions during study scoping/development is recommended and will improve TFW Policy's decision-making process at the conclusion of studies.

1. How does the feature being studied relate to the population of interest?
2. How does the treatment(s) being tested relate to common operational practices?
3. What specific, quantifiable performance targets are being assessed, and how/where are they being measured?
4. Do the specific performance targets adequately represent desired conditions/processes? How will we evaluate performance against nonspecific and/or unvalidated performance targets?
5. Have decision thresholds/criteria been identified and agreed to by TFW Policy?
6. Will we be able to extrapolate findings from the study to the population of interest?
7. For the FWEP and WMZ projects there is temporal target referenced in the study design and the charter, respectively "*...no net loss of functions of wetlands by half of a timber rotation cycle...*" WAC 222-30-010(4) Policy - Timber Harvesting states "*...protect these wetland functions when measured over the length of a harvest rotation, although some of the functions may be reduced until the midpoint of the timber rotation cycle.*" The WAC policy statement appears to have been reinterpreted for these two wetland studies, why is that and how will it affect decision making at the conclusion of the studies?
8. The riparian literature synthesis was originally intended to inform TFW Policy's deliberation on WFFA's RMZ Template Proposal Initiation (PI) but was halted due to concerns about contractor performance. The AMP is not in the same place it was ~five years ago when work was halted¹, and any literature synthesis we elect to perform now should be tightly focused on informing today's priorities for riparian related research and monitoring. As written, the current synthesis description is over broad, includes a mixture of specific and open-ended questions and uses terms which lack clarity. This suggests we do not have deep agreement on the next priorities for riparian related research and monitoring. Rather than spending the \$40K just because it is in the approved MPS, I recommend we spend time aligning on learning to date, information gaps, next level priorities and if/how a literature synthesis (or syntheses) can best inform upcoming work.

¹ To name a few relevant events, WFFA's PI is going to the FPB for consideration in the form of majority/minority reports; Np buffer proposals are going to the FPB for consideration in the form of majority/minority reports; TFW Policy recommendation regarding "net gains", also going to the FPB for consideration, is adopting a clear set of program priorities each biennium; the Type F exploratory project report is nearing completion in CMER; and TFW Policy continues to deliberate over Extensive Monitoring and EWA RMZ management within the context of forest health/resiliency.