

Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee
 July 9 & 10, 2014 Meeting Summary

Decisions and Actions from Meeting

Decision	Notes
1. Decisions about various projects on the Master Project Schedule and which to retain, remove, or hold/revisit (see pages 1-3, 6-7).	Agreement by all caucuses
2. Keep Riparian Hardwood Conversion on the MPS for the resample in 2016, pending further discussions.	Agreement by all caucuses
3. Keep Road Sub-Basin-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring – Resample on the MPS but ask for CMER’s advice on timing the second and possibly third samplings.	Agreement by all caucuses
4. Review priorities and the strategy to address them in a timely and efficient manner at every Policy meeting possible.	Agreement by all caucuses

Action	Assignment
1. Ask DNR how the CMER workplan and list of completed projects are reflected on the website.	Mark Hicks
2. Compile RMAP data for continued discussion on Extensive Fish Passage Trend Monitoring.	DNR
3. Determine readiness for voting to remove Wetlands Mitigation Effectiveness study.	Federal caucus
4. Discuss industrial timber caucus’s proposal on extensive monitoring.	All caucuses
5. Clarify for Policy WDFW’s fish passage program.	Terry Jackson

-----**Day 1: Wednesday, July 9, 2014**-----

Welcome & Introductions – Stephen Bernath and Adrian Miller, Co-Chairs of the Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee (Policy), welcomed participants and led introductions (*please see Attachment 1 for a list of participants*). They explained that this monthly meeting will be two days; the first day will focus on evaluating projects in the Master Project Schedule and the second day will focus on glacial deep-seated landslides, among other topics.

Master Project Schedule – The Policy Co-Chairs met with the Co-Chairs of the Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research Committee (CMER) to evaluate the Master Project Schedule (MPS). They identified three categories for Policy to organize the projects within:

- **Retain:** the project will stay in the MPS with the associated budget.

- **Remove:** the project will be removed from the MPS with the associated budget, and the CMER workplan should note why Policy recommended removing the project.
- **Hold, pending a decision on a MPS project or other action:** the project will be removed from the MPS with the associated budget, but will be noted in an associated list that Policy could return to in the future in the case of additional funding or a shift in priorities.

Policy reviewed the projects in the MPS based on recommendations from the four Co-Chairs. Policy's role is to deliver a revised MPS to the Board at the August meeting. The revised MPS is a prioritization tool and will be the basis for what the legislature sees in the next session. If Policy revises the MPS, then CMER can align the CMER workplan as appropriate at a later date.

- Red Alder Growth and Yield Model – Policy agreed to remove this project from the MPS because the piece for the Adaptive Management Program (AMP) is complete. There is a section in the CMER workplan that outlines the completed projects. Mark Hicks will follow up with the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to see how the CMER workplan and the list of completed projects are reflected on the website.
- Tailed Frog Literature Review – Policy agreed to remove it from the MPS because it is almost complete. There are no expenditures for FY15.
- Groundwater Conceptual Model – Policy agreed to remove it from the MPS because CMER and the contractor were unable to develop an unsatisfactory model. CMER put the effort on indefinite hold and is unsure if there will be any further work.
- Overlay Project (Wetlands Mapping) – Policy agreed to remove this from the MPS because it is a duplicate with the Wetlands Overlay Project listed in another section of the MPS.
- Landslide Hazard Zonation – Policy agreed to remove this from the MPS because the third phase of the project is more suited for DNR to complete rather than CMER. DNR is cautious about adding too much to their workload to finish in a timely manner, but is comfortable with the change and everyone agreed it made more sense to list as a DNR task instead of on the MPS.
- Board Manual Revision (Section 16) – Policy agreed to remove this from the MPS because DNR is already working on this within their Board Manual revision process.
- DNR GIS Wetlands Data Layer – Policy agreed to remove this from the MPS because it is not a task for CMER.
- Extensive Fish Passage Trend Monitoring – Policy discussed that this is more suitable as a task for WDFW instead of CMER, and discussed whether this is a study of compliance monitoring or trend monitoring. The study design was never completed because of a lack of funding. This will likely be affected by RMAPs because some RMAPs will take care of fish passage barriers while other RMAPs will not. This will need more conversation in the short term and DNR will compile their RMAP data for that follow-up conversation.
- Consistency and Accuracy of CMZ Boundary Delineations – Policy agreed to place this study on the Hold list, along with the CMZ Screen and Aerial Photo Catalog and CMZ Boundary Identification Criteria, because they are linked to the CMZ Validation Program. The two projects will be held until Policy revisits the program and decides the need for and scope of the projects.
- Yakima River Radiotelemetry – Policy agreed to remove this from the MPS because while CMER provided funding support, it was never a CMER-directed study and the draft report is still awaiting finalization by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS).

- Van Dykes Salamander Project – Policy agreed to revisit this project at the end of evaluating all MPS projects, because there may be adequate funding to keep this on the MPS. If not, Policy could consider moving the project to later years because the three phases of this project can be spaced out without harming the project.
- Effectiveness of RMAP Fixes – Policy agreed to revisit this project pending the Roads TWIG that is currently underway. This will stay in the MPS for now.
- Road Surface Erosion Model Validation/Refinement – Policy agreed to revisit this project pending the Roads TWIG that is currently underway. This will stay in the MPS for now.
- Wetlands Overlay Project (duplicate with Overlay Project listed earlier) – Policy agreed to remove this from the MPS because the most opportune time to initiate this data collection and coordination effort has passed.
- Wetlands Mitigation Effectiveness – Policy discussed removing this from the MPS because the project had already been deprioritized by CMER and Policy due to concerns over whether it could provide the information intended, and because CMER is developing a new wetland research that will include a similar study about road/wetlands interactions. The federal caucus will need to discuss offline if they can support removing the project at this time, and will be ready for a vote soon.
- Mass Wasting Buffer Integrity – Policy agreed to remove this from the MPS along with the related Windthrow Frequency, Distribution, and Effects because both projects are affected by the strategy to be developed on incorporating windthrow assessments in other projects. Policy also agreed to add a new line item, Windthrow Data Synthesis, which would have placeholder funding in years 2021, 2022, 2026, and 2027.
- Eastside Type N BCIF – Policy agreed to remove this from the MPS because other projects such as the Type N and Type F effectiveness studies on the eastside will collect stand data that will address this data need, too.
- Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment in Hard Rock – Policy agreed to remove this repeat entry describing the hard rock project from the MPS because it is likely a typo that was never intended to be on the MPS.
- Landslide Classification, Groundwater Recharge Modeling and Model Refinement, and Evapo-Transpiration Model Refinement – Policy agreed to revisit all of these after the Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides (GDSL) Policy subgroup has completed the research strategy review.
- Shallow Rapid Landslide Screen – Policy agreed to remove this from the MPS because it is not a CMER task and belongs more appropriately with DNR.
- Intensive Watershed Scale Monitoring to Assess Cumulative Effects – Policy agreed to remove this from the MPS because it is a repeat entry as the Watershed Scale Assessment of Cumulative Effects study previously identified for retention on the MPS. It was noted that a specific study is not associated with this programmatic category at this time.
- Eastside Type F Channel Wood Characterization – Policy agreed to place this on the Hold list for now.
- DFC Aquatic Habitat – Policy agreed to remove this from the MPS because the AMP already has performance standards for aquatic habitat so monitoring is not needed.
- Eastside Tailed Frog Distribution Study – Policy agreed to put this on the Hold list for now.

Riparian Hardwood Conversion – Ash Roorbach, co-author of the report, presented to Policy to help them decide if they want to support resampling in 2016 or not. Key points included:

- Eight different, landowner-volunteered sites. The landowners' requirements were to leave the conifers in the Riparian Management Zones (RMZs), and restock to 190 conifer trees per acre. There was a huge variety of sites.
- Three areas of data collected:
 - Pre-harvest and harvest data (not including upland data)
 - Financial data
 - Regeneration data including shrubs, grasses, and ferns
- Not all areas of the stream length were converted due to steep and unstable slopes. No herbicides were used in the RMZs.
- Conclusions:
 - It is feasible to do a hardwood conversion, but there is still a lot unknown since it is early after the re-plantings.
 - Currently there can be no comparisons to the upland.
 - Bigger seedlings planted had a better success rate.
 - The study can provide data to help scope future studies that can help answer other questions.
- Next steps: The study is in CMER review, then it will go to Independent Scientific Peer Review (ISPR). The project is currently scoped to re-sample in 2016.

Discussion:

- Despite this being a case study instead of a full study design, many caucuses support the resample in 2016 because there is still a lot to learn about how riparian areas function and how to reforest.
- The caucuses do not all agree on whether or not to do the resample – some agree it would be useful to have that resample information and others believe it would be marginal learning for the cost.
- Policy agreed to discuss the resample more in the short-term, and leave the funding level in 2016 of the MPS for now.

Extensive Monitoring – Extensive monitoring is one of many types of monitoring, including effectiveness and intensive monitoring. Policy discussed the need for extensive monitoring:

- Extensive monitoring is expensive and some caucuses believe that CMER does not have a consensus on what questions will be answered.
- There is uncertainty about what can be done with data collected in extensive monitoring and how that can inform potential rule changes.
- Many landowners were under the impression that the AMP would collect extensive monitoring data and shifts could occur over time through that information.
- Several caucuses' are most interested in preserving/improving water quality and fish survivability.

The industrial timber industry caucus brought a proposal for Policy to consider:

- Their proposal aims at continuing some extensive monitoring but at a more cost-effective level.

- The proposal is to focus the funding for extensive monitoring on remote sensing and vegetation data and not collect data on water temperature.
- Industry manages roads, riparian stands, and hazardous slopes, but not water quality, water temperature, or turbidity directly.
- Industry also manages for status and trends, but also for function, risk, and the context which are not mentioned in extensive monitoring.

Discussion:

- One caucus is concerned that in the proposal, shade is being used as a function that is a surrogate for temperature.
- The industry's proposal assumes that it is appropriate to illustrate what is happening on the ground as well as to illustrate what is happening over the course of time and over the landscape.
- One caucus is concerned that Policy would replicate questions that are being answered by expensive effectiveness studies. They support the idea of having a pilot project to see if this direction is worth pursuing long-term.
- Policy agreed to informally discuss this at lunch and formally re-visit this before the August Board meeting to see which extensive monitoring studies to include in the MPS.

Road Sub-Basin-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring – Resample – This project was intended to have three samples over a long period of time, and the study's intention was to determine whether runoff delivery is improving over time through the RMAP process. One sample has been taken and the second sample would be at the end of or after the RMAP process is complete. If the second sample is moved from 2021 to 2023, there is likely no need for the third phase of sampling.

Discussion:

- The third phase of sampling is \$1 million, and we likely will not learn anything new from what we will learn from the second phase of sampling.
- One caucus suggested looking only at the study blocks from the first sampling that were not meeting the standard to see if they did not yet have the RMAP in place or identify if there is a different problem.
- Timing is important to consider. If the second sampling does not happen until 2023, then presumably all the RMAPs will be complete so it would be late to come back to a landowner with a response for change. There is value in getting the information from the second phase of sampling before the RMAP time period is over in case there needs to be a response to landowners who have not yet completed their RMAPs.
- There are three sets of RMAPs: complete by 2016; complete by 2021; and small forest landowners (SFLOs), who have to meet RMAP only when they harvest on that land unit. Trying to capture the SFLO RMAP data in the second phase of sampling could skew the data because they were not in the first phase of sampling.
- This project plus another on the MPS are related to the work coming from the Road Prescription-Scale Monitoring TWIG. Policy will let the TWIG go ahead with their work and see how the other MPS projects are affected.

Decision: Policy agreed to retain the study with more discussion later about the specific form it will take. This will stay on the MPS for 2023, but Policy will ask for CMER's advice on how or if to do the focused resample earlier to address the timing issue.

Performance Targets and Effectiveness Monitoring – Performance targets are set based on the desired objectives. The assumption is that if the targets are met, the resource objectives will be obtained. As Dave Schuett-Hanes identified in an earlier study conclusion, there are some performance targets that are not reliable and Policy should clarify them. This could happen in reviewing research strategies.

Decision: After some discussion about whether there is agreement that the performance targets are structured well or not, Policy agreed that reviewing the performance targets (maybe through the research strategies) should be addressed but that there are other higher priorities to address right now. Policy agreed to have time at each meeting to talk about the priorities and the strategy to address them in a timely and efficient manner.

The Co-Chairs recessed Day 1 at 5:05pm.

-----**Day 2: Thursday, July 10, 2014**-----

Master Project Schedule (continued):

- **DFC Site Class Map Validation** – Policy agreed to put this project on the Hold list for now due to differing opinions on whether or not to remove this fully from the MPS. The purpose of this study is to create a way to adjust site class maps on a regional basis or to make sure they're accurate in a riparian area. The Co-Chairs recommended removing the study because site class is part of DFC, and changes in site class can result in changes in buffer width. This is not a priority for Policy to consider within the next two biennia, so it will stay on the Hold list to be discussed again later.
- **Tailed Frog Meta Analysis** – Policy agreed to put this project on the Hold list because it has not been highly prioritized by LWAG and should not be prioritized before 2019.
- **Tailed Frogs and Parent Geology** – Policy agreed to revisit this project pending the results of the Tailed Frog literature review and hard rock studies.
- **DFC Trajectory and Model Validation** – Policy agreed to revisit this study pending the work of the Westside Type F Prescription Effectiveness TWIG. Policy discussed:
 - Potentially removing this project because it is more a task for DNR than for CMER. DNR has completely re-developed the model.
 - The model and how to confirm its accuracy, other versions, and how to use the model in this case to answer this question.
 - The potential need for a broader conversation about DFC and the model, because there has been a lot of conversation on this topic and remain mixed perspectives about how best to use the model and the cost.

- Eastside Temperature Nomograph – Policy agreed to revisit this study pending the Bull Trout Overlay discussion in September 2014. A contractor produced a report for the nomograph that SAGE and CMER rejected because of technical shortcomings. Ecology also tried to use in-house contractors but they decided it was not technically defensible to produce a nomograph.
- Hydrogeomorphic Wetland Classification System – Policy agreed to revisit this project after WETSAG develops the wetland strategy.
- Annotated Bibliography Riparian Hardwood Conversion – Policy agreed to remove this from the MPS because it is incorporated into the Riparian Hardwood Conversion report that will be coming soon to Policy.
- Forest Chemicals Program – Policy agreed to revisit this once they have a better sense of the near-term budget numbers. This is an important program for several caucuses as well as being identified in the Habitat Conservation Plan, but there is no specific project yet that would fit within this program. WETSAG is developing a Chemical Effects to Forested Wetlands project that could fit under this program or the Wetlands program.
- Chemical Effects to Forested Wetlands – Policy agreed to revisit this study after WETSAG develops the wetland strategy.
- Fish Passage Effectiveness/Validation Monitoring Program – Policy discussed whether this is a task for WDFW or DNR, given the change in responsibility due to FPHP integration. WDFW remains the primary authority for fish passage issues and Terry Jackson will clarify for Policy the history and current status of the WDFW fish passage program. Once that information is clarified, Policy will decide whether this should stay on the MPS or not.
- Mass Wasting Validation Program (Intensive) – This will be revisited in the short term pending the outcome of the discussions on the Unstable Slopes Research Strategy.
- Eastside Type F Effectiveness – Policy agreed to revisit this study after the BTO report discussion in September 2014.
- Wetlands/Roads Interaction Study – Policy agreed to revisit this study after WETSAG develops the wetland strategy.

Policy discussed the need to talk at greater length about the projects they put on the Hold list. Policy will need to look at the long-term budget at the next meeting and see if the studies are in the right sequence.

Decision: At the next meeting, Policy will review a cleaned-up version of the MPS to reflect the decisions made yesterday and today. They will need to continue discussions on extensive monitoring, especially considering the proposal from the industrial timber caucus, as well as all the projects affected by the concurrent discussion on unstable slopes. Policy will meet again on Monday, July 28, from 10am – noon. Policy will address the remaining projects and budget at the two-day August meeting (August 6th and 7th).

Board Manual Group – Marc Engel updated Policy on the progress of the Board Manual Group, tasked with reviewing technical information about glacial deep-seated landslides.

- The group first met on July 9 and began to establish the group's task. The group will produce a description of deep-seated landslides (including glacial deep-seated landslides and groundwater recharge areas). They will also study a literature review and potentially add to it, then produce one for Policy to review. Time permitting, they will also address run-out.

- Board Manual Section 16 needs to be updated immediately. DNR can always re-open the Board Manual soon after to address other parts of that Section, but for now the focus is on deep-seated landslides.
- This technical group will meet once a week through August, and then the process will be opened up in September for Policy caucuses to be involved in reviewing the technical work.
- DNR will write the revised Board Manual, with input from the Policy caucuses and the technical experts.
- DNR will share when the technical group meets, but hopes that anyone who comes to observe the meeting will not distract the experts from having their technical conversation. DNR will consider whether they will send the materials in advance of the meetings.
- The technical group will notify Policy immediately if they identify any future research needs not already captured in the MPS.

Rule-making to respond to the Board's May 2014 motion:

- Within two weeks DNR should have the draft language ready for CR-102.
- DNR is looking at all applications involving unstable slopes to gather the appropriate data to prepare the cost-benefit analysis. They are having trouble finding the information on applications that had unstable slopes within a timely manner.
- DNR will try to bring the rule language to Policy prior to bringing it to the Board in August.
- DNR is now asking landowners to provide information on the application so they can classify it first, and then analyze the application.

Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides Program Update

Policy Subgroup: The Co-Chairs brought a draft document to the first Policy subgroup meeting in mid-June, which outlined Policy's response to the Board's motions from May 2014. The subgroup had initial consensus around the general concepts, and agreed that they would review information from both the Board Manual Group and the GDSL Technical Group. They also asked DNR to complete some tasks, such as describing different tools to use in identifying unstable landforms.

Technical Group: A smaller group who went through the assignment given to them by the Policy subgroup. They talked about how to make the table of tools for identifying unstable landforms, and the hope is to have this table filled in soon for the Policy subgroup. They also discussed how to gather information on landslides, and whether there are geologists from timber companies or outside consultants who could provide this information quickly.

The Co-Chairs adjourned the meeting at 4:00pm.

Attachment 1 – Participants by Caucus at 7/9/14 and 7/10/14 Meetings

Conservation Caucus

Chris Mendoza
 *Mary Scurlock

County Caucus

*Kendra Smith, Skagit County

Federal Caucus

*Marty Acker, USFWS

Landowner Caucus – Industrial (large)

Adrian Miller, Olympic Resource Management,
 Co-Chair
 *Karen Terwilleger, WFPA

Landowner Caucus – Non-industrial (small)

*Dick Miller, WFFA

*Caucus leads

Others

Julie Dieu, Rayonier
 Doug Martin, Martin Environmental
 Joe Murray, Merrill & Ring
 Ash Roorbach, CMER
 Jason Walter, Weyerhaeuser
 Claire Turpel, Triangle Associates

State Caucus – DNR

*Chris Hanlon-Meyer, DNR
 Marc Ratcliff, DNR

State Caucus – Ecology & WDFW

*Stephen Bernath, Ecology, Co-Chair
 Mark Hicks, Ecology
 *Terry Jackson, WDFW

Tribal Caucus – Eastside

Marc Gauthier, UCUT (phone)

Tribal Caucus – Westside

*Joseph Pavel, Skokomish
 Nancy Sturhan, NWIFC
 Mark Mobbs, Quinault

Attachment 2 – Ongoing Priorities Checklist

Priority	Assignment	Status & Notes
Type N	Type N policy subgroup	On hold until other workload lessens.
Type F	Policy	On hold until other workload lessens.
Adaptive Mgmt Program Reform Rule Changes		Accepted by Board at August meeting, CR-103 process initiated. Implemented initial changes at November 2013 meeting, will tweak changes for subsequent meetings.
Ongoing CMER reports reviewed by Policy	Mark Hicks & Todd Baldwin, CMER Co-Chairs	CMER Co-Chairs to give update(s) as needed at Policy meetings; AMPA to give quarterly reports for when CMER studies to come to Policy

*This table notes the Policy Committee priorities that were sent to the Forest Practices Board and any other major topics or issues that arise during the year.

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

Entity, Group, or Subgroup	Next Meeting Date	Notes
Forests & Fish Policy Committee	July 28, 2014 (10am – 12pm) August 6 & 7, 2014 (9am – 4pm)	July 28: Focus on extensive monitoring August 6 & 7: Finalize Master Project Schedule, discuss glacial deep-seated landslides progress
CMER	August 2014	No July meeting
Type N Policy Subgroup	TBD	On hold due to workload constraints.
Type F Subcommittee(s)	TBD	On hold due to workload constraints.
Forest Practices Board	August 11 & 12, 2014	August 11: Work session (likely on unstable slopes) August 12: Regular Board meeting

DRAFT