

F&F Strategic Plan Meeting
February 19, 2009
Lacey Community Center – Banquet Room A

Attendees:

Stephen Bernath, WDOE /Policy Co-Chair
Darin Cramer, DNR / Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Gary Graves, DNR, Acting Division Manager - FPD
Jim Hotvedt, DNR
Chase Davis, Upper Columbia United Tribes (via phone)
Steve McConnell, Upper Columbia United Tribes
Karl Forsgaard, Washington Forest Law Center
Dawn Hitchens, DNR / Forests & Fish Policy Coordinator / CMER Coordinator
Pete Heide, WFPA
Adrian Miller, WFPA
Nancy Sturhan, NWIFC
Mark Hicks, WDOE
Terry Jackson, WDFW/CMER Co-Chair
Chris Mendoza, Conservation Caucus /CMER Co-Chair
Miguel Perez-Gibson, Conservation Caucus
Tom Robinson, Washington Association of Counties /Policy Co-Chair
David Whipple, WDFW
Teresa Moon, DNR /Project Manager
Amy Kurtenbach, DNR /Project Manager

Darin started the meeting with an overview of the agenda for the day. The main focus of the work is:

- To review the Adaptive Management Research and Monitoring Priority matrix (as developed from the January 22nd strategic planning meeting);
- To identify the priorities among the caucuses & how they fit within the Clean Water Act assurances; &
- To match these with the current budget reality.

Process Discussion:

The Conservation Caucus expressed concern over how the group is approaching this work based on budget cuts directly linked to project cuts as it speaks to the viability of the AMP under the HCP. The conservation caucus is looking at project prioritization differently, yet the outcome may be the same. How we communicate this is of concern. It was suggested to use the metaphor of building a house for approaching this work; in order to build a house you follow specific steps and have a known outcome. The group needs to prioritize the AMP work by considering the timing; you cannot set up the frame of the house until something else is done first. The Conservation Caucus expressed concern about building a system where everything is completed except for the roof or wiring, whereby the house will not function

properly and recommended that the group focus on this in terms of what we need to get done and in what sequence. Timing and sufficient resources are important.

Co-chair Bernath emphasized that this is not a cutting exercise; this is a prioritization exercise.

Conservation Caucus stated that budget is part of the relationship.

Large landowner caucus recommended that the group concentrate on what it is we need to know; we currently have a laundry list. We need to move toward a focus on making decisions.

The large landowner caucus sent out their issues prior to meeting.

Water Typing Topic:

The counties identified that this is important & recognize that there are more steps to work on; the counties will go along with the group. There are underlying issues that need to be fulfilled within Water Typing.

The large landowner caucus thought it was a policy issue; not sure that CMER needs to spend more funding on this topic. They emphasized that we cannot leave Extensive Status & Trends behind.

The tribes identified water typing as a huge issue. The tribes stated that the extensive status & trends is something that we do not understand. The cumulative effects are what are important to fish.

State Caucus - Ecology emphasized that this is a priority exercise. Let's look at tier 1 in terms of the budget & timing prioritization. State Caucus DNR- Develop top priorities & then identify sub-priorities; possible to identify lower priorities; may end up with a different set within the budget conversation.

The Conservation Caucus agreed; concerned about the way we are talking about this. They do support Extensive and Status and Trends monitoring. Suggested that Policy look at what CMER is doing; what is on the ground; may get different answers based on the current projects. Do not confuse tactic with timing & budget; do not want to be corralled down a path of inadequate AMP funding that the Conservation Caucus cannot go based on the HCP's requirements; how we implement AMP should not be based solely on funding; concerned about losing a viable AMP as defined by the HCP.

The group agreed to use the January 22nd matrix as a guide for the discussion, as these were identified as priorities by the caucuses, and compare them to the current (FY 09) CMER work plan, as this was approved by the Forest Practices Board (FPB) May 2008. These are projects that originated as priority research topics in Schedule L-1 of the Forests and Fish Report, which was adopted by the Board and budgeted in Tier 1 (means they are active /on the ground).

Review Process:

Type N Rule Group

Riparian Effectiveness Program -

Westside Type-N Buffer Characteristics, Integrity, and Function - Field data was collected 3 and 5 years after timber harvest in the summer/fall of 2006 and 2008. These data are currently being analyzed. A draft final report is scheduled to be presented to RSAG in the spring of 2009.

Type N Buffer Study in Incompetent Lithologies (Soft Rock) - In the scoping stage - may fold in Temperature & Sediment; current connection to CWA.

Wind throw Frequency, Distribution and Effects Project - To be scoped with existing Type N riparian studies.

DNR Type 5 Experimental Buffer Treatment Project - Baseline data collection is complete and post-harvest data collection on recently harvest sites was completed in summer 2007. Data analysis has begun& no additional CMER funding is anticipated.

Riparian Effectiveness Program - Eastside

Eastside Type N Characterization Project: Eastside Type N Forest Hydrology Study - the study design is complete; entering the ISPR stage.

Amphibian Response Program (Effectiveness)

Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project – Site selection, site set-up, and the first 2 years of pre-harvest sampling are complete; harvest treatments began April 2008 and will be completed May 2009. However, due to economic conditions in 2009, one basin will have a delayed harvest, pushing post-treatment data collection back one year. Two years of post-harvest sampling will occur once harvest treatments are completed.

Buffer Integrity-Shade Effectiveness Project - One more year of post-treatment data collection.

Amphibians in Intermittent Stream - This project is identified in Tier 2 budget; Phase 3 scoping and study design has been completed and is currently being reviewed by CMER.

Extensive Riparian Status and Trend Monitoring Program

Temperature, Type Np Westside - This project is being implemented simultaneously with the Westside Type F project. Over one-half of the intended sites were sampled in 2008. Sampling will be completed in spring of 2010.

Vegetation, Type Np Westside and Eastside Projects - Protocol development is currently underway.

Eastside Temperature - project is hoping to take advantage of results from the Eastside Type N Forest Hydrology Study in order to better target appropriate study sites that have flow year round. Site screening will continue during summer of 2009, and sites will be measured and installed in spring 2010. If suitable sample sites cannot be located by October 2009, then sampling cannot occur in 2010.

Discussion Points:

Policy had a major conversation around this project; question about this due to the commitment of funding and how this would effectively delay other projects.

The Large Landowner caucus suggested that we see where Policy & CMER intersect; where does the policy question & budget cross; all caucuses need to do this more efficiently.

Co-chair Robinson added that it seems the role of this body is to set the policy & direction of study focus; then go to the step of intersection discussion.

Policy needs to be clear up front on the critical question as this makes it more efficient for the project.

The differences among Site Scale Effectiveness vs. Landscape Scale Effectiveness research was pushed up for discussion.

State Caucus – Ecology- Stay connected to the rules.

The Large Landowner Caucus - Big issue around the rules & implementation of rules; why characterization studies are important. Think some of the questions need to be addressed in an investigation mode, rather than a research mode; this is another way to get to an answer.

State Caucus – Ecology- Look at the rules and their impact on Water Quality; any data will help clarify, advance the prescriptive scale & make the connection to Water Quality.

Conservation Caucus shared that there is information on Eastside – the PIP Study - done by the Colville Nation as initiated in 2001 to evaluate field methods and inform sampling needs for a subsequent statewide field study. The field portion of the study was done by F&F cooperators (tribes, timber companies and WDFW) on a voluntary basis. Data analysis and reporting was done by CMER staff under the direction of the Np technical sub-group and UPSAG.

TYPE F Rule Group

Riparian Prescription

Eastside Riparian Current Condition Assessment (Phase 1) – Assessment complete.

Eastside Channel Wood Characterization Project - The study design is currently before CMER for approval. Upon approval by CMER, this study design will go to ISPR.

Bull Trout Overlay Temperature Project - This project is currently in the post-harvest data collection phase. Due to delays in landowner harvest schedules, the projected final timeline is 2011.

Bull Trout Solar Radiation Effective Shade - This component of the project is in the post-harvest data collection phase. The projected end timeline for the project is 2011.

Eastside Field Coordination for BTO Shade, Solar and Stream Temperature Project – The contract for this position will be complete by the end of June 2009.

Eastside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Monitoring Project (BTO add-on) - Initial post-harvest sampling was conducted at four sites in 2006, six sites in 2007 and five sites in 2008 for a total of 15 due to the staggered harvest schedule of the sites. The study sites will be revisited 5 years after harvest for a follow-up sampling effort.

Riparian Hardwood Conversion Project - Harvest has occurred at all sites, and post-harvest monitoring of regeneration is ongoing. In 2009, it is anticipated that 2nd year post-harvest data collection will be completed at all sites, and 3rd and 4th year post harvest data collection will occur at several sites. A draft report that describes the silvicultural costs and benefits at each site is currently in review by RSAG.

Riparian Hardwood Conversion Study - Temperature Component - WDFW completed the final report & it has been forwarded to CMER for review.

Discussion Points:

State Caucus – Ecology asked for clarification of status of the Hardwood Conversion project as this is not a priority for Ecology.

Silviculture is what is left; mainly a case study.

Large Landowner caucus - the silviculture aspects are about hardwood stand growth and remain important.

Type F Extensive Riparian Status and Trend Monitoring Program

Temperature, Type F/S Westside – This project is being implemented simultaneously with the Westside Type Np project.

Temperature, Type F/S Eastside - Reporting is currently in progress. A plan was developed to integrate site selection and sampling of this project with the Eastside Riparian Current Condition Assessment project.

Budget Discussion:

The discussion focused on the budgeted & active CMER projects (includes all projects at the data collection, analysis, & report writing stages). A spreadsheet was shared with the group to review the projects & total costs for projects on the ground. By 2012, the active projects will be completed. The funding sources do not match up with the costs of the projects.

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
Active CMER Projects	\$1,948,000	\$1,561,000	\$1,370,000
Costs CMER Staff – NWIFC	379,000	385,000	409,000
Subtotal	\$2,327,000	\$1,946,000	\$1,779,000
Project Support & Admn.	806,663	806,663	806,663
TOTAL	\$3,133,663	\$2,752,663	\$2,585,663
Carry Forward	\$1,066,337	13,000	-871,000
Grand Total	\$2,067,296	\$2,739,663	\$1,713,674

FUNDING Sources:

GF – State (AMP)	\$600,000
GF – State (FFSA)	\$1.1 Million (each FY)
GF – Federal (RCO)	\$2.5 Million (rough approximate of what is remaining)
RCO #5	terminates March 30, 2009
RCO #6	terminates May 2010
RCO #7	terminates April 2011

Prioritization Overview:

First Priority – CWA Assurances projects

- Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project – Basalt Lithologies
- Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project -Incompetent Lithologies
- Type N Effectiveness East (temperature & sediment)
- Bull Trout Overlay Temperature
- Bull Trout Solar Radiation /Effective Shade
- Mass Wasting Prescription Scale Effectiveness
- Mass Wasting Landscape Scale Effectiveness
- Extensive Temperature Monitoring

Second Priority – Ongoing or pilot projects

- Type N Buffer Integrity – Shade Effectiveness
- Type F Riparian Prescription Monitoring – Westside
- Type F Riparian Prescription Monitoring – Eastside BTO Add-On
- Type F Eastside Riparian Current Condition – Phase 2
- Type F Hardwood Conversion Project
- Effectiveness of Unstable Landform ID – delay to 2011
- Roads Sub-basin Scale Effectiveness – Phase II
- Wetlands Mitigation Effectiveness

Third Priority – potential delayed projects

- Eastside Type N Forest Hydrology Characterization
- Type N Amphibians in Intermittent Streams
- Type F Eastside Channel Wood Characterization
- Extensive Vegetation Monitoring

This re-prioritization of projects changed the project total for FY 2010 to \$3.5 Million.

With additions: \$766,337 by 2010
 - \$886,326 by 2011
 -\$2,571,989 by 2012

Discussion Point:

The Conservation caucus asked if a financial audit of the AMP has been performed; has a systematic review of the AMP been conducted? Do we have a lean program; clear indicator of the work done and the costs associated with it?

A fiscal audit focused on contracting has been performed, identified some findings about efficiencies and improvements have been made. This and next year are major benchmark years for AMP products; the current synthesis project is one of the major products for getting closer to the goal of what has been accomplished. This is part of the strategic process for AMP; have shifted from rule tools and into effectiveness projects.

Action Items:

- 1) CMER Co-chairs & Policy co-chairs work with the SAGs to review the costs of the re-prioritized projects. This review needs to include cost figures for the priorities; real costs check and a reality check about start up for next year. The SAGs need to identify the implications of delaying projects and the potential for integration of projects. The co-chairs need to emphasize why policy is suggesting the delays, this is the opportunity for the SAGs to weigh in on how they would do it differently. There may be efficiencies that the SAGs can identify for Policy. Perhaps the SAGs can take on the field work or pilot an integration project. Policy will need an answer back by next CMER meeting in time for the budget retreat in April. The co-chairs need to provide context for how Policy developed this and share the CWA document.
- 2) The Conservation Caucus requested a summary of the AMP funding so as to understand the cash flow – funded thru June 30, 2009 and to use this as a snapshot for talking purposes.
- 3) Objective 1 - AMP Strategic Plan Task 4 - Goal 2 Reestablish & maintain productive, collaborative caucus relationships. The status of this is that the FPD manager has moved up the request to the Commissioner to have a conversation w/ DOE & DFW.

Next Strategic Planning Meeting Agenda Items:

AMP Process

Long Term Budget

Policy needs to pay attention to the potential of federal funding, timing with Congress, communications – look at late March to talk with congressional representatives about funding for FY 10.