

In Attendance:

Stephen Bernath, Co-chair, Ecology
Mark Hicks, Ecology
Donelle Mahan, DNR
Mark Mobbs, Quinault Indian Nation
Nancy Sturnan, NWIFC
Chris Mendoza, Conservation
Miguel Perez-Gibson, Conservation
Amy Kurtenbach, DNR
Peter Heide, WFPA
Chase Davis, UCUT
Teresa Miskovic, DNR
Terry Jackson, WDFW
Jim Hotvedt, DNR
Kevin Godbout, Weyerhaeuser
Marc Engel, DNR
Ash Roorbach, CMER
Todd Baldwin, Kalispel Tribe
Chad McCrea, Spokane Tribe
Marty Acker, NOAA
Dawn Hitchens, DNR
Amie McIntyre, DFW
Bill Ehinger, Ecology

By Phone:

Dave Powers, EPA
Jim Peters, Co-chair, NWIFC

Decision/Actions from April 7, 2011 F&F Policy Meeting:

Decision #1

Draft Forest Practices Board Manual – Section 3 – Guidelines for Forest Roads - Part 2.1 Road Maintenance & Abandonment Planning & Part 2.2 Changes in Ownership

The draft reflects amendments made to the existing board manual section on road maintenance and abandonment plans (RMAPs) per WACs 222-24-051 and 222-24-0511. The draft language is incomplete and is in the process of addressing recommendations from F&F Policy accepted by the Forest Practices Board. The draft will be presented to the Forest Practices Board along with draft rule language for consideration for public review and to file CR-102.

Policy Co-chair Bernath asked for Policy members' approval to forward this as a draft of Section 3 – Guidelines for Forest Roads Part 2.1 Road Maintenance & Abandonment Planning & Part 2.2 Changes in Ownership and for Policy members to commit to the continuing work required for a complete package including rule amendments, completed board manual and an implementation plan.

Policy members reached consensus to approve this draft to move forward to the Forest Practices Board with the understanding that there will be further opportunity for input as

the complete package is put together, including rule amendments and an implementation plan.

Decision #2

Forest Practices Board Manual - Section 11 – Standard Methodology for Conducting Watershed Analysis Part 7 Review and Reanalysis of Watershed Analysis

The amendments to the Watershed Analysis board manual include the process for reviewing and performing re-analyses of the modules and prescriptions as appropriate.

Policy Co-chair Bernath asked for Policy approval of part 7 in section 11 for the watershed review and re-analysis language.

Policy members reached consensus and approved to move the amended manual forward for consideration by the Forest Practices Board.

Decision #3

The Upper Columbia United Tribes submitted in advance the following motion for an official FFR Policy vote: *“The FFR-AMP-Policy Committee recommends that the Washington St. DNR effective immediately give new, official direction to the six staff that are directly associated with this program and its annual budget. This new direction entails the following:*

1. All six staff under this program’s budget will immediately **reallocate approximately 20% of your current staff time and respective work plans to fundraising activities that will support CMER scientific research purposes**. This six staff include, but are certainly not limited to, the following positions: the AMPA, the three CMER PI staff, the DNR’s Contract Specialist, and the CMER/Policy Coordinator. Furthermore, other AMP—PMs/Project Manager staff could and very likely should also contribute effort by devoting an appropriate percent of their staff time to these fundraising activities and goals.
2. Under the direction of the WA St. DNR and the AMPA, this team of 6 staff (or more – TBD) will **work together to complete the following:**
 - A. Strategically plan, create, implement, and publicly share a team **goal** of identifying and securing \$1,000,000 in scientific research funds for sole use by CMER by next March 31, 2012.
 - B. Create and present/share (e.g., with Commissioner Goldmark, Governor Gregoire, and the FPB/Forest Practices Board) your team’s **top 5 recommendations and findings** for how the WA St. DNR, along with support from the AMP/CMER participants (e.g., WFPA), other caucus staff, and the caucus principals, can best go about identifying and securing long term, stable source/s of funding for the FFR/AMP—CMER.
 - C. This new team (presumably headed up by the AMPA) will present a formal **progress report** to CMER, FFR Policy, and to the FPB at the August/November 2011 FPB mtg. (i.e., please pick the most realistic date for a substantive progress report to occur) and this team will also present its **final report**, along with any findings, recommendations for next steps, and to date the amount of research funds secured by

this team at the February 2012 FPB mtg. (i.e., or again, whatever date makes the most sense).

- D. Robust interaction, collaboration, communications, and direct support/time from the FFR Policy Cmte., esp. the Policy Budget Subcommittee,** with this new fundraising team are expected to occur. Consequently, the FFR Policy Cmte.'s (and Budget Subcommittee's) monthly meetings, agendas, and prioritized work tasks will adequately reflect and seek to address and support this new team's efforts, challenges encountered, and directions taken.
3. The **rationale and justification** for the unanimous approval of this motion can be found as consistent with the AMP's overall funding goals and as documented within the following:
- A.** Line 97 in the draft FY2011 CMER Budget that this FFR Policy Cmte. is about to vote on, and not to mention that this AMP continues to spend time on planning for studies for which we have no funding, much less an actual funding strategy.
 - B.** The DOE's/EPA's FFR-AMP-HCP Clean Water Act Assurances and its associated Milestones that are related to our programmatic funding woes (please the HCP itself, and the DOE's memos to the FPB on 4/16/10 and on 1/14/11).
 - C.** The FFR Policy Cmte.'s 10/18/10 memo to the FPB that outlines this AMP's annual priorities, work tasks, and funding challenges.
 - D.** The FFR Policy Cmte.'s "Forest Practices Adaptive Management Program Strategic Goals, Objectives, and Tasks" document dated 9/8/08, which includes direct references both to funding issues, as well as to enhancing/increasing research capabilities and developing partnerships with other research organizations.
 - E.** There are several other documents that fully support the approval of this motion, including that fact that this AMP has been discussing this issue for years now (including preliminary discussions in both FY09 and FY10 about the need to layoff AMP staff), and this discussion dates back to at least late 2006 and early 2007 when the UCUT first began making motions about our AMP's known budget shortfalls. This also includes FFR AMP-related statements/commitments made by Commissioner Goldmark as a result of the "FEC" gathering at Quinault in September 2009."

Chase Davis requested a vote on the UCUT motion.

One caucus voted yes, three voted maybe, and one voted no.

Policy members did not reach consensus and did not approve the motion.

Decision #4

Kevin Godbout presented an alternative motion that the Forests & Fish Policy Committee recommends to the Forest Practices Board to allocate resources from the Adaptive Management Program (AMP) budget to support procuring external sources of funding for AMP research & monitoring projects.

Policy Co-chair Bernath called for the vote on this motion.

Three caucuses voted yes and two voted no.

Policy members did not reach consensus and did not approve the motion.

Decision #5

CMER FY12 CMER Work Plan & Budget - The following table represents the CMER FY12 work plan and budget as approved by CMER and as the basis for Policy discussion.

Table 1. FY12 CMER Projects and Budget (*are new projects)	Tier 1	Tier 2
Type N Rule Group		
Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project in Hard Rock Lithologies	416,000	
*Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project in Hard Rock Lithologies (Temperature and Canopy – 3 rd Year)	30,000	
*Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project in Soft Rock Lithologies	384,700	
Eastside Type N Characterization - Forest Hydrology	450,000	
Buffer Integrity - Shade Effectiveness	23,000	
Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring - Temp. Component (Type N) (budget combined for Type N and Type F)	17,000	
Type F Rule Group		
Eastern Washington Riparian Assessment Project (EWRAP)	50,000	
Eastside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Monitoring (BTO add-on)	60,000	
Bull Trout Overlay Temperature Project and Solar Radiation/Effective Shade Project	277,000	
Hardwood Conversion Project	11,000	
Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring - Temp. Component (Type F) (budget combined for Type N and Type F – shown under Type N)	---	
Unstable Slopes Rule Group		
*Testing the Accuracy of Unstable Landform Identification		40,000
Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring (aka Post-Mortem)		40,000
Wetlands Rule Group		
*Wetlands Systematic Literature Review	67,000	
Potential New Wetlands Study		45,000
Subtotal Projects (by Tier 1 and Tier 2)	\$1,785,700	\$125,000
Total Project (both Tier 1 and Tier 2)	\$1,910,700	
Project Staffing		
CMER Principal Investigator Staff at NWIFC (3)	393,500	
Total Project and Staffing Costs (by Tier 1 and Tier 2)	\$2,179,200	\$125,000
Project Support		
Contingency Fund for Active Projects		50,000
Policy Information & Analysis Support		50,000
Adaptive Management Project Managers (2 at DNR)		195,000
Program Administration		
AMP Administrator		106,000
Contract Specialist		66,000
CMER/Policy Coordinator		45,000
CMER Website		16,000
AMP Data Management		20,000
Independent Science Review Panel		60,000
Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit Dues (U of W)		16,000
Subtotal Support and Administration	\$624,000	
Total FY12 Expenditures for Projects/Activities (by Tier 1 and Tier 2)	\$2,803,200	\$125,000

Suggested Budget Changes:

The Department of Ecology raised the concern that the pass-through Forests & Fish implementation funding for Ecology and WDFW is 50% less in the Governor's proposed budget than the current level of funding. This will impact the matching funds Ecology can contribute to the Environmental Protection Agency grant for the soft rock project.

UCUT requested that the Policy contingency funding in the CMER proposal be replaced with a grant writer.

Policy Co-chair Bernath requested a vote on the AMP budget with suggested changes.

Three caucuses approved and two disapproved the AMP budget.

Policy members did not reach consensus and did not approve the AMP budget.

Policy Co-chair Bernath requested that the caucuses that voted the budget down submit a clear concise statement to the AMPA as this non-consensus action will need to be presented to the Forest Practices Board.

Discussion Item - Long Term Funding for the Adaptive Management Program:

Policy Co-chair Bernath will work with Pete Heide on crafting a letter from the Forests & Fish Policy Committee to the TFW principals.

Pete Heide suggested working with the governor's natural resource cabinet, after the legislative session, and then work with the other TFW principals.