

Forests & Fish Policy Committee
 April 4, 2013 Meeting Summary

Decisions and Action Items from Meeting

Decision	Notes
1. Accepted February 7, 2013 meeting summary with revisions.	Full consensus of all caucuses.
2. Accepted March 7, 2013 meeting summary with revisions.	Full consensus of all caucuses.
3. Approved FY14 CMER workplan.	Full consensus of all caucuses.
4. Removed Van Dyke's Salamander study from FY14 budget and moved to FY16; reduced by \$103,000 (line 18).	Consensus of all caucuses.
5. Reduced Extensive Riparian Status & Trends Monitoring Temperature and Vegetation (budget lines 19 & 20) to \$25,000 each.	Full consensus of all caucuses.
6. Kept \$50,000 for FY14 for Wetlands Program Research/Monitoring Study (line 46), but removed \$75,000 from FY15.	Full consensus of all caucuses.
7. Approved FY14 Adaptive Management Program budget with \$153,000 in reductions.	Full consensus of all caucuses.
8. Accepted Post-Mortem Report Findings Package with agreed-upon language change in for the disclaimer.	Full consensus of all caucuses.

Action Item	Assignment/Notes
1. Notify Policy the timeline for when the hydraulic code rules will go to CR-102.	Terry Jackson
2. Email two-page Conservation Caucus positions document on Type F to Marc Ratcliff to circulate electronically.	Claire Turpel
3. Draft April 4, 2013 meeting summary.	Claire Turpel

Introductions – Stephen Bernath and Adrian Miller, Co-Chairs, welcomed the group and led introductions (*please see Attachment 1 for the list of attendees*).

Announcements

- Marty Acker has transitioned from NOAA to USFWS. He remains the federal caucus representative.
- Terry Jackson announced that the concurrence rules have been adopted. A handout has the website people can visit for the posting, rule language, and concise explanatory statement of how public comments were addressed.
- Jim Hotvedt sent out version 3 of the draft hydraulic code rules at the request of Terry Jackson and WDFW. Initial comments are due by April 26. After comments from this draft are incorporated, the language will be prepared for review by the Attorney General. Please send comments to Randi Thurston using the comment log provided so WDFW can keep track of the comments effectively. After the language comes back from the Attorney General, the language will go to CR-102 for public comment period. Terry will get back to Policy about when the rules will go to CR-102.

Meeting Summaries

Policy reviewed the February 7, 2013 meeting summary that had been revised since the March meeting. After some discussion of the clarifying edits, all caucuses voted to accept this meeting summary.

Policy then reviewed the March 7, 2013 meeting summary. After some discussion of clarifying edits, all caucuses voted to accept this meeting summary.

DECISION: Policy Committee approved both the February 7 and March 7, 2013 meeting summaries.

Update from DNR on Guidance Issues for Type N Strategy

DNR hosted an internal statewide meeting with all regions on how to disseminate the guidance. Right now, they're focusing on how to reach out to people that the dry season is the best time of year to locate the uppermost point of perennial flow (UMPPF). At this point, this will only be draft guidance since it needs to go before the Forest Practices Board (Board) before it is finalized.

The projected date for revising the Board Manual will come out of the work of the Type N group and will start in June or July. Policy has agreed to have draft language before the Board's February 2014 meeting, which means they need to have the draft language by mid-January 2014, so Policy should review it at the December or January meeting.

CMER Workplan

Mark Hicks reviewed the *Summary of Ongoing and New Projects in FY14 CMER Work Plan and Budget* document with the budget spreadsheet. Since there is a lot of information in both the workplan and this summary document, Mark mostly highlighted what information has changed since FY13. In general, the changes to the workplan include status updates and more descriptions around extended monitoring. CMER has approved the budget with the list of projects, but CMER has done no prioritization of these items in the budget.

Policy discussed whether they should vote on the workplan first or wait to approve it with the budget. Discussion that the workplan should be approved first, since that's a catalogue of everything, and then there can be discussion when approving the budget of whether everything stays in this year or not. If there is substantial change to the budget Policy can revisit the workplan for changes appropriate with the budget. There is not much in the workplan that Policy has not already seen and/or asked CMER to do.

After reviewing the changes to the FY14 CMER Work Plan, Policy voted whether to approve it or not.

DECISION: The Policy Committee approved the workplan with full consensus.

Extensive Status & Trends Studies

There is a growing recognition that there are a lot of studies within CMER and outside of CMER, so an important question to consider is how to leverage existing work. While there is a relative value of extensive projects, the benefit of these projects is uncertain. It would be good to have a focused discussion about what information Policy wants out of such studies, considering that these studies take a while to get going (for example, finding suitable sites), and they take a while to collect the data. The

group decided that it would be good to table this discussion until they have the time to address it, hopefully in June or July. Other good questions to consider for this focused discussion would be:

- What information does Policy want from these studies?
- Does Policy still need that information?
- Can Policy get that information in another way?
- How do Clean Water Act assurances fit in?

Clean Water Act milestone dates vs. Settlement Agreement dates

Mark Hicks reviewed the document he created that compares the CWA milestone dates with dates set forth in the Settlement Agreement. It is important to consider what challenges exist for meeting the CWA milestones while reviewing the budget. Sometimes, the dates are far away from the milestone.

This led to a discussion about the Master Schedule and the priorities set forth in that. At this point, all six caucuses have agreed to the Master Schedule at the December 11th focused meeting. This will go to the Board for information only at the May 14 meeting. The special Policy meeting on the Settlement Agreement, April 10, is a good time to further discuss the Master Schedule.

Budget

Policy reviewed the budget spreadsheet line by line. Many line by line clarifications were made along with a few decisions for action. Policy was reminded that Forests and Fish Support Account (FFSA) project funds come from a dedicated account, so unspent money at the end of a year does not go back to the General Fund. If not used, Policy will have a chance to use the funds in FY15 if need be.

Budget decisions:

1. Van Dyke's Salamander Study (Type N Rule Group, line 18), was discussed as a non-essential study at this time. Policy voted and reached consensus to remove this project from FY14 and move it forward to FY16 with the following votes: Conservation Caucus: thumbs sideways. County Caucus: thumbs up. Federal Caucus: thumbs sideways. Landowner Caucus: thumbs up. State Caucus: thumbs sideways. Tribal Caucus: thumbs up.
2. Extensive Riparian Status & Trends Monitoring, Temperature, Type N Eastside and Vegetation, Type N West & Eastside (Type N Rule Group, lines 19 & 20), were discussed as how to keep this on the budget list without much money for it. Policy voted to change lines 19 & 20 to \$25k and \$25k each for 2014 only. Policy will meet to decide how/if to conduct extensive monitoring. Policy voted unanimously to approve this budget change.
3. Wetlands Program Research/Monitoring Strategy (Wetlands Rule Group, line 46): a contractor is doing a literature synthesis, so it may be good to leave some money for this contractor to help the SAG do this monitoring strategy. Policy voted to keep \$50,000 for FY14 but remove \$75,000 from FY15. Policy voted unanimously to approve this budget change.

*The approved budget will be attached to the approved workplan online.

DECISION: After answering final clarifying questions, Policy voted to approve the FY14 Adaptive Management Program budget with the agreed-upon changes with full consensus from all caucuses.

Post-Mortem Report Findings Package

Policy was asked to accept this Report Findings Package from the Adaptive Management Program Administrator (AMPA), which will begin the 45-day timeline to make a decision about what to recommend to the Forest Practices Board.

The AMPA shared language for the disclaimer on the inside cover of the report that had been used for an earlier CMER report. Policy discussed whether or not to accept this language, change it on the spot, or wait to accept the disclaimer language and the full Report until everyone has had time to review and discuss with their caucuses. Everyone agreed that they would like to change the language on the spot.

The language was changed to:

This document was reviewed by CMER and was assessed through the Adaptive Management Program's independent scientific peer review process. ~~This is a non-consensus CMER report not supported by all CMER members. The minority reports are appended to the report. This was not approved as an official CMER document, however, because the contents did not meet the study objectives and/or the scientific standards of CMER reviewers.~~

DECISION: With the above language change, Policy voted unanimously to accept the Post-Mortem Report Findings Package with the disclaimer language change, 6 Questions (with two opening paragraphs moved to the end of the document), minority reports as appendices, and the rest of the package.

Agenda Topics for May Policy Meeting:

- Substantive discussion on Post-Mortem Report Package and next steps.
- Continue brainstorming for Type F Objectives & Issues table to prepare for first focused Type F meeting, May 16, 1-4pm.
- Thoughts about the budget & workplan process and desired changes for next time.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 pm.

Attachment 1 – Attendance at 4/4/13 Meeting by Caucus

Conservation Caucus

Mary Scurlock
 Peter Goldman, WFLC

County Caucus

Kendra Smith, Skagit County (phone)

Federal Caucus

Marty Acker, USFWS

Landowner Caucus

Kevin Godbout, Weyerhaeuser
 Adrian Miller, Longview Timber Corp
 Dick Miller, WFFA
 Karen Terwilleger, WFPA

State Caucus

Stephen Bernath, Ecology
 Marc Engel, DNR
 Mark Hicks, Ecology
 Terry Jackson, WDFW
 Marc Ratcliff, DNR

Tribal Caucus

Chase Davis, UCUT
 Chad McCrea, Spokane Tribe
 Mark Mobbs, Quinault Tribe
 Joseph Pavel, Skokomish Tribe
 Jim Peters, NWIFC
 Curt Veldhuisen, Skagit River System
 Cooperative (phone)

Others

Bill Ehinger, Ecology
 Jim Hotvedt, Adaptive Management Program Administrator
 Amy Kurtenbach, DNR
 Aimee McIntyre, WDFW
 Dave Schuett-Harnes, CMER scientist
 Claire Turpel, Triangle Associates
 Bob Wheeler, Triangle Associates

Attachment 2 – Ongoing Priorities Checklist

Priority	Assignment	Status	Notes
Type N Board Manual Development	Type N Policy Subgroup	One remaining issue to resolve: determination of uppermost Type N break, particularly during the wet season.	Policy approved language change to recommendation 2.b. and full Strategy Summary Document on March 7. Type N technical subgroup meetings are being scheduled. Policy will draft language and review at the Dec '13 / Jan '14 meeting and pass to the Forest Practices Board in Feb 2014.
Type F	Facilitation team	Series of meetings focused	Send any thoughts about

Priority	Assignment	Status	Notes
	with Policy Co-Chairs	on this topic set for May/June 2013	Objectives & Issues table to facilitation team before May 16.
FPHP Integration		Begin CR-102 process, pending Board decision at the May FPB Meeting.	
Adaptive Mgmt Program Reform Rule		Begin CR-102 process, pending Board decision at the May FPB Meeting.	Focused Policy meeting on April 10, follow-up conference call April 19.
Policy recommendations based on Post-Mortem Report		Findings Report Package accepted by Policy on April 4, substantive discussion on May 2.	Language change to disclaimer for inside cover approved by Policy April 4.
Ongoing CMER reports reviewed by Policy	Mark Hicks & Chris Mendoza, CMER Co-Chairs	CMER Co-Chairs to give update(s) as needed at May Policy meeting	

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

Additionally, the WDFW HPA rule-making is in progress. The draft language is being prepared for the Attorney General; once they return from the AG office, the CR-102 process begins. Policy members are encouraged to send any comments on the draft language to Randi Thurston at WDFW.

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

Entity, Group, or Subgroup	Next Meeting Date	Notes
Forests & Fish Policy Committee	May 2	
CMER	April 24	
Type N Subgroup		Technical group meetings being scheduled.
Type F Subgroup		Brainstorm objectives/issues for Charter; send any thoughts to facilitation team before May 16.
Forest Practices Board	May 14	

Attachment 4 –Parking Lot & Ongoing Issues

- Extensive Status & Trends (as early as July 11 Policy meeting?)
- Science workshop for mass wasting and Post-Mortem Report (consider after May Policy meeting)
- CMER process changes

- How to prevent science/policy decision split (consider changes from CMER). Action: Have quick re-orientation (from Nancy?) about protocols document, organization, where they can get a copy of it is, highlights, etc.
- LEAN Process – consider how to increase efficiency and speed up timeline
- Long-term CMER Strategy
 - CMER priorities; 2-year budget and workplan (consider for 2015-2017 biennium).
 - Also consider timeline for drafting and approving workplan and budget
 - Consider how to reduce CMER non-consensus and the science/policy decision split
- CMZ effectiveness
- Draft language for Type N; Policy to review at December 2013 or January 2014 meeting; pass to Forest Practices Board for February 2014 meeting.