

Forests & Fish Policy Committee
 July 11, 2013 Meeting Summary

Decisions and Actions from Meeting

Decision	Notes
1. Approved June 6, 2013 meeting summary.	Full consensus of all caucuses.
2. Approved three steps for eastside UMPPF data analysis: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Share with Policy the task list for Greg Stewart's analysis b. Have Greg Stewart perform data analysis c. Type N Policy Subgroup to review analysis 	Full consensus of all caucuses.
3. Took no action on the Eastside Type F/S Monitoring Project.	
4. Directed CMER to consider and report to Policy by November high-level options and alternatives to extensive monitoring and studies.	Full consensus of all caucuses.
5. Approved draft AMP Board Manual Section 22 with two minor edits.	Full consensus of all caucuses.
6. Approved Mass Wasting Charter with two edits.	Full consensus of all caucuses.
7. Directed work to continue on Option 1 for westside UMPPF data analysis with the understanding that more will be considered at the Type N Policy Subgroup meeting, TBD.	Full consensus of all caucuses.

Action Item	Assignment
1. Update TFW audience of dry season methodology guidance at breakfast and other events.	DNR
2. Update language on dry season methodology guidance on small forest landowner website.	DNR
3. Provide link to website for dry season methodology (including small forest landowner website) to WFPA to be included in newsletter.	DNR
4. Reach out to membership through newsletter and other means applicable for change in dry season methodology guidance.	WFPA
5. Provide Policy with proposed task list for Greg Stewart's work to analyze eastside UMPPF data.	Mark Hicks or Jim Hotvedt; week of July 15
6. Reconvene Type N Policy Subgroup in August to review results of Greg Stewart's analysis on eastside UMPPF data and westside UMPPF options.	Mark Hicks

Action Item	Assignment
7. Make two minor edits to AMP Board Manual Section 22 (add Conservation Caucus and make sure links are correct).	Marc Ratcliff
8. Make two edits to Mass Wasting Charter.	Adrian Miller (or DNR)
9. Send link to science of HPA rulemaking draft EIS on WDFW's website.	Terry Jackson
10. Provide Policy a sense of the process needed for HPA code revision, if Policy chooses to incorporate this into the workplan.	State caucus
11. Draft two memos and two workload prioritization charts (for completing 2013 and for calendar year 2014) for Policy's priorities.	Adrian Miller & Stephen Bernath with DNR as support
12. Draft July 11, 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*).

Review Agenda, Announcements, and Meeting Summary

Mary McDonald has gone back to the regional office after having represented DNR for the last few months. Donelle Mahan is attending today and will step in as the interim DNR representative for an indefinite period.

The Policy Committee (Policy) approved the June 6, 2013 meeting summary with no changes.

Type N Update – This agenda topic had two updates; one from DNR on the dry season methodology guidance and one from Ecology about the progress of the Type N technical group.

Update from DNR on dry season methodology

Marc Engel and Donelle Mahan provided the update from DNR. The dry season methodology guidance incorporates changes in two places, including the water type classification worksheet. On this worksheet, the last question gives direction to the uppermost point of perennial flow (UMPPF), where DNR will give guidance to subscribe to doing this methodology during the dry season only. This language change will also be changed on the website language.

The change to the protocol surveys guidance will come out in Fall 2013 (this form will not incorporate the UMPPF direction). While later than originally anticipated, this timeline ensures that the Board is the final approval for any guidance to be published. DNR will try to make changes to the worksheet in mid-August, but their work in fire suppression around the state takes priority over this work, so they cannot promise to fulfill this timeline.

Policy members asked DNR to provide this language to the TFW audience at the breakfasts or other meetings/events. Additionally, WFPA agreed to spread the word to their membership and WFFA has already done so in a newsletter to their members. DNR will ensure that this language will also be updated

on the small forest landowner website, and this link will be shared with WFPA to be included in their newsletter.

Update from Ecology on Type N Technical Group progress

When the Type N Technical Subgroup last met, they decided to ask CMER staff (primarily Greg Stewart) to analyze the eastside UMPPF data. This measures the distance to channel head from the distance to flowing water.

Mark Hicks has generated a task list for Greg to do to complete this work; either Mark Hicks or Jim Hotvedt will share this task list with Policy next week. Policy was reminded that this task is more than Policy originally asked for. It was suggested that Policy may, at some point, want to make new defaults based on different factors (i.e., precipitation).

The Type N Policy Subgroup will reconvene in August to review the results of Greg's analysis on the eastside UMPPF data, and can consider next steps and strategy.

DECISION: Policy approved the direction of this data analysis: the proposed task list will be shared with full Policy; Greg Stewart will do the analysis; and the Type N Policy Subgroup will reconvene in August to do the review and discuss next steps.

In addition to the eastside UMPPF data, the Type N Technical Subgroup also forwarded information to Policy on the westside UMPPF data. Four options were presented in a comparison table for alternatives to derive the wet season default distance. There was much discussion about the options and next steps to fulfill the Type N Strategy and consider all relevant and informative data. There was desire by several caucuses to either fulfill the original timeline of bringing the draft Board Manual 23 to the Board at the February 2014 meeting, and desire by another caucus to consider data that could influence the information in that draft Board Manual. Additionally, DNR expressed discomfort with forwarding an incomplete draft Board Manual to the Board.

This topic was tabled to provide caucuses more time to consider the options; later in the day, Policy reconsidered this topic.

- All caucuses understand that Option 1 has already been agreed to in earlier Type N work. The discussion centered on the differences of Options 3 and 4 and whether Policy should move forward with either of them.
- Option 3 allows Policy to meet the February 2014 deadline to bring the draft Board Manual to the Board and does not incur significant extra cost to Policy but does not have consensus on the non-CMER supported study. Option 4 will not provide a draft Board Manual to the Board until late 2014 at the earliest, but does most accurately meet Recommendation 2.d. of the Type N Strategy.
- Several caucuses expressed concern at accepting Option 3 because it is not a CMER-supported study.
- Some caucuses expressed discomfort with Option 4 because it extends the deadline to take the draft Board Manual to the Board and because it incurs a cost to the adaptive management program budget.

After discussion, Policy voted on several potential motions to test the possibility of work going forward on this topic. The results of these votes are as follows:

- Motion 1: Move ahead with Options 1 and 3 – No Consensus
 - Votes: County Caucus – yes. Conservation Caucus – no. Federal Caucus – sideways. Landowner Caucus – yes. State Caucus – sideways. Tribal Caucus – no.
 - 2 yes, 2 no, 2 sideways
- Motion 2: Move forward with gathering information in Options 1 and 4 for the purposes of discussion. Extend the timeline to bring the UMPPF draft Board Manual to the Board later than the February 2014 meeting. Request the Board for appropriate funding to complete Option 4. No Consensus
 - Votes: County Caucus – between yes and sideways. Conservation Caucus – no. Federal Caucus – between no and sideways. Landowner Caucus – yes. State Caucus – yes. Tribal Caucus – no.
 - 2 yes, 2 no, 1 yes/sideways, 1 no/sideways
- Motion 3: Draft Board Manual language be moved forward (on Option 1 only) because adequate landowner options exist for UMPPF identification and is based on sound CMER data – No Consensus
 - Votes: County Caucus – no. Conservation Caucus – yes. Federal Caucus – yes. Landowner Caucus – no. State Caucus – yes. Tribal Caucus – yes.
 - 4 yes, 2 no

Policy agreed to incorporate consideration of the discussion and motions at the August Type N Policy Subgroup meeting, though the work on Option 1 will continue.

Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring Program – Stream Temperature Phase I: Eastside Type F/S Monitoring Project

Bill Ehinger, Department of Ecology, made a presentation about the Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring Program. Overall points in his presentation included:

- Site selection took 1.5 years due to the amount of work it took to find 50 samples that fulfilled the requirements, including: willing landowner, geographic proximity to other samples, and water type classification.
- The success rate for sampling on public and industrial lands was the same at 27%. The success rate on small forest landowner lands was 1%, making the sample batch less than accurate for the geography of eastside forests.
- There are different inferences of how much of Type N waters on the landscape as a whole were analyzed.
- Next steps include a consideration of the value of extensive temperature monitoring, as well as a consideration of the use of extensive vegetation monitoring instead.

Policy discussed the next steps from this report and 6 Questions:

DECISION: Policy agreed to take no action on submitting anything from this project to the Board for the August meeting.

Additionally, Policy requested CMER to consider high-level options for how to move forward on extensive monitoring as well as options for other extensive studies. This should include perspectives considering the past and future as well as existing technologies. CMER should also consider other monitoring approaches to landscape-level performance.

CMER will be asked to work on this through August, September, and October and submit to Policy. Policy will review these options and alternatives at their November meeting.

AMP Board Manual Section 22 Review – Marc Ratcliff provided an update to the changes made to the draft Board Manual Section 22 since the last stakeholder meeting, including Figure 1. Two minor edits remain to be made.

DECISION: With these minor edits, Policy approved the AMP draft Board Manual Section 22 for submittal to the Board for their August meeting.

Mass Wasting Report and Charter – Adrian Miller provided an update to the changes made to the Mass Wasting Charter since the last meeting. DNR has requested that the presentation and workshop be changed from the week of August 5 to the week of August 19, though this will not affect the end deadline.

One Policy member suggested a change to the Tasks, Responsibilities, and Deliverables, which changes the bullet that read “A description of the application review process...” on page 1 to “The potential to deliver sediment or debris to a public resource or that has the potential to threaten public safety.” This language is taken directly from the WAC 222-16-050 (1)(d), referring to when SEPA is enacted for forest practices projects.

DECISION: With those two changes, Policy approved the Mass Wasting Charter with full consensus.

HPA Rulemaking Update – Terry Jackson provided the update to the HPA code revision process:

- WDFW is currently working on incorporating comments on the rules from the regular stakeholder process. They will then set up meetings with the stakeholders to go through comments.
- Current status of HPA code revision process:
 - WDFW will initiate SEPA review from October – December 2013 and six public meetings will be held during this time.
 - The plan is to present the proposed rule language to the Commission in March 2014, and anticipate rule adoption in April 2014.
- WDFW proposed the following next steps:
 - Terry will present draft rule language, relevant sections of the draft EIS, and other sections to Jim prior to the October meeting. Jim will review the package and will present his recommendations with Terry Jackson to Policy at the October meeting. Policy will have until December 15, 2013 to provide a report back to WDFW which would include the issues by caucus, areas of disagreement, and areas of agreement. Depending on the level of disagreement, Policy could provide a minority report to WDFW as well.

- Both the Board and Policy need to consider how this will affect Policy's workload and if Policy can take this on as a topic from October – December 2013.

The discussion included reminders that Policy should take seriously whether or not this workload topic should be addressed. This would probably take a handful of focused meetings, but it is hard to estimate the workload needed at this point. It will also be important to take the time to have a meaningful review of the science in the draft EIS. The science is already on WDFW's website and Terry will provide the links to those. Finally, Policy discussed the importance of considering this as a precedent for future processes, and to discuss sideboards for this discussion. Policy requested that the state caucus provide Policy with a clearer sense of is the process needed for this effort.

Policy's Priorities for 2014 – Adrian Miller and Stephen Bernath reviewed their work on creating an update to the Board at the August meeting about completing priorities for 2013 and the anticipated priorities for 2014.

- It was agreed that the Co-Chairs will present two memos and two workload prioritization charts to the Board; one about completing priorities through December 2013 and one for anticipated priorities in calendar year 2014. It is important to provide two memos because it will be set up for the Board to take action on one memo and receive the other as an update.
- These table documents are to help both the Board and Policy manage Policy's workload.
- The Co-Chairs are prepared to draft two memos with accompanying workload prioritization chart to share with Policy for the August 1 meeting. Policy should be prepared to make a decision on August 1st for these memos and charts to be submitted to the Board for their August 13th meeting.

The meeting closed with thoughts for those who lost their lives fighting fires in Arizona earlier this season. A connection was made with the important work Policy is doing that can affect forest safety.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15pm.

Attachment 1 – Attendance at 7/11/13 Meeting by Caucus

Conservation Caucus

Mary Scurlock, Conservation Caucus
Chris Mendoza, Conservation Caucus

County Caucus

Kendra Smith, Skagit County

Federal Caucus

Marty Acker, USFWS

Landowner Caucus

Kevin Godbout, Weyerhaeuser
Doug Hooks, WFPA
Adrian Miller, Longview Timber, Corp. (Co-Chair)
Dick Miller, WFFA
Karen Terwilleger, WFPA

State Caucus

Stephen Bernath, Ecology (Co-Chair)
Marc Engel, DNR
Terry Jackson, WDFW
Donelle Mahan, DNR
Marc Ratcliff, DNR

Tribal Caucus

Chase Davis, UCUT (phone)
Mark Mobbs, Quinault Nation
Joseph Pavel, Skokomish Nation
Nancy Sturhan, NWIFC
Curt Veldhuisen, Skagit River System
Cooperative (phone)

Others

Bruce Chandler, DNR
Bill Ehinger, Department of Ecology
Aaron Everett, DNR (Chair, Forest Practices Board)
Claire Turpel, Triangle Associates (facilitation team)
Bob Wheeler, Triangle Associates (facilitation team)

Attachment 2 – Ongoing Priorities Checklist

Priority	Assignment	Status	Notes
Type N Board Manual Development	Type N Policy Subgroup, to be scheduled in August	Resolve westside UMPPF data question.	
Type F	Facilitation team, with Policy Co-Chairs	Series of meetings focused on this topic set for May/June/July 2013	
FPHP Integration		Begin CR-102 process	
Settlement Agreement		Complete; being forwarded to Board for August meeting.	
Policy recommendations based on Mass Wasting Report	Policy Committee	Approved Charter.	
Ongoing CMER reports reviewed by Policy	Mark Hicks & Chris Mendoza, CMER Co-Chairs	CMER Co-Chairs to give update(s) as needed at August 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.

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

Entity, Group, or Subgroup	Next Meeting Date	Notes
Forests & Fish Policy Committee	August 1	
CMER	July 30, 9am – 4pm	
Type N Subgroup	TBD, August	
Type F Subgroup	July 18, 9am – 5 pm	Contingency meeting scheduled for July 30, 1-5pm.
Forest Practices Board	August 13	