

Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee
 January 3, 2019 APPROVED Meeting Summary
 v. 2.7.19

Action	Responsibility
Send the draft 2018 memo regarding water typing guidance, as well as the related memo from 2017, to Policy.	Chris Conklin/Triangle Associates
Retrieve and distribute to Policy the correct figures from the Governor’s proposed budget.	Terra Rentz
Send notes on the Governor’s proposed budget and impacts to DNR Forest Practices to Triangle for inclusion in the meeting summary.	Marc Engel
Follow up with the non-state agency caucuses to begin a collaborative effort to educate legislators about natural resources funding needs.	Darin Cramer
Draft a memo contextualizing the Type Np Workgroup charter to accompany the Board packet and circulate to Policy for high-level review by caucus representatives.	Terra Rentz
Identify a potential meeting space north of SeaTac for one or more meetings from July to December.	Triangle Associates

Decision	Notes
Approve the December meeting summary.	The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.
<p>Whereas the Forest Practices (FP) Board approved a motion on May 9, 2018 directing the FP Chair to contact the State Auditor’s office to conduct an independent audit of the AMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend to the Board for an independent third-party performance audit to be conducted with the State Auditor’s office. • Recommend that DNR convene a meeting with staff and Policy Co-Chairs and the State Auditor’s office to understand the process and steps/needs of the auditor. 	The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend that the Board asks each state agency affiliated with the AMP process prioritize an AMP Performance Audit with their state auditor requests. 	
<p>Whereas an existing financial audit conducted by the DNR internal auditor has been in progress, Policy moves that if complete the financial audit report be provided to TFW Policy and the FP Board or a status update be given.</p>	<p>The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.</p>
<p>Accept the budget reallocation of remaining biennium funds as listed in the results of the ranking process (see page 6).</p>	<p>The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.</p>
<p>Accept the Type Np Alternative Workgroup Charter for delivery to the Board.</p>	<p>The Federal and Eastside Tribal caucuses were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.</p>
<p>Direct the AMPA to include facilitation and notetaking support for two additional meetings of the Small Forest Landowner Template Workgroup.</p>	<p>The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.</p>

Welcome, Introductions, & Old Business – Policy Co-Chair Terra Rentz, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), opened the meeting and reviewed the day’s agenda.

Terra noted that the TFW Policy Co-Chairs are working to improve communications and information transfer between Policy and CMER.

The Washington Farm Forest Association (WFFA) is having its annual meeting at the Silverdale Beach Hotel. The theme will be celebrating the 20th anniversary of the Forest and Fish Agreement. Policy representatives are invited to attend.

Chris Conklin, WDFW, made an announcement about interim guidance for water typing. WDFW worked with stakeholders to develop this guidance with approval from DNR. There will be a monthlong window for stakeholders to review this document, which will then be delivered to DNR as recommendation for the next protocol season. Caucus members asked to be sent a copy of the memo from 2017 which was referenced in the current memo.

Action: Chris Conklin will send the draft 2018 memo regarding water typing guidance, as well as the related memo from 2017, to Policy.

Decision: Approve the December meeting summary. The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.

CMER update – Howard Haemmerle, Department of Natural Resources (DNR), provided an update from the CMER December meeting.

- CMER discussed the updates to its workplan. Updates made to the sections completed by Scientific Advisory Group – Eastside (SAGE) and Instream Scientific Advisory Group (ISAG) as well as Appendix A were brought forward and approved.
- A document describing CMER accomplishments was approved and is expected to be made available soon.
- Regarding the Type Np Hard Rock report that accompanies the extended sampling, CMER approved the Principal Investigator (PI)'s request to change the structure of the guidance document. WDFW is taking the lead on the restructuring effort. The PIs are putting emphasis on the Soft Rock study completion before the Hard Rock Extended study.
- An update to the CMER and SAGs' report will be available after the January meeting.
- There will be a workshop on Type Np waters at Oregon State University on January 15-16. A number of individuals involved in the Hard Rock study will present on the project as a whole, including the extended monitoring work.
- CMER plans to continue its discussion on the difference between extended and extensive monitoring.

Terra reported that CMER had formed a collective opinion on the prioritization of projects for the reallocation of unspent funds, though it did not hold an official vote.

Legislative and Budget Update – Policy representatives reported out on funding allocations and legislative efforts.

Ken Miller, WFFA, noted that WFFA is working on draft legislation for a study bill regarding small forest landowners. Caucus representatives requested to receive the legislation documents as soon as possible in order to distribute to their caucuses.

There was discussion of the proposed changes to the Adaptive Management Project (AMP) budget. Policy representatives expressed a need for better clarity on the budget breakdown between the General Fund State (GFS) and the Forest and Fish Support Account (FFSA), and the resulting net difference in funding for the next biennium.

Action: Terra Rentz will retrieve and distribute to Policy the correct figures from the Governor's proposed budget.

Marc Engel, DNR, reported that there is no money allocated in the Governor's proposed budget for the Small Forest Landowner Office, which effectively has one full-time employee (FTE) to support all Washington small forest landowners. The Forestry Riparian Easement Program (FREP), the Family Forest Fish Passage Program (FFFPP), and the Rivers and Habitat Open Space Program (RHOSP) also received proposed funding amounts below the level of need. The state budget for fire management was well funded in the proposed budget.

Marc also noted that a \$1 million placeholder was allocated for the Cultural Resources Conservation Easement Program, though there is no program put in place to administer the funds. There is a need to follow through with a request for legislation to empower DNR to spend the money allocated to the capital budget. Darin Cramer, WFFA, noted that Commissioner Franz put out a call for names of willing individuals to participate in a workgroup to advocate for this legislation.

Members of the the Small Forest Landowner, Eastside Tribal, and Westside Tribal caucuses expressed interest in collaborating to support both the cultural resources implementation effort and small forest landowner funding needs.

Caucus representatives suggested that legislators may have proposed smaller budgets for natural resources programs because they were underspent in the current biennium. It was noted that for natural resources agencies, funding needs fluctuate over the years because of the dependence on certain environmental conditions for projects to be implemented. Policy members expressed an interest in communicating to legislators that because of this, the practice of budgeting based on past spending inhibits natural resource agencies. Non-state agency caucuses (Westside Tribes, Small Forest Landowners, Industrial Landowners, Counties, and Conservation) offered to participate in an effort to convey to legislators the nature of natural resource funding needs.

Action: Marc Engel will send notes on the Governor’s proposed budget and impacts to DNR Forest Practices to Triangle for inclusion in the meeting summary.

Action: Darin Cramer will follow up with the non-state agency caucuses (listed above) to begin a collaborative effort to communicate to legislators about natural resources funding needs.

Re-allocation of 2019 Remaining Biennium Funds – Terra Rentz, WDFW and Co-Chair, presented the Budget Workgroup’s latest version of its recommendation for re-allocation of funds, in the form of an Excel spreadsheet. She reminded Policy that in a review for feasibility, projects were removed from the list if they did not meet the following criteria:

- A one-time expense
- Able to be fully expended by June 30, 2019
- No long-term carry-over costs
- Able to “stand alone” (i.e. if associated with another project, able to be completed and have an unknown time gap between the next phase)

Based on a suggestion by the Small Forest Landowner caucus, the Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan (RMAP) Checklist Road Survey project was added to the list.

Comments expressed in the discussion are noted below in correspondence to each budget line item.

- Olympia Experimental State Forest (OESF) Riparian Extensive Monitoring Implementation
 - This is an opportunity for a comparison study on another basin.
 - This work would help understand the health of the forests that are not managed under Forest and Fish Rules.
 - The Riparian Scientific Advisory Group (RSAG) anticipates that the models that were developed under this study are very specific to the watershed they were developed. RSAG would like to see how these models work on different landscapes, and how they might need to be changed to reflect different landscapes.
 - The AMP does need to be doing extensive monitoring in some way.
 - This project idea came from the Adaptive Management Program Administrator (AMPA). There is mixed response from RSAG on the value of this project.

- This study is a foundation for the extensive riparian status and trends. The goal is to help improve models that would be applied around the state.
- RSAG is in the process of putting together a recommendation for this study.
- This study was not discussed during the CMER meeting, but some brought it up in a conversation after the meeting closed.
- Scoping for the Clean Water Act (CWA) Wetland Scientific Advisory Group (WetSAG) Wetlands Management Zone Effectiveness Monitoring
 - The request for proposals (RFP) is ready to be released, but it will take four months to secure a contractor and complete the process.
- Fire Workshop
 - No comments were made.
- Literature Review on Forested Wetlands
 - Terra noted that literature reviews can be hard to complete within a tight deadline.
 - This literature review was suggested to fill identified gaps. If this literature review is selected, CMER will need to expedite the review and approval process in order for the work to be completed by the June 30 deadline.
 - Concern was expressed about the high cost for a partial literature review.
 - The cost assessment was produced by a gap analysis in the literature review that is currently being used for the study.
 - What happens if the project is not completed by the June 30 deadline?
 - If the project is not complete, and if Policy has the capacity, Policy can hold that contractor accountable to the budget and timeline within which they have committed to complete the work. Policy could also extend additional funding in the next biennium.
 - This is an update to an existing literature review under an existing contract; therefore, Policy has more leverage. However, the study design is still being processed including the Independent Scientific Peer Review (ISPR) comments.
- Literature Review on Windthrow
 - It was noted that this project's timeline depends on the contractor's work schedule. AMP staff have not been able to get in touch with the contractor to date.
 - It was noted that the Literature Review on Windthrow is less expensive than the Literature Review for Forested Wetlands described in the previous item. Policy should be careful of overbudgeting for end-of-year projects.
 - It was noted that there was detailed thought put into the cost estimates.
- Chehalis Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) Acquisition
 - No Policy representative was able to speak to any current projects of CMER's that would use LiDAR data in the Chehalis basin in the next couple of years.
 - Mark Mobbs, Quinault Indian Nation, noted that LiDAR data for the Chehalis basin would help habitat recovery projects led by Tim Kramer, WDFW, for the Chehalis Basin Strategy.
- Eastside LiDAR Acquisition
 - There is generally poor LiDAR coverage on the east side of the state.

- Policy should prioritize projects that are connected to the goals of the AMP and Forest and Fish Agreement. However, LiDAR is also extremely helpful for WDFW and other agencies in providing landowner assistance.
- Policy should consider first how CMER will benefit from the LiDAR projects.
- Equipment for Riparian Characteristics and Shade study
 - Mark Hicks, Department of Ecology, reported that the equipment needed for the study may cost more than the amount recorded in the re-allocation list. He stated that the equipment should be shelf stable for a year without having to be recalibrated, but is not certain it would remain shelf stable for up to three years. This equipment could be used for other studies.
- Type N Workgroup Needs
 - Given the Workgroup's projected start date of March 2019, is it likely to spend the full \$20,000 by June 2019?
 - The group considered lowering or eliminating the money allocated but keeping the project as a line item below the line to receive any extra funding. The group ultimately agreed to change the amount to \$10,000.
- Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan (RMAP) Checklist Road Survey
 - This involves conducting an RMAP checklist survey for Small Forest Landowners around the state. The survey document is nearly operational, but funding is needed to implement it. DNR has identified resources that can be reassigned to complete a significant portion of the 200 sites before June 30. There is an existing workload, as over 100 landowners expressed interested in the program.
 - This work will make progress toward a Clean Water Act assurance milestone.

Policy then took time to rank the line items with a “dot exercise.” Each caucus placed four equal-value dots on projects of their choice. Any caucus could place more than one dot on a single project in order to rank it higher.

After a lunch break, Policy reconvened to discuss the ranking. Policy representatives used one more dot each to prioritize among the three projects that tied in last place. The following list represents the results of the ranking:

- SFLO RMAP - \$25,000
- Equipment for Riparian Characteristics and Shade Study - \$30,000
- Type N Workgroup - \$10,000
- Wetlands Effectiveness Monitoring - \$35,000
- Eastside LiDAR Acquisition (70%) - \$175,000

The following items were listed “below the line,” in the order in which projects will be prioritized if there are available funds:

- Eastside LiDAR Acquisition (30%) - \$46,000
- Forested Wetlands Literature Review - \$45,000
- OESF Extensive Riparian Monitoring Implementation - \$75,000
- Fire Workshop - \$25,000

- Chehalis LiDAR - \$100,000

Decision: Accept the budget reallocation of remaining biennium funds as listed above in the results of the ranking process. The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.

Financial and Performance Audits of the AMP – As part of the budget re-allocation discussion, Policy discussed the option of financial and performance audits. Caucus representatives expressed support for making audits a priority and discussed how best to communicate their importance to the State Auditor’s office. It was noted that these audits would be completed at no cost, but they most likely will not be done by June. It was thus agreed that the audits would be removed from the ranking and moved forward as a separate motion.

Steve Barnowe-Meyer, WFFA, moved that Policy make performance and financial audits a priority outside of the budget re-allocation conversation. The motion was seconded, followed by discussion and recommended amendments to the motion. It was noted that according to the May 9, 2018 Board meeting notes, the Board Chair requested an independent performance audit of the AMP. At that time, a financial audit was underway.

The final and complete motion read as follows:

Decision: Whereas the Forest Practices (FP) Board approved a motion on May 9, 2018 directing the FP Chair to contact the State Auditor’s office to conduct an independent audit of the AMP:

- Recommend to the Board for an independent third-party performance audit to be conducted with the State Auditor’s office.
- Recommend that DNR convene a meeting with staff and Policy Co-Chairs and the State Auditor’s office to understand the process and steps/needs of the auditor.
- Recommend that the Board ask each state agency affiliated with the AMP process prioritize an AMP Performance Audit with their state auditor requests.

The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.

Steve Barnowe-Meyer moved that any existing completed financial audit conducted by the DNR internal auditor be provided to TFW Policy and the Board. The motion was seconded.

Decision: Whereas an existing financial audit conducted by the DNR internal auditor has been in progress, Policy moves that if complete the financial audit report be provided to TFW Policy and the FP Board or a status update be given. The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.

Type N Alternative – Policy reviewed the Type N Alternative proposal that was approved at the December meeting in order to move toward a decision for a recommendation to the Board.

It was suggested to strike the word “minimization” in “Account for minimization of windthrow.” The edit was made in the meeting.

Policy also reviewed the draft Workgroup charter written by the Policy Co-Chairs. Terra suggested that Policy try to keep the charter specific, while also giving the workgroup the space it needs to function. The group clarified that the current document is not a consensus document. Edits to each section were recommended and agreed upon one by one. It was moved and seconded to accept the revised charter document.

Decision: Accept the Type Np Alternative Charter for delivery to the Board. The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.

Please see Attachment 2 for the complete Type Np proposal to the Board.

Action: Terra Rentz will draft a memo contextualizing the Type Np Workgroup charter to accompany the Board packet and circulate to Policy for high-level review by caucus representatives.

Small Forest Landowner Template Update – Marc Engel, DNR, and Ken Miller, WFFA, Workgroup Co-Chairs, reported that the Workgroup is continuing to review the proposed prescriptions. The group has also reviewed the other templates identified by the Board. The Workgroup aims to complete its tasks within two more meetings, with the goal of delivering recommendations by the March meeting mailing date. If the Workgroup does not complete its tasks, Policy will consider whether to extend the Workgroup timeline or make a decision on the results at hand.

Ken Miller moved that Policy direct the AMPA to amend Triangle Associates' contract to include facilitation and notetaking support for two additional meetings of the Small Forest Landowner Template Workgroup. The motion was seconded.

Decision: Direct the AMPA to include facilitation and notetaking support for two additional meetings of the Small Forest Landowner Template Workgroup. The Eastside Tribal caucus and Federal caucus were absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.

Next Steps – Policy reviewed the monthly workload document and the meeting schedule for 2019. There are rooms reserved at Ecology through June for Policy meetings.

Policy decided to hold a two-day meeting in March in order to discuss the budget.

Marc Gauthier, Upper Columbia United Tribes (UCUT), announced that NWIFC staff and SAG members are organizing a fire workshop in mid-May and suggested that Policy members consider attending. This could be an opportunity to hold a Policy meeting on the east side.

Action: Triangle will identify a potential meeting space north of SeaTac for one or more meetings from July to December.

Next meeting date: February 7, 2019, at the Department of Ecology R1S-16/17.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Attachment 1 – Participants by Caucus at 1/3 Meeting*

Conservation Caucus

*Alec Brown, WEC

County Caucus

Kendra Smith, Skagit County

*Scott Swanson, WSAC

Industrial Timber Landowner Caucus

*Darin Cramer, WFPA

Meghan Tuttle, Weyerhaeuser

Small Forest Landowner Caucus

*Steve Barnowe-Meyer, WFFA

*Ken Miller, WFFA

Harry Bell, WFFA

State Caucus – DNR

*Marc Engel, DNR

Marc Ratcliff, DNR

State Caucus – Ecology & WDFW

*Rich Doenges, Ecology

*Chris Conklin, WDFW

Mark Hicks, Ecology

Terra Rentz, WDFW and Co-Chair

Tribal Caucus – Westside

*Jim Peters, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission

Ash Roorbach, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission

Mark Mobbs, Quinault Indian Nation

Tribal Caucus – Eastside

Marc Gauthier, Upper Columbia United Tribes

*caucus representative

Others

Rachel Aronson, Triangle Associates

Annalise Ritter, Triangle Associates

Howard Haemmerle, Adaptive Management Program Project Manager

Attachment 2 – Type Np Alternative Consensus Proposal



State of Washington
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 43200, Olympia, WA 98504-3200 • (360) 902-2200 • TDD (360) 902-2207
Main Office Location: Natural Resources Building, 1111 Washington Street SE, Olympia, WA

January 8, 2019

TO: Forest Practices Board

FROM: Terra Rentz, Co-Chair, Timber, Fish, and Wildlife Policy Committee
Curt Veldhuisen, Co-Chair, Timber, Fish, and Wildlife Policy Committee

SUBJECT: Consensus proposal in response to study results of Type NP streams in Westside basalt lithology

On 12 July 2018 TFW Policy formally accepted the Findings Report and associated materials of the study entitled *Effectiveness of Experimental Riparian Buffers on Perennial Non-fish-bearing Streams on Competent Lithologies in Western Washington* (hereafter: Type N Hardrock Study). This action put into motion a 180-day timeline specified in Board Manual Section 22 that directs policy to (i) review and evaluate the findings, (ii) determine if the findings warrant action, and (iii) develop, and select by consensus, alternative actions for consideration by the Board. More specifically, Policy took action according to the following timeline:

- A. 12 July 2018 – Findings report and associated materials formally accepted (consensus)
- B. 26 August 2018 – Policy determined that the findings warrant action and approves the formation of a Workgroup to develop action alternatives for consideration (consensus)
- C. 25 October 2018 – Workgroup delivers action alternatives to Policy for consideration (no action)
- D. 6 December 2018 – Policy formally accepts an action alternative for Board consideration (consensus)
- E. 3 January 2019 – Policy approves a functioning Charter for the Technical Type Np Prescriptions Workgroup as a supplemental element of the action alternative (consensus)

After review of the findings, Policy affirms that the Type N Hardrock study indicates a temperature increase associated with the buffer treatments tested. Therefore, Policy agrees action is warranted. The following consensus proposal outlines an alternative action process including creation of a Technical Workgroup charged to develop proposed Riparian Management Zone (RMZ) buffer prescriptions for Type Np streams in Western Washington for Policy’s consideration. The associated workgroup charter is the product of the collaborative TFW Policy process with input from all caucuses. The purpose of the Charter is to guide workgroup operations, timeline, and outcomes and was approved by full consensus.

Policy requests that the Board accept the consensus proposal and associated Charter.

TFW Policy Consensus Proposal to the Board on a response to study results of the *Effectiveness of Experimental Riparian Buffers on Perennial Non-fish-bearing Streams on Competent Lithologies in Western Washington*

Approved v. 12-6-18

The *Effectiveness of Experimental Riparian Buffers on Perennial Non-fish-bearing Streams on Competent Lithologies in Western Washington* study (hereafter: Type Np Hardrock) indicates there is a temperature increase associated with the buffer treatments tested. Therefore, Policy agrees action is warranted. Policy recommends the following components:

1. Formation of a technical workgroup.
 - a. This workgroup shall be governed by a charter. The charter will be drafted by Policy member(s) and approved by Policy.
 - b. For efficient decision-making, the composition of the workgroup will include no more than 10 members:
 - i. Two representatives of Policy caucuses, one of whom will chair the process. The primary role of Policy members will be to manage the process. The policy members are non-voting in the workgroup.
 - ii. Up to eight people balanced among the following areas of expertise: biological and physical stream processes, and silviculture/field forestry.
 - iii. Additional experts can be added on a temporary, ad-hoc basis as needed per the direction of the workgroup.
 - iv. The caucuses and AMPA will put together a list of names for Policy to approve. Policy will choose potential members by least objectionable. In the event of a tie, there will be a random draw.
 - v. This workgroup will be staffed by a project manager from the AMP.
 - c. Expectations of the workgroup:
 - i. Meet on a regular and timely schedule
 - ii. Adhere to a timeline [established by the Board]
 - iii. Report regularly to Policy
 - d. The deliverable of the workgroup is a set of alternative Type Np prescriptions that meet the following objectives.
 - i. Protect water temperature to meet the rule (WAC 173-201A-200, -300-320)
 - ii. Are repeatable and enforceable
 - iii. Are operationally feasible
 - iv. Provide wood to the stream over time
 - v. Account for windthrow
 - vi. Consider options that allow for management in the RMZ
 - vii. Minimize additional economic impact
2. The workgroup shall utilize all relevant information to inform alternative prescriptions for Np streams, including available literature and data while adhering to the timeline.
3. Additional Type N projects currently in the CMER process shall also inform the workgroup, upon receipt of approved findings reports from CMER. Policy agrees to support timely completion of these projects, including regular status reports at Policy meetings. The projects include:

- a. Buffer-Shade Amphibian Response (anticipated Feb '19)
 - b. Buffer Characteristics, Integrity and Function (BCIF) (anticipated Spring '19)
 - c. Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment in Hard Rock Lithologies- Extended (anticipated September '19)
 - d. Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project in Soft Rock Lithology (anticipated December '19)
4. Policy agrees the Riparian Characteristics and Shade study should be funded and initiated as soon as possible. This study does not necessarily need to be completed for decision-making by the workgroup (see below), but it is expected that the study can inform the workgroup and vice-versa. It is anticipated that rulemaking will be needed to implement prescriptions that result from Policy's recommended actions.
 5. The workgroup process is expected to run concurrently with the CMER process associated with the remaining Type N projects, and conclude within 6 months of receipt of the final Type N study. A final Policy recommendation to the FPB is anticipated in mid to late 2020.

By the January 2019 Policy meeting, Policy will consider a draft charter for the technical workgroup reflective of the elements described in this proposal and that clearly articulates the manner in which the workgroup will conduct their analysis and their deliverables to Policy.

CHARTER: TECHNICAL TYPE NP PRESCRIPTIONS WORKGROUP

- I. **Date:** March 7, 2019
- II. **Project Duration:** March 7, 2019 through completion.
Completion is to occur six months after receipt of final affiliated report, estimated June 19, 2020

III. Introduction

This charter is intended to guide the formation and efforts of a Technical Type Np Prescriptions Workgroup (hereafter: Workgroup), which is a sub-group of the T/F/W Policy Committee (hereafter: Policy). The Workgroup will be formed as an outcome of alternative actions proposed by Policy in response to the study entitled *Effectiveness of Experimental Riparian Buffers on Perennial Non-fish-bearing Streams on Competent Lithologies in Western Washington* (hereafter: Hard Rock Study). The purpose of the workgroup is to develop proposed Riparian Management Zone (RMZ) buffer prescriptions for Type Np streams in Western Washington for Policy's consideration. Based on the scope of the Hard Rock Study, the initial focus is on western Washington streams in areas of hard rock lithology, to achieve temperature protection objectives. However, this scope may be expanded per the direction of Policy as more information becomes available.

Policy affirmed, through consensus, that the Type N Hard Rock Study indicated that there was a temperature increase associated with the buffer treatments tested. Therefore, Policy agreed the findings warrant action and proposed the following process components:

1. Formation of a technical workgroup, governed by a charter, to develop and deliver a set of proposed Type Np water RMZ buffer prescriptions that meet a suite of resource protection, feasibility, and economic objectives.
2. The workgroup will utilize all relevant information to inform proposed Type Np water RMZ buffer prescriptions for Np streams, including available literature and data while adhering to the timeline.
3. Inclusion of additional Type N related projects currently in the CMER process including the *Buffer Integrity – Shade Effectiveness (Amphibian)* project, *Westside Type N Buffer Characteristics, Integrity and Function* (BCIF) study, *Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment in Hard Rock Lithology - Phase II Extended Monitoring* study, and the *Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment in Soft Rock Lithologies* study. These products would be available for the workgroup upon delivery to Policy from CMER.
4. Expedited funding and implementation of the *Buffer Characteristics and Shade* study to both inform, and be informed by, the workgroup
5. Adherence to a timeline that is expected to run concurrently with the CMER process associated with remaining Type N projects and conclude within 6 months of receipt of the final study. At the time of drafting, the *Type N Soft Rock* study is anticipated to be the final study delivered by CMER in this series.

Policy anticipates that rulemaking will be needed to implement Type Np water RMZ buffer prescriptions that result from recommended actions.

IV. Workgroup Purpose

The purpose of the Workgroup is to develop proposed RMZ buffer prescriptions for perennial, non-fish bearing (Type Np) streams in western Washington that meet the following objectives:

- i. Protect water temperatures to meet the rule (WAC 173-201A-200, -300-320);
- ii. Are repeatable and enforceable;
- iii. Are operationally feasible;
- iv. Provide wood to the stream over time;
- v. Account for windthrow;
- vi. Consider options that allow for management (e.g. selective harvest) in the RMZ; and
- vii. Minimize additional economic impact.

Although the site specificity of the *Type N Hard Rock* study applies to above ground stream components in basalt (hard rock) lithology, Policy may expand the objectives and/or geologic/geographic applicability of proposed prescriptions if findings from subsequent Type N projects warrant action.

The workgroup shall understand results of the *Type N Hard Rock* study and utilize all available information to inform the development of proposed RMZ buffer prescriptions for Np streams as described above, including best available science and related documents from within the Adaptive Management Program (AMP), and additional final CMER-approved findings reports from Type N projects. These studies include:

- A. Buffer Integrity – Shade Effectiveness (Amphibian) Project
- B. Westside Type N Buffer Characteristics, Integrity and Function (BCIF)
- C. Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment in Hard Rock Lithology - Phase II Extended Monitoring
- D. Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment in Soft Rock Lithologies

As each study becomes available, the Workgroup will assess its implications and incorporate the new results into the Workgroup's ongoing work, per Policy's direction. These studies and their associated findings are the products of an agreed upon process within WAC 222-12-045. It is not the role of the Workgroup to reanalyze the Type N Hard Rock study, or the additional Type N projects listed above, to refute the findings produced through the CMER process.

Policy expects the Workgroup to understand the findings and full reports of the Type N Hard Rock study, and subsequent projects and, if needed, solicit additional input from project Principal Investigators (PIs) or outside experts to identify knowledge gaps and gain a better understanding of the CMER research. The Workgroup may employ any necessary information gathering, synthesis, and/or understand cause and effects to inform prescription development. However, Policy expects the Workgroup to adhere to the timeline established in Section VI of the Charter.

V. Deliverables

1. Development of one or more RMZ forest practice prescriptions for perennial, non-fish bearing (Type Np) streams in western Washington that meet the objectives in section IV.
2. Estimate the level of effectiveness of proposed Type Np water RMZ buffer prescriptions at meeting resource objectives identified in Schedule L1 of the Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan using literature, modelling or other methods.

- Submission of final report no later than 6 months post-receipt of final Type Np study (estimated June 19, 2020) to Policy that articulates Deliverables 1 and 2, any major process findings, and any areas of non-consensus.

VI. Timeline and Milestones

Task	Anticipated Timeline*
Board acceptance of Policy Proposal	February 2019
Workgroup is convened	March 2019
Workgroup members become familiar with Type N Hard Rock study results and Washington State water quality standards.	April 2019
Receipt of Buffer-Shade Amphibian Response study	Early Spring 2019
Written update for Policy and Board (I)	April 19, 2019
Receipt of Buffer Characteristics, Integrity & Function study	Late Spring 2019
Written update for Policy and Board (II)	July 19, 2019
Receipt of Hard Rock Phase II Extended study	Fall 2019
Written update for Policy and Board (III)	October 25, 2019
Workgroup drafts new Type Np prescriptions for initial Policy review	Early Winter 2019
Receipt of type N Soft Rock study and findings	Winter (<i>Est. Dec 2019</i>)
Written update for Policy and Board (IV)	January 24, 2020
Workgroup update, if necessary, proposed Type Np water RMZ buffer prescriptions based on review of Type Np Soft Rock study findings	3 months post Soft Rock (<i>early Spring 2020</i>)
Written update for Policy and Board (V)	April 24, 2020
Final submission of deliverables to policy	6 months post final Type Np study (estimated June 19, 2020)

*The dates in this timeline are subject to change based on the dates of receipt of the Type Np studies and other factors. The Workgroup will adjust as necessary to accomplish its deliverables within the allotted overall schedule.

Process and Milestones

The following process steps are recommended to complete the deliverable:

- Review the completed Hard Rock report and associated findings;
- Review and understand Forest Practice rules associated with Type Np streams and how Washington's water quality standards apply to forest practices;
- Identify information gaps and assess available information to assist Workgroup in deriving proposed Type Np water RMZ buffer prescriptions;
- On an ongoing basis, review newly completed Type N related studies and their associated findings; integrate relevant information into decision making process; consider field visits/practical field application time as needed;
- Develop a suite of possible alternatives and assess on-the-ground feasibility;
- Through consensus, select final prescription(s) for recommendation to Policy;
- Develop associated language that articulates how/where to implement a given prescription;

8. Aggregate proposed prescriptions and a description of the process pursued, additional resources utilized, and any other relevant information into a final proposal for Policy’s consideration.

VII. Membership & Composition

Workgroup Name	Role
[Insert Workgroup roster once completed]	

Composition

The workgroup consists of two representatives of Policy, one of whom will serve as Chair and up to eight experts with the following areas of expertise: biological and physical stream processes, and silviculture/field forestry.

An Adaptive Management Program Project Manager, [NAME], will serve as staff support for the workgroup. Specifically, the Project Manager will be responsible for assisting with meeting logistics, providing necessary materials related to the AMP process, and securing resources, as necessary, to achieve the workgroup’s objective.

Expectations

All workgroup members shall operate as technical experts and will not serve as representatives for any specific caucus. However, an understanding of the field and policy context will be valuable. Because familiarity and continuity among members are crucial to timely completion, meetings will require participation by all members. With Workgroup approval, members may invite associates to provide additional information. Associates' role will be technical, short-term, and specific.

Workgroup members agree to:

- Acquire a deep understanding of past and incoming CMER studies on Type N streams;
- Familiarize themselves with other related materials in preparation of the meeting;
- Assist in the identification and evaluation of relevant non-CMER studies;
- Read and understand Forest Practices WACs relevant to Type Np prescriptions;
- Meet on a regular and timely schedule;
- Attend all meetings (in-person or by phone);
- Adhere to the timeline; and
- Assist in reporting regularly to policy.

VIII. Group Process and Governance

Norms

The Workgroup will follow standard Policy norms and ground rules. However, the small size and technical nature of the work may allow for a more informal approach than occurs at Policy meetings. Members of the Workgroup agree to collectively provide a collaborative space to foster the development and presentation of proposed Type Np water RMZ buffer prescriptions that achieve the aforementioned objectives.

Meetings will be open to the public, but with no public comment.

Governance

The Workgroup will actively work toward consensus. If there is a lack of consensus, a simple majority vote can occur to move a decision forward. Majority-minority reports will be catalogued for all non-consensus decisions.

It is the role of Workgroup co-chairs to inform Policy of non-consensus issues and to elevate those issues, if needed, for Policy resolution.

Roles and Responsibilities

Chair & Alternate

- **Run workgroup meetings that maintain open and productive discussion and decision making;**
- **Work with Project Manager (PM) to set up meeting schedule in advance;**
- **Work with PM and Workgroup members to develop a work plan that meets deliverables, expectations, and timelines as articulated in the Charter;**
- **Work with PM to ensure that meeting announcements and meeting summaries are prepared and distributed;**
- Provide written and oral updates to TFW Policy on Workgroup progress, issues, and decisions according to the timeline;

- Provide updates to the Workgroup on status of affiliated CMER studies and/or pertinent decisions or discussions made by Policy; and
- Identify if the workgroup is at an impasse and notify Policy immediately with a recommended course of action.

Project Manager

- Serves as staff support to the Workgroup;
- Assist Chair with meeting logistics and providing necessary materials related to the AMP process;
- Post on the TFW Policy Website Workgroup meetings, agendas, and relevant materials for the public; and
- Work with AMPA to identify and secure any necessary resources to achieve the Workgroup's objectives – if funding is needed, work with the AMP Administrator (AMPA) and Policy to determine availability of funds.

Workgroup Technical Members

- Provide expertise that helps solve technical problems related to developing new Type Np prescriptions that meet the objectives articulated in the Charter;
 - Along with the Type N Hard Rock study results, become familiar with the other CMER Type N study results when available;
 - Attend in person or via conference line/video link all regularly scheduled workgroup meetings;
 - Participate in organized field trips;
 - Be prepared for regularly scheduled workgroup meetings and complete assigned tasks within agreed upon deadlines;
 - As requested by Workgroup Chair, attend Policy meetings and provide updates to Policy members;
 - Follow guidelines established by the workgroup Charter; and
- Adhere to Workgroup ground rules.