

Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee  
 July 6, 2017 Meeting Summary

Actions and Decisions from Meeting

Action	Assignment
1. Draft the October 2-day agenda and send out sooner than later.	Co-Chairs, Hans, Claire
2. Confirm that line 32 on the Master Project Schedule is or is not a Clean Water Act (CWA) assurance project.	Rich Doenges
3. Bring a report to a future Policy meeting about how the outcomes of CWA projects would meet the CWA assurances and would inform the work of the subgroup.	Rich Doenges
4. Develop next iteration of budget criteria.	Budget Subgroup: Terry, Rich, Karen, Ray, Mary with input from Michelle and Mark H
5. Look at Schedules L-1 and L-2 to see if anything is left out in the MPS list.	Scott

Decision	Notes
1. Accepted as final the June meeting summary with minor edits.	Consensus from all caucuses
2. Approved the structure for the 1.5-day October meeting and field tour (see pages 2-3).	

**Welcome, Introductions, and Old Business** – Scott Swanson, Co-Chair of the Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee (“Policy”), welcomed participants and led introductions (*please see Attachment 1 for a list of participants*). He reviewed the draft agenda which had no suggested changes.

*Announcements*

- Marty Acker apologized for missing the June 1-2 meeting and field tour; he clarified that it was not due to federal travel restrictions but a family medical emergency.
- Steve Barnowe-Meyer has continued working on potential sites near the Olympia area that would be conducive to seeing the wet season default methodology issue in the October meeting. He has been talking with willing landowners and will keep Policy updated on the progress for that field tour. Steve is also open to other caucuses helping to identify sites.

*Draft June Meeting Summary* – Policy identified a few edits to the June draft meeting summary.

**Decision:** the draft was accepted as final by all caucuses with those edits.

**CMER Updates** – Doug Hooks, Co-Chair of the Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research Committee (CMER), updated Policy on several projects CMER is currently working on, including:

- The Fire Salvage Literature Synthesis is complete and CMER will review for approval at their July meeting. At that point, they will develop a Findings Report and 6 Questions response for

Policy, and due to being a literature synthesis, CMER has discretion as to whether or not to send it to independent scientific peer review (ISPR).

- The Hardwood Conversion Project has received comments from the Riparian Scientific Advisory Group (RSAG) which the authors are reviewing now along with any other comments from CMER through August 7. Then it will go to ISPR and then CMER will develop a Findings Report and 6 Questions response for Policy.
- The Wetlands Mapping Tool will be presented to CMER at the July meeting and likely not presented to Policy because it is a GIS tool, not a study that could affect the rules. They have found that the tool is a learning algorithm that can be applied to an existing wetlands GIS layer, but if there is no existing wetlands layer than the tool will not be as helpful.
- The Uplands Scientific Advisory Group (UPSAG) is reviewing the Deep-Seated Landslides Literature Synthesis and will hopefully approve at the July meeting. Then they will develop a Findings Report and 6 Questions response for Policy.
- The Eastside Timber Habitat Evaluation project is still ongoing.
- CMER will receive a presentation at their July meeting about the Riparian Extensive Monitoring project, and Policy will receive a presentation soon thereafter.
- The BTO Add-On project is collecting comments from CMER through July 31 and may be ready for the August CMER meeting.
- The Forested Wetlands Effectiveness and Unstable Slopes Criteria TWIGs are still working on their study design based on the Policy-approved alternative.
- CMER just received comments on the ENREP project.
- CMER hopes to approve Chapter 7 of the Protocols & Standards Manual at the July meeting and then start work on Chapter 8.
- Updates on the Hard Rock study:
  - CMER hopes to review and approve Chapters 7 and 17 at the July meeting.
  - There has been confusion about the purpose of Chapter 17: it started as Chapter 18, and has also moved from being a “synthesis chapter” (which would have summarized what the implications are from all chapters) to being a “discussions chapter” (which condenses the results without analysis).
  - There was some disagreement in reporting how the CMER comments have been incorporated into Chapter 17, and by what deadlines.
  - The Adaptive Management Program Administrator (AMPA) still expects that there will be a special session to present all the chapters, and hopes that the Findings Report and 6 Questions response for Policy will be available at the same time. Ideally, this would be at the October 5 Policy meeting.

Policy discussed how to structure the October Policy meeting, with the decision including:

- Thursday, October 5 will be a regular Policy all-day meeting with half the day dedicated to the Hard Rock presentations.
- Regular Policy business the other half of the day would include an update from DNR about what they have updated in the water typing rules prior to presenting them to the Board at their November meeting.
- The field tour will be from 8am-1pm on Friday, October 6. This will be a good time of year to see how the dry season methodology works and then compare to the wet season default methodologies that have been waiting for further Policy discussion.

- The Co-Chairs, AMPA, and facilitator will work to develop a draft agenda and share with the caucuses earlier than normal.
- The federal caucus asked that as much as possible, Policy stick with one-day meetings.

**Type F Update** – The AMPA updated Policy on the work of the Potential Habitat Break (PHB) technical group, which is working towards a deliverable to the Board at their August meeting. Updates included:

- The AMPA hopes to share the technical group’s work with Policy at their August meeting, ahead of the August Board meeting.
- Data sharing has included data from several industrial companies, Washington Trout, CMER studies, the model development project, DNR State Lands, U.S. Forest Service, eastside data, and information from approved Water Type Modification Forms (WTMFs). There will likely be more data from industrial companies.
  - The eastside tribal and federal caucuses expressed concern that the Washington Forest Protection Association (WFPA) is compiling data from industrial companies. The industrial timber landowners caucus explained that WFPA member companies asked WFPA to compile the data because each company has different ways of collecting their data. The data is directly from concurred-with WTMFs and where available, survey data from companies that have collected that information in individual databases.
  - With all this information, the AMPA expressed confidence in having a reasonable recommendation to the Board under the tight timeline.
  - The eastside tribal caucus asked if WFPA could share their screening process or decision tree in compiling this data. The AMPA clarified that the report to the Board from the technical group will address all the data considered and those found not to fit, specifically the quality of information used.
  - The federal caucus expressed interest in other information in order not to be concerned that the technical group’s work will be biased on this screened data. The AMPA noted that there are other datasets, such as the CMER studies that includes original data, that will be separate from the WTMFs data from industrial companies.
- The AMPA is available for any additional questions outside of the Policy meeting.

**SFLOs Database** – Ken Miller reminded Policy that the small forest landowners caucus (SFLOs) have a proposal for a westside alternate template and hope to have an eastside alternate template proposal in the near future. Policy may wish to look at site-specific potential risks to resources and landscape-level risks and cumulative effects, which Ken thinks could be helped by the database. Luke Rogers from the University of Washington’s Precision Forestry Cooperative presented on the database; highlights included:

- History of developing the database:
  - DNR was mandated to generate reports for the legislature (as stipulated in the Forests & Fish Report), so they started talking with counties back in 2001.
  - In 2002, a validation study was completed to compare tabular data from counties with the spatial data from only a few counties. Then they made the first “spatially-approximate” map of SFLOs in Washington which showed distribution and acreage of SFLOs. This showed that SFLOs are largely in the lower watersheds (e.g., on more Type F streams).
  - In 2003, there was the 20-acre exemption work.
  - In 2004, they also looked at areas with good data on fish blockages and did barrier assessments.

- In 2005, the Family Forest Foundation & the Washington Family Forest Association (WFFA) received \$1 million from the federal budget to build a database of all landowners across the state. They worked with UW to build the database and then developed a survey to inform relevance of the data.
- In 2007, they had the statewide parcel dataset which combined data from counties, BLM, DNR, WDFW, and Parks into one dataset. Then they looked at owner classes so they could identify forestland across the state.
- Now that the dataset is done, the data can be organized in almost any way to create maps, graphs, a biomass calculator, parcel ownership by cost of parcel, fish and non-fish stream miles by WRIA, etc. The type of information they have learned from the dataset includes: 80% of the SFLOs own 80 acres or less; half of SFLOs have no streams on their property.
- WFFA/UW have not been funded to do any future work. Ideally, the database would be updated since it has not been fully updated since 2007.
- Necessary updates total around \$500,000. The break down includes:
  - Update parcel database (\$190,000);
  - Review all forestland parcels (\$85,000);
  - Develop the next generation in state resource assessments (\$225,000); and then
  - Make the database widely available.

#### *Discussion*

- UW cannot request legislative funding but can inform the legislature which they have done a few times. The bulk of their funding is through grant proposals.
- It is hard to know how much of the data is out of date. Some of the data has been updated in the last ten years and Policy could use that, but Luke cautioned against using the 2007 data.
- There is no current relationship between this work and the work of the economic census, though it could be a potential funding source.
- Ken Miller encouraged caucuses to support funding for UW to update the database. Several caucus representatives said they would bring the idea back to their caucus.

#### *Update on the SFLOs Alternate Template Subgroup*

- Ken Miller and Marc Engel anticipate scheduling the Subgroup to meet again in the late summer or in September.
- The Subgroup will first focus on bringing Ken Miller and Steve Barnowe-Meyer up to speed on their work so far, and then to see what the initial findings are from the ongoing science review.
- The hope is to have a Subgroup report to Policy in January.

#### **Legislative Updates**

- The state approved an operating budget by June 30<sup>th</sup> but has not yet approved a capital budget.
- DNR has a status quo operating budget, and they thanked caucuses who helped make the case to legislators about why a proposed cut of \$1.1 million to DNR would be problematic.
- The Adaptive Management Program saw the anticipated fund shift of \$1.5 million dollars. This means it does not cut the budget but will affect future years of funding.
- State agencies also saw a management cut of 6%.

**Board Subcommittee on the AMP** – The AMPA updated Policy on the first meeting of this Board Subcommittee, which met on June 16. The Subcommittee chair is Lisa Janicki and members include Dave

Herrera, Paula Swedeen, Brent Davies, and Stephen Bernath. They discussed the AMPA's recommendations as presented at the May Board meeting and discussed the need to hire a neutral facilitator to convene a principals' meeting. The hope is that meeting would happen in late 2017.

The Subcommittee will meet next on July 12 from 9-11am and will focus that discussion on the scope of work for a facilitator for the principals' meeting. There will likely be another meeting between July 12 and the August Board meeting.

It is likely that DNR will hire the facilitator through a competitive process and then that facilitator would probably do individual interviews prior to the principals' meeting, so it makes sense that the meeting will not be for some time.

The AMPA also noted that the performance and financial audits are built into the program and expect that any other recommendations related to AMP improvements do not have to wait for the audits which are likely a year away.

**Program Priorities and Budget** – The AMPA and Co-Chairs introduced this topic as important to make sure that the AMP projects are well-prioritized and sequenced within the Master Project Schedule (MPS), that there is an agreed-upon process for when new studies come up, and that there is an agreed-upon process for how projects come off the MPS list. Discussion included:

- Policy put together a decision tree for prioritization a few years ago, but the Co-Chairs and AMPA hope that Policy can further discuss how to address the projects in the MPS (e.g., several TWIG projects have not yet moved into field implementation and because those are expensive, Policy should make sure there is a prescribed order of doing those projects so that there is no budget over-extension).
- The WDFW representative remembered that CMER and Policy used to prioritize projects based on resource risk and scientific uncertainty.
- There was interest in Ecology clarifying the Clean Water Act assurance projects because they are expensive. Ecology will look into clarifying the outcomes of the CWA projects so it is clearer how those studies will meet the CWA assurance(s).
- The industrial timber landowner caucus suggested more check-ins on projects to see if extended monitoring is still necessary.
- The settlement agreement set in place the priorities that Policy currently has for projects but there is other information that could be used in prioritization, such as Schedules L-1 and L-2. Additionally, the federal caucus reminded Policy that there is a research schedule in the Habitat Conservation Plan that is a part of maintaining the permit.
- Policy realized that lines 38 and 46 of the MPS should be updated to denote they are CWA assurance projects.
- The federal caucus also suggested that, if there is a specific set of research needs, the budget requests reflect the anticipated costs, instead of limiting budget requests to a stable value.
- The industrial timber landowner caucus reminded Policy that the B&O tax surcharge ends on June 30, 2024. Because the state budgets on a four-year basis, in order for that surcharge to be extended and not show up as a negative impact on the state budget, Policy has until 2020 to get that done so it is probably best to start the strategy now.
- Policy started a prioritization criteria table and assigned a subgroup to work on developing more thoughts on prioritization before the August meeting. Terry Jackson, Karen Terwilliger, Ray

Entz, Rich Doenges, and Mary Scurlock agreed to be on the subgroup with input from Mark Hicks and Michelle Wilcox. The subgroup will consider these topics that came up in this meeting:

- Make sure projects in the MPS are sequenced correctly;
- Reduce stress on out-years (e.g., the “bow wave effect”);
- Create a process for new studies that could be developed;
- Create a process for how projects could come off the MPS;
- Consider what to do about the extended monitoring studies;
- Report from Ecology on the outcomes of CWA projects and how that satisfies the CWA assurances; and
- Staffing the AMP to ensure the entire state has coverage.

The Co-Chairs adjourned the meeting at 2:45 pm.

Attachment 1 – Attendance by Caucus at 7/6/17 Meeting

**Conservation Caucus**

\*Mary Scurlock, M. Scurlock & Associates

**County Caucus**

\*Scott Swanson, Washington State Association  
of Counties, Co-Chair  
Kendra Smith, Skagit County (phone)

**Federal Caucus**

\*Marty Acker, USFWS (phone)  
\*Michelle Wilcox, EPA

**Industrial Timber Landowners Caucus**

\*Karen Terwilleger, WFPA  
Doug Hooks, WFPA

**Small Forest Landowners Caucus**

\*Steve Barnowe-Meyer, WFFA  
\*Ken Miller, WFFA  
Elaine Oneil, WFFA

\*Caucus representative

**Others**

Hans Berge, AMPA  
Heather Gibbs, AMP  
Luke Rogers, University of Washington Forestry Precision Cooperative  
Claire Chase, Triangle Associates

**DNR Caucus**

\*Marc Engel, DNR  
Joe Shramek, DNR

**WDFW/Ecology Caucus**

\*Rich Doenges, Ecology  
\*Terry Jackson, WDFW  
Mark Hicks, Ecology

**Tribal Caucus – Eastside**

\*Ray Entz, Kalispel/UCUT, Co-Chair (phone)  
Marc Gauthier, UCUT (phone)

**Tribal Caucus – Westside**

Mark Mobbs, Quinault Indian Nation  
\*Jim Peters, Northwest Indian Fisheries  
Commission (NWIFC)  
Ash Roorbach, NWIFC

Attachment 2 – Ongoing Priorities Checklist

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Assignment</b>	<b>Status &amp;Notes</b>
<b>Type N</b>	Type N policy subgroup	Caucuses are encouraged to talk offline about the wet season default methodology.
<b>Type F</b>	Policy	At regular meetings and in mediation, Policy is working towards responding to the February 2014 Board motions (specific to off-channel habitat and electrofishing) in addition to other related water typing issues (such as default physical criteria, recovery, habitat, etc.).
<b>Small Forest Landowners Westside Template</b>	SFLOs Template Subgroup	Subgroup is meeting separately; co-chaired by Marc Engel and Ken Miller.
<b>Unstable Slopes</b>	Policy	UPSAG hired a contractor to do a glacial deep-seated literature synthesis. Policy will present their perspective on the unstable slopes proposal initiation to the Board in May 2017.
<b>Ongoing CMER reports reviewed by Policy</b>	Doug Hooks & Todd Baldwin, CMER Co-Chairs	CMER Co-Chairs to give update(s) as needed at Policy meetings; AMPA to give quarterly reports for when CMER studies to come to Policy.

\*This table notes 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

<b>Entity/Group/Subgroup</b>	<b>Next Meeting Date</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>TFW Policy Committee</b>	August 3	
<b>CMER</b>	July 25	
<b>Type N Policy Subgroup</b>	To be addressed at the August 3 Policy meeting	
<b>Type F</b>		The water typing mediation is complete and the AMPA and Co-Chairs presented the outcome to the Board at the May meeting. Additional technical work is ongoing.
<b>Forest Practices Board</b>	August 9	
<b>Small Forest Landowners Template Subgroup</b>	TBD	As workload allows.