

People, Timber, Forests, Fish, and Wildlife:
An Assessment of the Conflict and Collaboration Dynamics in Washington
2019- 2020

Prepared by Francine Madden, Center for Conservation Peacebuilding (CPeace)

Acknowledgements:

As the third party neutral (TPN), I wish to express my deep gratitude to the 139 individuals who generously shared their time, wisdom, needs, concerns, insights and experience through the course of this assessment, with a special note of appreciation for the tribal leaders, members and citizens who welcomed me onto their land in the course of this assessment. My attempt to understand the long and rich history of collaboration and conflict, the complex current dynamics, and the many hopes, needs, and concerns for the future across all caucuses would not have been possible without the generosity, candor, and thoughtfulness of those whose voices and perspectives are reflected in this report.

While all conversations were and will be held in confidence, this report provides an overview of the dynamics currently in Washington as the 139 individuals interviewed perceive them, including some perspective on how things evolved over time. This report is intended to convey those voices and perspectives and create mutual understanding of the needs and concerns across and within caucuses, while ensuring equity in information sharing.

The conversations that led to this report provided an opportunity for all who participated to share the successes and air their grievances – a crucial first step toward readiness in the effort to deeply listen and understand, repair and strengthen relationships, and to genuinely and fully come together to carve a path forward, finding creative, collaborative, shared solutions to old and new challenges.

Methodology and Purpose:

Between November 2019 and May 2020, the TPN interviewed 139 people relevant to Timber, Fish and Wildlife (TFW), the Forest and Fish Report (FFR), the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and the Adaptive Management Program (AMP). The TPN used a modified snowball approach to identify key people to meet in person or speak with over Zoom, Skype or telephone. Starting with an initial list of diverse engaged caucus members provided by the WA Department of Natural Resources (DNR), the TPN invited those she met with to contribute additional names of people or groups who would be critical to her developing a full understanding of the past and present dynamics around a multi-decade collaboration effort around issues of timber, forests, fish and wildlife. The TPN was able to speak with nearly everyone suggested by more than one individual, as well as most people who were suggested only by a single individual. That said, a few recommended individuals or people in key positions were not accessible during the course

of this assessment. Thus, those who participated in this assessment process represent a vast majority, but not an exhaustive list, of those who could have been or may need to be engaged with going forward. Many people were met or spoken with multiple times. Contact time ranged from 1-4 hours for each interview. Most initial interviews averaged approximately 2 hours. This report is a distillation and direct conveying of the views and perspectives shared during the assessment. To ensure fidelity within each section, caucus-specific sections of a draft version of this report were thoroughly reviewed by multiple members of each caucus (with the exception of the county caucus section which had one reviewer) to ensure accuracy of diverse perspectives within each caucus. A cross-section of individuals across diverse caucuses also reviewed the overview, historical and AMP/FPB sections of the report with the author. All reviews were done verbally and individual reviews were limited to the perspectives from within their own caucus.

Interviews were largely open-ended. Interviews generally began with an effort to first understand the broader issues, concerns, opportunities, challenges each person or group faces within and outside the context of the scope of this assessment. As every case or conflict exists in a broader system of change, processes, events and realities, having a sense of this broader context is useful for determining where TFW/AMP/FFR fits within the person's or group's priorities and concerns. Following this, interviewees were asked 'what was working well and what needed improvement' within the TFW/FFR/AMP/HCP realm. The question was balanced to allow the individual to speak to whatever was most important to him/her and to ensure that both the positive and negative issues were given space to be honored in the context of the interview. As the individual interview and/or the assessment process proceeded and as information was gathered, the TPN periodically targeted questions to specific concerns, needs, and issues expressed by them or others to assess the existence or magnitude of existence, and understand the nuances, of that concern within or across caucuses.

The purpose of this assessment was:

- 1) to meet with and learn from a diversity of people representing various levels of historic and current engagement, influence, leadership, knowledge, and concern regarding the timber, forest, fish and wildlife issues,
- 2) to identify and begin filling in gaps in leadership that were discussed during the June 2019 workshop, as well as those which were subsequently reported to exist across multiple caucuses throughout the course of this assessment, and
- 3) to provide a means to engage diverse caucus, group, company or tribal re-engagement where engagement has waned over time and interest in re-engagement may have been low.

The challenges in achieving the above included:

- 1) a need to balance engaging sufficient numbers and diversity of voices and perspectives among what could have been many hundreds of people, while ensuring efficiency over the course of the assessment,
- 2) a multi-decade trend where leaders and key actors from various caucuses have increasingly disengaged from direct participation in the collaborative process or delegated engagement to those with less decision-making authority,

3) unforeseen events, especially the novel coronavirus, cut short some efforts to continue making progress toward achieving access to higher level decision-makers and leaders and, finally,

4) several participants in this assessment process felt their best chance of motivating and engaging higher level leadership from within their own caucus or community would come after this assessment was written, disseminated and read. This pivotal and common sentiment made the need for a more comprehensive conflict assessment report, which was not initially planned for, a necessity for maximizing the likelihood of future engagement and progress.

Indeed, following up from this assessment, and despite renewed commitment to engagement by numerous leaders, additional work will be needed to circle back to key figures to “set the table” for a high-level leadership, or principals, process that can create, sustain, or re-imagine the spirit and productivity as was articulated and set forth in the original TFW agreement.

Overview of the Conflict and Collaboration Dynamics:

Naturally, opinions and perspectives vary, sometimes greatly, within and between caucuses and ranged from a sense that things are mostly working or working well enough, to a declaration that things are completely broken; from a feeling that the problem is relationships to a sense that the problem is the structure and process; from a sense that the status quo is largely acceptable to a sense that the current situation is deeply and urgently intolerable.

Largely, participants expressed satisfaction and praise for what the original agreements initially accomplished, including the creating the spirit of TFW, as well as many instances of current success on the ground in forest practices. Those who spoke to the longer history of conflict around forestry recognized and articulated that a lot of positive progress had been made, though mostly people spoke to earlier and especially point-in-time progress after agreements were made, or the scientific research since then. It was frequently noted that the world in which decisions are being made now is a lot different than when the TFW agreement, or even the HCP, was made. And while many are feeling discouraged about the possibility of positive change going forward, participants consistently expressed desire for improved relationships and a rekindling of a collective spirit of “give and take” and “solving each other’s problems” that many felt embodied the original TFW agreement. That said, there was also a widespread feeling across all caucuses of imbalance in the “give and take” where consistently caucus members (from all non-agency caucuses) expressed that they or their caucus were the ones who had given more (often significantly more) compared to other caucuses.

Meanwhile there was a consistently expressed frustration, across all caucuses, and often a sense of futility regarding the current dynamics within the Adaptive Management Program (AMP). There was widespread concern about a lack of engagement at the leadership or decision-maker level, and a broad sense that there has been a longstanding gap in visionary, collaborative leadership on all sides since the initial leadership of the TFW agreement. There was a lack of clarity in how or whether it’s possible to re-engage higher leadership now, especially among tribes and large timber companies, given how conditions, structures and priorities for one or both have changed over the last couple decades. Even where there is an interest in doing the relationship-building work, there was often a lack of even knowing who to reach out to, or how to reach key individuals, in order to try to re-establish a relationship.

There are common concerns about a loss of historical perspective, a lack of awareness and shared spirit of engagement among those currently involved, and a lack of shared understanding regarding the original intent or goals of early agreements and how they may conflict or align with existing rules. As one example of the latter, which was highlighted repeatedly by all sides, there is a fundamental disagreement over whether agreements, rules, implementation and compliance is or should be based on “fish presence” or recoverable or suitable “fish habitat” including protecting fish at all life stages. Divergent interpretations has created a reported cascade of conflict. Further, there is a lack of clarity on the end game regarding what success should look like for both economic viability and ecological goals.

There was an expressed need to reconcile past and current conflicts and provide for better onboarding and succession planning for the current and next generations of those engaged with and leading shared progress. There is a general sense that divisions across caucuses are deeper now than ever before, self-interest is more prevalent now, and that arguments over science or the interpretation of results is a means to articulate a deeper conflict between caucuses. Despite some wondering if what's needed is to unravel past progress or dismantle existing agreements, many of these same people expressed a (often reluctant) willingness to try again if the process going forward is productive and honest and demonstrated results within a discrete period of time (usually 1-2 years).

There are significant and widespread concerns about power and its imbalances among caucuses and in this process. Individuals on all sides expressed concern about other individuals or groups, including, occasionally, members of their own caucus, using the process as a weapon against others or to secure their own interests (individual or caucus interests).

There are other common themes of concern across caucuses. For instance, many expressed frustration with the slow nature of the adaptive management process, particularly where it is perceived to be caused by efforts to intentionally delay or stall progress, revisit issues or decisions already agreed upon, or in an attempt to resist needed change and maintain the status quo. On the other hand, considerable frustration and suspicion erupts when it is perceived that one caucus is trying to advance their own science or solutions by bypassing the existing procedures in AMP. And while many of these same people acknowledged that adaptive management is designed to be slow and methodical, many across most caucuses point to a lack of changes to rule making over 15-20 years as an indication of a deeper problem that is people-centered, process-centered, or both. On the other side, others, especially among the non-agency large and small timber interests, feel that a lack of change in rules over the years may be a clear indication that the initial conditions put in place were largely accurate and the lack of needed change today reflects the good judgment and significant action taken at the onset or that there has been insufficient or inadequate science to warrant significant changes currently, especially as this may violate the principle of "shared risk".

There is considerable divergence among caucuses in their interpretations of what is contained in the Forest and Fish Report (FFR) and the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). Ready knowledge about what is contained in the HCP was self-reported as low among those with whom this topic arose. That said, individuals were able to recall or point to elements of the HCP/FFR that validate their current frustrations, actions or concerns. Some pointed out that as a result of a lack of shared clarity and understanding of the whole, including overarching goals and foundational tenets of the agreements, current disputes tend to become more polarized because individuals and caucuses operate under different interpretations of what the foundational agreement or goals contained. Several emphasized that the caucuses need to go back to the original agreements and together come to a shared understanding of what was and wasn't agreed to, rather than rely on word-of-mouth interpretations or current perceptions that skew along the lines of single caucus interests. The basic premise of the AMP is also a point

of contention in terms of when and how rules change with respect to science, certainty, and risk.

Underlying these questions, many spoke to differences in perceived risk to caucus interests and what was acceptable or not in terms of various levels of certainty or uncertainty. Perceptions of increased economic risk or regulatory uncertainty produces a resistance to what is perceived as change for the sake of change without high degrees of scientific certainty. Perceptions of increased ecological risk associated with maintaining the status quo produces a greater inclination toward stricter regulations to reduce uncertainty for fish, wildlife, and habitat. Further exacerbating the tension is a question about what it means to have sufficient certainty, in science, in regulation, in the environment, or in business. Similarly, a goal of regulatory stability could be perceived, depending on the person, as being achieved with minor, modest or significant change, once every year, or 5 years, or once every 50 years. This push and pull results in caucuses feeling legitimate and valid in advocating for or resisting change while they are then perceived by the other as relentlessly wanting change or never allowing change. Finally, further exacerbating current negative dynamics are long-standing concerns of promises unfulfilled, of needs not having been met, or of external changes in the enabling environment (social, structural, political, economic, cultural, ecological) over the last 20-30 years limiting individual and caucus receptivity or capacity to give now.

That said, many spoke to a need for collective perspective taking in terms of honoring the before (20-30 years ago) and after (since then), celebrating the achievements and recognizing the fact that all caucuses have far more that can or does bring them together than that which divides them. And despite significantly more time spent explaining what the challenges are, many across the caucuses also kept those problems in context with the accomplishments and their commitment to collaboration. In fact, the desire for a set of constructive, positive processes that would honor and nurture the good, engage in power balancing, relinquish weapons, and provide for genuinely shared goal setting (or clarifying) and problem solving was widely supported – this includes some cases, where revitalization could trigger positive ripple effects in other processes, systems, and sectors of society.

Historical Perspectives:

Perceptions of historical context include a continued feeling of celebration and historical achievement for what was accomplished 15-30 years ago to a sense that things were incredibly difficult decades ago and that that reality has been glossed over during the ensuing decades. Many who were “in the room” back then report that the leadership was both essential and admirable, the accomplishments were great, but also that work was left undone and the conflicts that exist now existed then, as well. Some also note that what brought the caucuses together initially was a significant crisis combined with the shared realization of what the unfortunate consequences would be if collaboration wasn’t undertaken in earnest.

Some reported that “everyone came to agreement” while others pointed out that key tribes, conservation organizations, and some large timber companies walked away from the

discussions and negotiations. Some feel that a lack of full reconciliation of those deeper conflicts back then, or a lack of working through critical details at that time has ‘kicked the can down the road’ to this point in time when more difficult decisions need to be made, when details that were not ironed out previously are creating conflict now, and where there is a sense of loss of visionary and collaborative leadership from key caucuses to revive and maintain momentum. Some note that maybe the reason decisions seem more challenging now is due to the lack of high quality, positive relationships now, as opposed to back then. There is a sense that “back then” there was a greater sense of community, interconnectedness and inter-dependency between caucuses that no longer exists (or not to such a degree). There is a sense that the original leaders created a strong sense of needing to work together, needing to “give and take”, needed to put down their weapons, and engage in shared risk together in order for all to thrive. There is a concern that the shared spirit and collaborative leadership was not sustained or nurtured through time to see caucuses through the difficult decisions in the decades after. There is also a sense that the lack of shared leadership today means that each caucus isn’t held accountable the way they once were.

While there is a memory of disagreement and some feelings of not getting what they or the resource needed back then, memory of that time includes an unyielding force of commitment by leadership to work together with those who chose to stay at the table and a focus on getting the agreement done. Alongside this motivation, many shared that there was an understanding that not everything would be worked out at that time, more needed to be addressed, and those other issues were intended to be dealt with down the road. Some reported that as they got into the details of the agreement later, even well before the Forest and Fish Report (FFR) but especially as the FFR/HCP was being negotiated, friction increased significantly. One referred to that time as “bloody”, but the sentiment is shared by several others who were involved at the time. Many reported that the spirit of TFW was high initially for those involved, then faded palpably either immediately after, soon after, or years later.

Many expressed deep concern that those involved now won’t be able to recapture the spirit of 30 years ago. Some point to the current polarization, sense of personal aggrievement and self-interest in our nation as a parallel to, or source of, the polarization and self-interest perpetuating in the process today. Some pointed to structural, social, cultural and environmental changes in the last 20 or so years. Many feel that any hope rests on diverse leadership who are willing to take a risk, find and build on common ground, motivating their own community toward shared collaboration with other caucuses. And many suggested that the tangible legacy and spirit of what was achieved still survives to some extent today, even as it needs to be renewed or even re-imagined.

Reference for Acronyms and Synonyms referencing caucuses, agreements or structures throughout this report:

Caucus synonyms:

Large Industrial Timber Caucus: “Timber” or “Large Timber” or “Industrial timber” or “Industry”

Small Forest Landowners Caucus: “SFLOs” or “Smalls” or “Small timber”

Acronyms:

AMP: Adaptive Management Program

CMER: Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee

CWA: Clean Water Act

DFW: Department of Fish and Wildlife

DNR: Department of Natural Resources

ECY: Department of Ecology

FFR: Forest and Fish Report, 1999

FFPPP: Family Forest Fish Passage Program

FPB: Forest Practices Board, also called the “Board”

FREP: Forestry Riparian Easement Program

HCP: the Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan

NRM: Natural Resource Management

NWIFC: Northwest Indian Fish Commission

Principals or Principals Plus: A group of leaders across caucuses within the AMP

TFW: Timber, Fish, and Wildlife – the 1987 TFW agreement

WAC: Washington Administrative Code

WFFA: Washington Farm Forestry Association

WFPA: Washington Forest Protection Association

TPN: Third Party Neutral

Perspectives on Conflict and Collaboration by Caucus:

Tribal Caucus:

Tribal perspectives on and priorities around forest, fish and wildlife issues, as well as their level of interest in and engagement on these issues, are diverse, both between tribes, as well as within some tribes. Generally, those interviewed expressed a growing frustration and pressing need for positive progress, even as they place deep value on collaboration and in maintaining, reviving, or advancing the spirit of TFW. Many interviewed were quick to point out their sustained commitment to collaboration, particularly in forest practices work on the ground with landowners and state agencies, and their belief in and appreciation for the point-in-time progress resulting from the original agreements, despite current frustrations. Many feel a split between what they feel is working well enough – some examples of forest practices on the ground and scientific research generally – with what many feel is not working well: the AMP process and the implementation of and balance of goals being sought or met in the HCP, the handling of cultural resources, a lack of key leadership engagement, as well as the overarching sense that fish, wildlife and climate concerns were not being sufficiently addressed in society.

With regard to a lack of leadership engagement, many lamented the loss of convening leaders within their own caucus and a sense of that loss within other caucuses, particularly large timber leadership. There was concern that leadership in other caucuses didn't hold their caucus members accountable to rules or behaviors or even the spirit of TFW, especially as it relates to the AMP process.

It was noted that the way tribes speak about problems, frustrations or concerns publicly or in collaborative settings is different from how non-tribal individuals may speak to concerns. Several expressed concern that there is a current lack of knowledge and understanding of, respect for, or adherence to tribal treaty rights. Some noted that natural resources are cultural resources and cultural resources are natural resources.

Despite differences – in level of engagement with TFW/AMP, the quality of relationships, geographic location, wealth and power, size, rights, neighbors, level of urbanization, revenue sources, etc. – and some variation in priorities that result from these, there were few clear or strong trends that were exclusively defined by those differences. That said, some expressed a concern that east side tribes were not valued, included or respected to the same degree as west side tribes. Above all, however, respect, sovereignty, cultural survival, fairness, collaboration, and a connection to and reliance on fish, wildlife, and a healthy environment, all held great importance for all those interviewed.

Views range from a sense that the overall FF/HCP/TFW process is mostly working with a few tweaks needed, to a sense that a few tweaks would not be sufficient and major change was needed and/or their efforts to create change through engagement within the process has been futile. Multiple tribes across Washington spoke to this diversity in range of views, although the tribes who are less engaged in the AMP or less invested in, reliant on, or impacted by the HCP,

generally, but not always, expressed their concerns somewhat more mildly. And regardless of their level of involvement in AMP/HCP, many articulated a need to address bigger scale issues of concern.

As to what was working, several took pride in their good relationships on the ground with land owners, particularly large, but also small. Expressions of both appreciation and frustration were felt for DNR. The variation in quality of relationships was often reportedly based on the individual people in those institutions. Regardless of whether their tribe engaged in timber harvesting on their own land or not, many expressed respect for timber harvesting and the importance of it being economically viable to the landowner. Where tribes conducted timber harvesting themselves, they typically pointed out that their harvest practices were more conservation-focused than those of industry, for instance with smaller harvest areas, longer rotations or larger buffers. That said, they also pointed out that this difference was understandable given the differences in tribal and industry priorities.

Many tribal caucus members felt the large timber industry held unfair power to: 1) delay or stall progress in adaptive management or 2) to prevent or threaten preventing access to ceded land or 3) to influence agencies through the legislature (budgets), lobbying, or threat of lawsuits. Commonly it was expressed that the goal of economically viable timber harvesting was being met, while the goals around fish recovery, wildlife and habitat restoration were not being met and even being obstructed in the effort to maximize economic returns and maintain regulatory consistency even when science indicates change in regulations is warranted. Some expressed concern that while members of the large timber caucus spoke in positive ways, their actions contradicted their words. While many expressed a feeling that the conservation caucus shared many similar concerns and alignment on issues, some expressed frustration that the conservation caucus wasn't willing to compromise, or to be patient or to be flexible where it was needed and possible to achieve progress or collaboration.

Many spoke to a need for onboarding (e.g., training on history, context, substance) for new or newer people in the TFW space and a need for succession planning for future generations so that there isn't a need every few years for revitalization and so trust can be built with current actors in the TFW space and could continue to be built for decades to come. Some reported that past efforts at revitalization failed and some expressed skepticism about this current effort, concerned that it could become yet another failed effort with no real, sustained progress because there wasn't sufficient and genuine motivation and leadership among various caucuses to make essential changes. There was a sense that some in other caucuses give lip service to collaboration without following through on genuine, collaborative problem-solving.

There were multiple reports of appreciation for tribal relationships with DNR staff, as well as its role and leadership, but also concerns about a lack of inclusion of and respect for certain tribes or generally for tribal scientists and science, a lack of leadership and action around compliance and enforcement by DNR and an inconsistency among agency staff, particularly new staff, in understanding procedures and rules around engaging with tribes or engaging in forest practices. There was some concern that multiple state agencies or individual staff were overly

beholden to or influenced by large timber industry at multiple levels. And there was concern that the role of tribes as co-managers wasn't being honored. There is some concern that state agencies are more concerned with generating revenue than conserving resources, both cultural and natural. There was concern about a perceived lack of federal agency engagement at multiple levels.

Many spoke to an erosion in relationships among caucuses. That said, there were differences as to when this erosion began, ranging from a sense that commitment, relationships and a spirit of collaboration broke down shortly after the TFW agreement was signed to a sense that these critical relationships broke down more significantly after a few years, or several years, and/or especially around the time the Forest and Fish/HCP agreements were reached. Frustration has further increased in recent years. Again, exceptions were made by several people across multiple tribes where they felt they had good working relationships on the ground with their landowner neighbors, they felt the large timber supported their efforts on fish recovery, or they felt large timber shared their concern regarding agricultural and development impacts on fish recovery. Perceptions ranged in terms of action, where some felt that large timber had acted or would be inclined to act on their behalf vis-à-vis agriculture and development and others noted that large timber support for changes in other sectors was desired, but had yet to materialize.

In some cases, these on the ground relationships and collaboration around forest practices (among tribes, agencies, industry) are the only things that have thus far held some tribes back from taking legal action outside the formal process to correct perceived inefficiencies, obstruction, lack of honoring commitments made, and lack of progress, particularly in the HCP/AMP process. In other cases, the on the ground collaboration is sufficient to provide a general sense of satisfaction with the agreements. In yet other cases, even good on the ground relationships are irrelevant to the frustrations and need for change in AMP and at higher levels. And in still other cases, the on the ground relationships and how decisions are made provide tangible evidence of the lack of balance in power and in priorities in implementation of agreements. This deep concern and sense of injustice includes, but is not limited to, multiple tribes feeling they have been, and continue to be, cut off by large timber from their traditional and historical land because of faulty court decisions.

Many feel that the bigger fight is between industry and tribes over a balance between economic and ecological goals. Some feel that the occasional bad actor – by a large or small landowner that is not in compliance – undermines otherwise good relationships and behavior by the majority. Many expressed concern that large timber was no longer invested in the ecological goals, or in the people of the region, or in the watershed where they harvest trees. Many noted that many larger companies are no longer headquartered in WA. Many also suggested the reason large timber is no longer invested is that large timber is no longer working on a similar long-term time horizon as tribes are. And while there was empathy for the challenges industry faces, even with regard to tribal engagement, and while there is a desire to work with industry to meet the shared goals, the lack of commitment from large timber was expressed as one of the roots of the problem currently. There is also concern that the dialogue

has moved to a false either/or choice regarding economic vs ecological gains, and an assertion that the caucuses need to get back to an “and” approach.

Several feel that significant responsibility for change rests with government agencies needing to assert themselves (and not currently doing so sufficiently) instead of stepping back and avoiding conflict or their responsibility out of fear of making an unpopular-to-some decision or of retaliation. Some noted or added that agencies fail to honor them as co-managers, offering examples such as the fact that tribes may make a recommendation in the field that the agency then overrides. A few noted a concern that the fight between industry and conservation is central to the “people problem” saying it prevents substantive problems from being addressed, leaving tribes on the sidelines, frustrated and waiting for an opportunity to get down to the work. Nonetheless, there was appreciation expressed for several positive, constructive relationships at leadership level, even as they and others expressed frustration that relationships overall are more strained now, even as they are key to progress. Overall, while tribes report operating on a very long time frame and don’t expect change overnight, they were concerned that important decisions weren’t moving forward, important scientific updates and studies weren’t being done or acted upon, and time was being wasted.

Some tribes have disengaged from AMP, choosing other avenues to work towards fish recovery or habitat restoration since they felt their energy was not well spent in the AMP process. Others have disengaged as they assess their motivation and strategy for how they might fight for necessary change through other channels. Overall the sentiment is that the AMP process is in need of repair or replacement, as well as higher-level engagement. Tribes expressed wanting to see more efficiencies, more progress, less obstruction, and less delay with regard to implementation of the HCP and adaptive management. Many expressed that the fight over science (or interpretation or validity of scientific research) is a manifestation of a more deep-rooted, identity conflict between groups emerging as an ongoing dispute over science. Others conveyed that the easy issues, the ‘low hanging fruit,’ had already been addressed and only the more difficult decisions and actions were left, and these were causing further divisions among caucuses. One reviewer noted that what may have been considered ‘low hanging fruit’ back then, were actually tough problems, but because the relationships were stronger back then, those issues didn’t seem as hard as current issues now seem because relationships now are more fractured, making problem-solving more difficult. For some, their issues of concern were broad and many, while others expressed an interest in targeting what they perceive as the bigger issues in this space, like water temperature increases in streams, climate change adaptation and other significant issues.

There is a sense of both resignation and disappointment as many relayed that the large timber companies of 20-30 years ago now have different structures, priorities, and sense of commitment to partnerships. For many the loss of that relationship and sense of commitment to TFW/FFR, and feelings of commitments not being honored, has led to diverse tribal members, leaders and staff feeling an increased sense of frustration and futility. Some view leaning into a revival of the existing process, whether that be the Principals Plus process or the AMP/FPB as important. Others feel a sense of hopelessness about the current structures and

processes and expressed that the only way tribes are heard and the only way change occurs is in the court system. Some interviewed, even among those who had suggested the courts would be the best path, have since expressed a willingness to re-commit to engagement through this leadership revitalization effort (or are considering re-engagement) but only if there's shared, genuine commitment. They also wish to know who else will come to the table, what will be addressed, and they want some assurance that the process will be productive, will involve leadership commitment, particularly from industry, other tribes and agencies, and that there's a genuine interest in making shared progress, either on AMP/HCP issues or on larger scale issues of interest or both.

Reasons given for a lack of sufficient current tribal leadership engagement include:

- 1) Since Billy Frank Jr, there hasn't been a single tribal leader who can pull most or all tribes together;
- 2) TFW/FFR/HCP was now a competing or diminished priority among many tribes (either because of other high or higher priorities, or because the process was working well enough or because the process was working so poorly that engaging in the process was a waste of time);
- 3) Large timber has little or no genuine commitment to adaptive management aspect of the HCP/FFR agreement because they feel they already gave up too much in FFR/HCP;
- 4) Tribes generally suffer from a lack of capacity to engage (time, knowledge, people, resources (including funding), and/or that TFW is a small part of tribal natural resource management);
- 5) A lack of perceived willingness by diverse large timber leadership or other tribes to engage has diminished their own motivation for leadership engagement;
- 6) Reduced engagement was a result of process fatigue, either with this process or as a result of many other processes they are engaged in, or both;
- 7) Fixing what is wrong could only come about through action take in the courts; and/or
- 8) A lack of same side alignment because of the long and difficult history for all tribes which is compounded in today's world, historical and current conflicts among tribes, as well as varying levels of power and funding between tribes, different priorities, needs, interests, and impacts from TFW/HCP/FFR among tribes, and different experiences (good and bad) in TFW space.

There was widespread acknowledgement that relationships, and the need to build or repair relationships, must be central to forward movement. But concrete, timely progress on tangible issues is equally essential, as many conceded that their patience is wearing thin, they are frustrated and they feel an increased urgency for tangible, significant progress. Through the assessment process, there was increased interest in and support for inclusion in a process to re-engage at the leadership level, as well as a process solely among tribes that would first allow them to understand their own diverse views, common ground, and ensure alignment and cohesion across tribes before engaging in a multi-party process. Many noted that any process going forward would need to honor the governance and decision-making structures internal to tribal nations, as well as the importance of tribal engagement at all levels.

Scaling up from TFW/FF/HCP/AMP, many tribes spoke to what they see as the bigger natural and cultural resource challenges they face, that need immediate attention and that in many cases for many tribes dwarf concerns regarding adjustments to timber operations. These are

mainly harmful impacts from agriculture and development on fish, wildlife, and habitat, as well as impacts from climate change, a lack of or limited access to private lands for access to cultural and natural resources or for science/monitoring, and a lack of satisfactory resolution on cultural resource issues. Several noted that an improved and genuinely revitalized model for collaboration in the TFW space could become a model for adoption elsewhere.

Within the Forest and Fish realm, many see a need for clear deliverables on key topics, including but not limited to: gaining shared clarity and commitment on the goals of the HCP, determining whether the foundation of the HCP is based on fish presence or fish habitat, including recoverable habitat; exploring whether and how the HCP is meeting its intended objectives or even whether and how society is meeting the goal of recovering or conserving fish, wildlife, and habitat sufficiently; developing a policy or approach to stop the repeated cycles of stagnation in the current AMP process or change the structure behind AMP entirely; development of a high level leadership approach or criteria to prevent or minimize quarreling lower down; developing mechanisms to ensure accountability and forward progress, including having science inform policy/rule changes; changing FPB rules to ensure east side tribes have a seat on FPB (this came from both east and west side tribes); gaining clarity on DNR's role and exploring re-inserting agency staff back into the AMP process, for instance as co-chairs in committees; addressing effectiveness, efficiency, and professionalism of and the blurring of lines between CMER and Policy committees and removing political agendas from both, including a removal of lawyers being present in policy committee; ensuring the "W" in TFW is given greater consideration, as there are concerns wildlife have been ignored or given little priority and resources since that agreement.

For those who were part of the June 2019 workshop, there is both appreciation for the learning, growth, communication and connection achieved, as well as a concern that there was a lack of follow through post-workshop. There is also an expressed need to re-engage the June group to strategize how to disseminate what was learned in that workshop and ensure accountability and timelines to ensure success. This was echoed by those who were not involved in the June workshop, as they expressed a need for there to be an opportunity to rebuild relationships, develop shared understanding of the problems, goals, risks and consequences of things continuing as they are. There is a greater need to recognize and respond to the changing climate within the forest practices space, and elsewhere. And, going forward, there is a need for greater inclusivity and self-selection in the Principals Plus process among tribal leadership. Tribes need a voice in how the process is designed, resources to sustain engagement, and a say in scheduling so they can ensure consistent engagement.

Small Forest Landowners Caucus (SFLOs or Smalls):

Many SFLOs feel that the root of their concern is a grievance over promises made (FREP, FFFPP and SFLO Office, etc) in the original agreements that were repeatedly not fulfilled, even decades later. Underlying these unfulfilled promises is a deep concern that SFLOs aren't afforded an equal voice in collaborative discussions, that their influence carries less weight than

other caucuses, and several point to a sense of injury, expressing that they are not respected as valuable contributors to conservation, forest health and stewardship, and the timber industry. By way of example, one pointed out that declines in funding during the great recession targeted SFLO programs first. And even when the recession ended, their funding never came back. To them, this feels like compounded evidence of the lack of respect and equity given to SFLOs. Some suggested that the SFLO push for the “template” was a reaction to promises not being honored, while others contend that the template is a creative solution that fills the gap left behind after those promises weren’t fulfilled. There is a deep frustration in the fact that the template, after five years, still hasn’t gone forward when the smalls feel they made an earnest and good faith effort to honor the science and minimize impacts while ensuring that their needs are being met.

Generally there is a sense of frustration that work isn’t getting done, decisions aren’t being made and that people and groups are dragging their feet. There’s also a perception that others fear that if there’s a concession made for smalls then someone will find a way to lower standards or rules for all landowners, and they worry this may fuel resistance to exceptions being made for SFLOs. There is concern that dynamics among caucuses have become very polarized and that the spirit of “give and take” has been lost. There is a concern that people or caucuses, especially state agencies and conservation, are coming in with a hard line approach and that what is economically viable for Small in terms of timber harvest is not being considered. Regarding science, some feel that a lot of science has been done, but no rules are being changed to honor the science. Some noted that everyone interprets the science however they want, playing up or down the results. Still others noted that when it comes to doing scientific studies, the individuals involved are learning as they go and some of the current studies didn’t benefit from the scrutiny needed to ensure valid results. Finally, others, in referring to both science and policy, noted that there are differences between the ecology on the east and west sides that is often not taken into account with one-size-fits-all policy.

Several expressed frustration with the extent of regulations in Washington State which they feel put undue burden on SFLOs. Several acknowledged that big picture problems like climate change are not being addressed in the current structures and processes. They expressed that the goals of timber growing and harvesting balanced with ecological protection could be a means to address climate change in Washington. Some expressed concern about the lack of mills to process logs. Some expressed that rules around how forests are managed needs to better reflect regional differences and needs across the state.

Regarding the June 2019 workshop, several spoke to an appreciation for the process and a recognition that the principals, or leadership, needs to set the tone and provide the direction for the rest of those operating in this system. Yet there’s a frustration that the agencies, in particular, didn’t share what they learned in June so that lessons learned and forward momentum would effectively spread to others in those agencies. They added that there’s a need to have a mechanism to cascade down messages from the principals level to create genuine and sustained change in the current dynamics. Their frustration is born out of a concern that decisions in AMP and elsewhere are being overtaken by politics, and that the

consequences of current status quo will be a greater threat to SFLOs, and will lead to more land conversion for development.

The Conservation Caucus is frequently seen as afraid of cutting trees, or finding the action of cutting trees not culturally acceptable. There was acknowledgement that this mindset may be a reaction to the “rape and pillage” of timber in the past. That said, this perceived resistance to SFLO culture is seen as facilitating an increasing likelihood of land conversion. Some expressed a natural alignment with conservation and tribal values that is, should, or could be there in stronger ways since SFLOs self-describe as stewards of the forest. One further noted that SFLOs see themselves as a part of the system, not apart from it; thus they look not just to protect resources, but to make them better for ecological and economic benefit. As such, giving individuals the flexibility to manage forests is a benefit to multiple goals. One added that their community was receptive to creatively working to extend rotations and manage buffer and riparian zones for growing older forests in order to address needs of the conservation caucus.

While tribal concerns about, and sense of importance for, securing access to cultural resources was validated, some noted that these issues add a layer of uncertainty for SFLOs. That said, they relayed a willingness to work on concerns where they exist and communicate to their community about this issue.

Many members of WFFA acknowledged that their membership represents a very small percentage of all small forest landowners, namely those Smalls who want or intend to harvest timber on their land. That said, they note the rules only apply to when someone harvests timber. They also noted that there is tremendous internal diversity in terms of size of SFLO property. Further, recognizing the diversity of views among SFLOs, even among those who harvest timber, some suggested a need for intra-caucus alignment so they could address their internal differences before engaging in a multi-caucus process.

Large Industrial Timber Caucus (aka Large Timber):

Many in the large timber caucus spoke to their pride in their industry, in their partnerships, their role in the green economy, their value for offsetting carbon, and what they have achieved as a result of fulfilling their obligations under the HCP.

Many of those interviewed noted that Washington generally feels more adversarial now. As such, they feel revitalizing the relationships in the TFW/FFR space is important. That said, several feel that the topics for discussion among caucuses need to reflect bigger, current, and mutually relevant priorities, recognizing that bigger issues, including potential impacts from COVID-19, will shift priorities and may narrow industry receptivity for further cycles of debate over AMP-related issues that they feel have little ecological benefit, but may have significant economic costs. That said, one reviewer noted that large timber’s desire to focus on larger scale issues doesn’t mean that they want to get out of their current obligations.

Several expressed appreciation for existing relationships with individuals in other caucuses, including relationships on the ground, with agency and tribal partners. Still others expressed that where relationships were poor or compliance low, even if that involved a different company from their own, those conditions and behaviors adversely impacted their company or the industry as a whole.

Several expressed frustration over what feels like an emphasis of comments or reflections by other caucuses on TFW/FFR/HCP/AMP that is overly negative when they feel there is much to celebrate, when most or all of the big obligations have been met, and/or when big picture needs, issues, opportunities or successes are ignored and clouded over by a persistent focus on minor issues or debates. Further, some reported feeling offended when they perceive others as accusing large timber of not keeping its promises or claiming that large timber hasn't done enough when they spend millions of dollars annually, and a significant percent of their land is kept out of production continually, to meet ecological goals.

Some expressed a desire for more leadership and guidance from state agencies and felt that in the absence of strong guidance in the process, the conservation and large timber caucuses were left to fight it out. Some feel that state agencies are increasingly leaning too far toward ecological aspects of agreements while reducing their commitment to the economic goals or that they have become more restrictive over time with respect to regulation and enforcement. Where federal agencies were discussed, there is a sense that federal agencies are content with how the HCP is being implemented. Some expressed concern that other caucuses came at problems with only a "stick" approach to solving them.

While many expressed that they felt they had good or excellent relationships with tribes, several commented that the strength of the relationships has waned over the years. Some suggested the relationships generally were not very good at present. One expressed appreciation that some tribes still maintain the spirit of solving each other's problems that many others, including some within the large timber caucus, have lost. At a leadership and state-wide level, large timber representatives expressed a concern that it was hard to foster relationships with tribal leaders because of high turnover of leadership in tribal governments, tribal inconsistencies within and between tribes and because of a lack of a singular or cohesive voice among Washington's many tribes over a myriad of issues related to timber operations. This lack of cohesion and sometimes conflict between tribes can put a timber company in a difficult position.

Multiple people expressed the concern that the conservation caucus seems to always be on the offense and large timber is always on defense. They articulated that it was unfortunate that the two sides seem stuck in this dynamic. Many felt that those in the conservation caucus seem to push for unrealistic changes in forest practices. Concern was expressed over what feels like a singular drive, particularly by many in the conservation caucus, but increasingly by tribes, to always equate rule changes to only more restrictive regulation when they feel that current rules or even less restrictive rule changes may be supported by science and/or under the principal of "shared risk". There is a perception that many, especially in the conservation caucus, engage in

a mindset that cutting any trees is bad and that they advocate for not cutting “one more tree”. There were a few who expressed concern that while there are moderate environmental groups in Washington who do support and value timber, they have not been engaged in the regulatory arena and should be. Regarding the prejudice against the timber industry or even corporations more generally, one noted, by way of example, that a scientific study produced some years ago by industry scientists demonstrated a need for increased regulatory restrictions, something conservationists would otherwise applaud, yet the findings were rejected by the conservation caucus simply because it was industry scientists conducting the research.

Some noted that tribes that harvest timber are more sympathetic to the industry than tribes that do not harvest. Large timber generally feels an alignment with the values of small forest landowners, and with some, though not all, their proposed solutions.

Many reported that there is little appetite in the industry for changing forest practices or rules significantly, moderately or at all. Opinions depended on the perspective of the company or its representative. By way of example, because many feel that current science does not warrant change in rules, or that change would negatively impact the goal of economic viability, several articulated a lack of receptivity for changes that would result in cutting fewer trees or changing the “tree budget”. That said, industry is receptive to developing and implementing creative solutions to address concerns, such as the Smart Buffer concept, where a “tree budget” is maintained but where trees are harvested or left in riparian areas to achieve ecological goals, such as increased shade, without impacting economic viability. One expressed frustration that because industry suggested the “smart buffer” program, it is automatically being met with skepticism or suspicion because of the prejudicial assumptions other caucuses make about the large timber caucus. They asserted the idea was created to be more responsive to other caucuses concerns about temperature and shade, and they share a genuine desire to include others in further development of this program. Another caucus member commented that the intent of the “smart buffer” program was to prevent or delay changes to regulations. However, during the review of this assessment report, one reviewer expressed strong disagreement with this assertion, noting that their sole goal in spending a lot of time, effort and money is to create a shared win for all sides.

Multiple reasons were given to explain the general reluctance for supporting additional regulatory restrictions in harvest:

- 1) At its inception, large timber made significant sacrifices in exchange for regulatory certainty; they feel they have taken on the bulk of the risk in the HCP; and they feel they have honored their commitment and completed a vast majority of the obligations under the HCP;
- 2) Disputes over current issues stem from a lack of shared clarity and understanding of the original goals and objectives set forth in relevant agreements, which need to be rectified first;
- 3) The goals of TFW and the FFR/HCP include economic viability and regulatory certainty which need to continue to be honored (and several feel are no longer being honored, or not honored as much, in favor of an increasing emphasis on the ecological goals);

- 4) The challenges to salmon recovery are largely now due to cities, urbanization, population growth, agricultural and development land, or in oceanic conditions;
- 5) Because timber is under a regulatory framework, the need to address larger landscape level problems is unfairly being targeted on the narrower scope of an industry that is arguably doing more to help salmon, especially when compared to other sectors;
- 6) The current science provides little evidence to warrant regulatory change that would have an unnecessary adverse impact on industrial timber companies. For instance, studies being discussed currently for potential policy change either lack robustness or power - for instance, the sample size was too small; or conditions during the study, such as drought or blow down, adversely impacted the results or power of the study; or the study wasn't designed to do what it is now being interpreted for; or the results are not significant enough as to warrant change; or the results demonstrate that change is not needed;
- 7) If the regulatory environment in Washington becomes untenable for industrial timber companies, land conversion to development may occur and/or more trees will be cut in places with less regulation, like the South East USA or Brazil. Concern that this aspect of increasing regulation in Washington, at the expense of the increased negative impact to the environment globally, is perceived to be largely missed by other caucuses.

Underlying these concerns is a feeling that those outside the industry are trying to impose significant or unrealistic change on their industry and reflect a "making change for the sake of change" motivation. There is also considerable concern that several decisions or proposals for change violate the principle of shared risk that was originally agreed upon.

There is concern that while the focus is narrowly on TFW and the HCP/AMP, diverse caucuses are missing an opportunity to engage in bigger opportunities and challenges. Opportunities include using timber harvesting (and all components of the timber production industry) for offsetting carbon and promoting climate-friendly wood products over concrete and steel for new construction. Challenges include focusing on what timber management and forest composition may need to look like now so the timber industry and the forests they rely on can be healthy and viable in 50 years under climate change. Additionally, several shared that society's energy should focus on the significant costs that other sectors impose on fish, wildlife, and habitat, rather than aiming to squeeze the industry for changes that would have minimal value for reaching ecological goals. That said, within the TFW/AMP/HCP/FFR space, several noted that they are still committed and would still like to focus on relationships and on key mutual priorities.

Large timber leaders and representatives shared a desire to be recognized for the significant contribution they've made to improve forest practices and honor obligations made as a result of TFW/HCP. Many expressed frustration with the lack of recognition for their measurable accomplishments, especially in comparison to a lack of progress elsewhere. This includes less regulated industries like agriculture, negligent efforts elsewhere regarding culverts, as well as other societal challenges like rapid urbanization and development. One expressed concern that pressure toward more land conversion may escalate in the aftermath of COVID-19 as people

move out of cities. Many also expressed a strong desire for societal recognition for how their industry has significant value as a green industry, for instance, in offsetting carbon, especially in comparison with other industries, such as concrete and steel. Some expressed a desire for that recognition to include both sides of the industry (timberland and manufacturing).

Given the recent (2019) conflict and subsequent agreement between environmentalists and industrial timber companies in Oregon to pursue an HCP there, industry leaders and representatives felt that there is now majority recognition within the large timber caucus of the value of an HCP for regulatory certainty while maintaining economic viability. Some expressed, however, that the Washington HCP lacked balance, evidenced by both science and Washington having the toughest regulations in the industry. As such, several expressed that the large timber caucus will seek to apply lessons learned from Washington to negotiations in Oregon to achieve a more balanced and fair agreement.

Several noted that despite strict regulations in Washington, it still has among the most favorable and profitable conditions for growing trees anywhere, both because of the climate conditions and because of the regulatory certainty and stability. Some expressed concern about potential threats to that regulatory certainty in Washington. A couple individuals noted that the industrial timber companies in existence today are viable, successful, and resilient and can withstand some change in the regulatory space, even suggesting that change, such as increased buffers in riparian areas, would not greatly impact their bottom line. One noted that the constant regulatory creep and pressure on the asset base continually erodes the viability of the industry. Some noted that the impacts from the Coronavirus would have notable impacts.

Several spoke to a need to maintain the “tree budget,” which they noted was born out of financial necessity, a desire to demonstrate flexibility within that budget, and a feeling of already having taken great risks and given significantly to meet the high standards in Washington. Many expressed frustration at a perceived mantra from the conservation caucus for “not one more tree” (to be cut) particularly because this feels like a direct attack on the industry’s identity. That said, one industrial timber representative noted that the “not one more tree” (to be taken out of harvest production) position that industry expresses also violates the spirit of TFW.

Several noted that the structure and agreements set up as part of the HCP no longer match the realities of the industry. Thus, the large timber caucus is put in a difficult position of engaging in a process and structure and under agreements that they can no longer adhere to in the same way they once could because of corporate structure and other changes over the last 20 years.

There is some receptivity to making process changes, especially as many share a frustration with dynamics in the current AMP process. That said, many noted that adaptive management in the AMP is happening largely as intended, slowly, and methodically, and according to science. One conceded that while a lack of change in rules over 15 years is good for industry, it does call into question whether adaptive management, as intended, is really happening. Some noted that all sides are guilty of protesting CMER study findings and other science that does not

match their desired outcomes or goals. Others feel other caucuses are more responsible for this behavior. Some commented that the current dynamics make industry feel cornered and that they have no choice but to dig their heels in and play a game that others are playing within this process. Concern was expressed that technical expertise in AMP, and particularly in CMER, is not at the level it once was and the lack of sufficient technical capacity threatens scientific integrity and renders processes inefficient and ineffective.

Overall, there is a sense that Washington industrial timber companies are generally cohesive as a caucus and well-served by WFPA, especially in comparison to Oregon where there is more in-group conflict and less industry cohesion and organization. Still, competition and differences among companies produce challenges in getting their caucus to consensus internally. Many noted that the changes to the industry over the last 20 years means more diversity among companies, with many having a greater focus on profit, a lack of incentive to change, or a lack of capacity to make changes that other caucuses want. Many expressed that more companies, including their own, are now focused on quarterly earnings and profits, stating that some of the civic- and community-minded ethos has diminished over the years. Others spoke to a sense of civic- and community-mindedness that still exists in many companies. Many noted that differences in company size, ownership, structure and function(s), location of operation, position within the company, and leadership values all influenced receptivity to local relationships, community needs, or regulatory or policy change. Some said regulatory changes would negatively impact profitability of companies because they operate on much smaller margins now than years ago. A few noted that industrial timber companies in existence today were more resilient and financially viable and could afford to make additional changes to address ecological concerns with no significant impact on profit. Some expressed frustration that some individuals and companies were really trying to be collaborative while others were not. There was expressed desire by several individuals to ensure that all aspects of the timber industry, both the timber growing and harvesting side, as well as the processing and transportation side, remain connected and unified.

Some expressed concern about repercussions if the public perceived certain practices as harmful or if the AMP is perceived as a poor use of taxpayer money, especially as a result of actions taken by other caucuses. Some feel frustrated that other caucuses weren't doing more to recognize large timber industry's role in the green economy. Several expressed pride in the communication work done by WFPA for the industry.

Going forward, there was expressed appreciation for the relationship progress and mutual learning at the June 2019 principals plus workshop. There was also frustration by several that what happened during the workshop didn't stick afterwards, as everyone eventually went back to their corners, and appreciation by a couple for observed changes in some relationships in the months after. Some expressed concern that caucuses aren't trying to solve each other's problems. Several expressed a desire to continue working on relationships and to focus the multi-caucus efforts on areas of high mutual value and interest. There is a widespread desire going forward for more tribal leadership, and some indication of a desire for more moderate environmental group leadership. Concern was also expressed that no members of the

Hardwood Commission were represented in the principals process and needed to be because their niche provides significant ecological and economic value, while bridging state and private lands, small and large forest ownership.

Several suggested that more diverse and higher level company leadership within the large timber caucus is needed. That said, they felt that leaders of industrial timber companies, especially the larger companies, are perceived to feel that everything is going well with the HCP agreement or they lack awareness of the problems or they have other higher or more urgent priorities. As a result, they noted that these large timber leaders may not be motivated to come to the table. To some within the large timber caucus, this lack of engagement by these leaders is acceptable, while to others it represents a concern and a lack of parity, particularly with tribes. Some noted that if top company leadership realized that Washington could become like Oregon, if problems now aren't addressed and escalation of conflict isn't reversed or prevented, they may be more inclined to engage. They suggested that large timber leadership may also be more inclined to engage if they feel like tribal leadership is equally engaged and that topics are relevant for their level of engagement. Further there was a need expressed regarding the importance of having the right people at the table on their own side, as some suggested that some large timber representatives may be less willing or able to make compromises based on their position or have a less conciliatory or collaborative mindset or approach. A couple expressed that this process needs leadership that has the vision, authority and willingness to take a risk and make compromises now to avoid an escalation of conflict down the road.

One observed that doing any collaborative work is hard and participants get weary, but overall they feel that this program is succeeding far more than where it's failing. As evidence of this, this individual noted that leaders on all sides in Oregon are looking to emulate the processes in Washington around fish, forests, water quality, and carbon.

Conservation Caucus:

Several in the conservation caucus self-describe as the most reluctant party to the collaboration, noting that they weren't a party to the original agreements, didn't find those agreements sufficient, and that their caucus' engagement has waned over the years. Further, they express a reluctance to engage or have faith in a process where the regulated community is a party to establishing their own regulations, particularly in light of a perceived lack of trust, lack of agency oversight and accountability, and evidence of a lack of adaptation over the years. And while many who are engaged in TFW/AMP say they do see that non-regulatory, incentive-based approaches are also effective and important, they feel that there is little trust to engage in this realm now, there is no mechanism to do so at present, and the existing regulatory agreements should still be honored; they feel the frameworks for adaptive management should be functional and effective, ensuring that the resources are protected. To that end, most feel that current agreements aren't being honored or complied with and processes aren't effectively or sufficiently protecting the resources. While several point to positive relationships

with individuals across multiple caucuses, overall, members of the conservation caucus note that trust and hope for change are low.

Several maintain frustration with state agency leadership and staff, particularly DNR, for either bending to industry or not enforcing compliance; federal agency leadership not pointing out compliance violations; and the AMP process for not fulfilling its mandate to adaptively manage the program for all goals. Most feel that large timber holds significant sway over agencies and that agencies allow this condition to perpetuate. Conservation caucus members feel that they have largely held back on using the influence they have in deference to trying to work things out collaboratively. That said, several conservation members note their awareness that they are not seen as being very collaborative and that they are perceived often as over-reaching or impatient. And while some concede to having over-reached in the past, several also note that with a lack of tangible progress, without others stepping up to balance industry's power (especially agencies) or without the industry itself acting in good faith to ensure all HCP goals are met equally, they feel stuck in maintaining an offensive position. Conservationists feel that because industry is able to use their power to obstruct adaptive management in AMP or hold their power over agencies, they are able to indefinitely maintain the status quo. Thus, they feel they are operating in an environment where there's a lack of mutual motivation and shared need to work authentically toward collaborative solutions.

While some noted that tribes possess power derived from their treaty rights to re-balance the playing field, they expressed concern about a perceived lack of sufficient leadership engagement and cohesive organization from tribes, as well as a perceived reluctance to 'rock the boat'. Some expressed concern that industry focuses on nurturing tribal relationships as a means to sustain tribal patience so industry can maintain the status quo on rules. Some noted that the conservation caucus has not always been as effective as they could be in building relationships and participating in collaboration. One reviewer noted their frustration that while all sides have a role in fixing the problems, all sides, including their own, spend more time pointing fingers at the other.

Conservation caucus members are concerned about both relationship and process challenges in AMP and TFW/FFR realm, including a concern that process changes won't prevent bad actors from impeding progress. These concerns relate to a root problem they perceive which is that adaptive management isn't happening. While they expressed an acceptance with a slow process of change through adaptive management, and shared a recognition of the impacts of a rule change on industry, they articulated that no change for 20 years is unacceptable. Several see the relationship problems as most visible in the FPB/AMP realm, while some noted a need to work on relationships at all levels. Many expressed frustration with the consensus process in AMP, concern about the blur in lines between CMER and Policy and an inability of Policy to move recommendations up to the FPB. Some expressed concern that the FPB has no designated seats for conservation and tribes, just at-large seats. Several expressed concern that FPB avoids making difficult decisions, for fear of upsetting industry mostly, and as such delays and the status quo persist. Some noted that the initial design of the AMP was a guess about what might work and expressed concern that there hasn't been a review of the AMP's

effectiveness, especially since the initial good intent may have resulted in a process and structure that doesn't actually work, or not as well as intended, and may need change.

Many are concerned that the HCP and CWA are not being followed, even where directives are clear, and/or that in other cases, rules and guidance manuals contradict one another in ways that create greater conflict among caucuses. Several noted concerns that AMP and HCP were designed to be minimally protective initially, but their understanding is that the trade-off was that as new science is conducted, additional changes, where science indicates they are needed, will be made to improve protections. They expressed deep concern that despite many years and millions of dollars put toward scientific research that clearly demonstrates that additional protections are needed, no change in regulations have resulted. Again, they feel the current dynamics and process make it all too easy to delay or obstruct efforts toward adaptive management. The current and historic dispute over water typing was brought up as an example that demonstrates the lack of a shared understanding and interpretation of the HCP, the bad faith behavior of industry, and the lack of leadership in agencies to move things along.

Some spoke to frustrations with being left out of decision-making processes or information sharing, for instance with ID teams and in being prevented from submitting water-typing modification forms. They expressed that this lack of inclusion, voice, and parity, drives conservation to contemplate last-resort actions outside the formal process. Some spoke to a feeling that their caucus is more generally marginalized because of their relatively lower power position among caucuses. Several have concerns that climate change is neither being adequately considered in the AMP nor regulated by the EPA. And many spoke to their frustration that there is no incentive for large industrial timber to leave trees on the ground, while current regulation is considered inadequate to protect fish, wildlife, and critical habitat. Several hold perceptions of fluidity among people working at times for state agencies or industry and then later for the other which drives down confidence about agency autonomy. Many expressed concern that there is no accountability and no consequences if work doesn't get done.

Many in the conservation caucus expressed empathy for and see opportunities for creative solutions to meet the needs of both their caucus and SFLOs. Within this context, however, some expressed frustration with the repeated threat made about significant land conversion if perceived demands aren't met.

They also expressed frustration that agencies are perceived not to hold either large or small landowners accountable when they protest change or bypass the formal process to advance their efforts. There is a concern that agencies fail to engage in the needed difficult conversations with, or enact practical consequences to, these caucuses for fear of retaliation, remonstrance or of perpetuating a feeling the caucuses hold about being either demonized or marginalized.

Few in the conservation caucus are particularly inspired to engage in the regulatory realm. A couple people noted that most forestry-focused conservation organizations focus on incentive-

based, non-regulatory, and climate-oriented approaches. Yet, some noted that they do not feel that their caucus is so far off from the others and they expressed hope that real progress is possible. That said, they feel this will require increased trust and genuine commitment to the ecological goals in the HCP, including the realities of a changing climate. Also, they expressed a need for improvements to the process to ensure accountability and genuine adaptive management. Some suggested that even one step forward, one reasonable compromise in the direction of increased protection of the resources, would give them an indication that genuine collaboration is possible.

County Caucus:

County representatives and leaders spoke to the diversity of counties reflecting the diversity of views, needs, concerns, priorities, and issues reflected across the state and across the different caucuses. And while each county may have different values, priorities, or concerns, taken as a whole, county leadership sees themselves as a bridging caucus in which all the values, issues and needs represented by the different caucuses are reflected across the state's counties. As such, counties are interested in good governance that best meets the balance of needs for their constituents.

County leadership engages in a diversity of issues, ranging from changing population demographics, jobs, economic vitality, sustainability, public services, timber harvest, excise taxes, endangered species, the environment, counties' as trust beneficiaries of state land timber harvesting, forest health, water issues, carbon sequestration, solid waste, culverts for fish passage, and land use planning, among others.

Some noted they would like a coordinated approach with tribes on addressing culvert issues. One noted that timber revenue going into counties was important, but it isn't what it once was. That said, another noted that the forest product industry is still an important part of the resource-based economy, culture and identity of several Washington state counties. Further, timber is an important source of revenue for critical public services ranging from schools to fire fighting. They expressed that increasing regulation and loss of opportunities is a cost born by local communities for the benefit of all residents of Washington and the USA. It was noted that economic opportunity and diversification is needed, as many counties lack a diverse portfolio of income, as well as insufficient income overall.

State Caucus:

Many in state government agencies feel a sense of accomplishment for what was achieved, especially initially, through early agreements, and with scientific research since, and they articulate a recognition of the need for a balance among goals. Meanwhile, they also expressed significant concern and frustration about the current quality of relationships (which many relayed being at an all-time low) and a sense that how the AMP process is being engaged in is

fueling social discord and a lack of adaptation. Many expressed concern that long-standing conflicts are increasingly impeding collaboration today and a lack of leadership engagement across caucuses allows these conflicts to fester. They noted that band-aid solutions of the past did little to rectify relationship and process challenges. Many acknowledge that the AMP process was designed to be deliberate and methodical, that a lot of learning needed to take place, especially in the early years, and that it has produced cutting-edge science. However, many are concerned by how engagement in the process, has, in effect, locked down the initial point-in-time agreement, preventing any further progress in achieving the goals in the HCP from happening, and/or has been weaponized to impede that progress. There is an expressed sense of uncertainty in how to revive a spirit of collaboration and address potential process or structure changes to prevent perceived exploitation, particularly when some individuals or caucuses are perceived to have used the existing process to their advantage and may be reluctant to fix a problem that has helped them achieve that advantage.

Many acknowledge the interdependency of all caucuses and goals, particularly as a means to meet any one individual caucus' needs or goals. Individuals spoke to a shared concern for ecological and economic goals, expressing a continual struggle to ensure ecological goals are fulfilled while ensuring both small and large timber are viable. In the midst of this, they also spoke to their challenges, and even the no-win nature, of trying to balance both agency authority and responsibility to legal mandates while supporting, leading, or participating in a collaborative process, all while attempting to honor their role and mandate and/or avoid being the target of caucus weapons that are frequently used against the agency. These weapons range from abusive, disrespectful, or otherwise inappropriate behavior toward staff to the use of legislative connections to impede agency efforts and budgets and/or direct lobbying of agency leadership.

The challenges for DNR are felt as especially poignant given they are a regulatory agency under a collaborative agreement where everyone has a say in regulatory decisions. Many noted the no-win situation where if DNR comes down on an issue, they feel they are accused of violating the collaborative spirit of the agreement, but if they are collaborative, empowering and share in decision-making, they are accused of violating their role as a regulator. They feel that, both internally and externally, there is a lack of clarity for how DNR should lead or engage to strike the right balance.

There is a sense by some that the system, as is, is on a path to breaking unless all sides genuinely lean in together, engage in an honest dialogue and exhibit sincere willingness to explore and adhere to what, where, and how adaptation needs to happen. Several expressed concern about the level of genuine commitment, especially from large timber and conservation, for this collaboration. Some expressed concern that past efforts to revitalize the relationships and process had failed, while others expressed hope that the new effort to revitalize collaboration with a focus on leadership and relationships would set the stage for sustained collaboration and progress.

Some are frustrated about a perceived double standard that seems to exist when expectations are high for agency leadership, integrity, consistency, accountability, and transparency but they feel those same expectations need to be exemplified in leaders and members across all caucuses, not just state agencies. That said, room for improvement within the state caucus was explicitly acknowledged by several participants, specifically calling out a need for greater accountability, including taking explicit ownership when things go wrong. This sentiment was applied to Forest Practices as well as AMP, including its key leadership, coordination or chair roles. Overall, many feel that the spirit, commitment, and genuine progress at the onset of TFW can only truly be revitalized if all caucuses recommit with the same spirit of leadership, collaboration, honesty, and transparency. While many noted the challenge to achieving this is in large part due to the deep distrust underlying relationships, they also noted that the original spirit of TFW may be especially difficult to re-ignite, particularly given changes in industry and the environment over the last couple decades.

Some expressed feeling that few involved really feel or can anticipate the consequences of the HCP and AMP falling apart. They worry that until they do, there may be insufficient momentum for all to roll up their sleeves and genuinely commit to collaboration. Some expressed concern that key milestones in the HCP aren't being met. Several noted that inconsistencies across rules and guiding documents, and varying interpretations of or sources for key guiding language, leads to increases in divisions. Some felt that the structure of and processes within AMP, which were designed under different circumstances, may no longer be a good match for today's reality. Some point to a promise many years ago to revisit or adjust guidance on how to implement AMP that has never happened. Many feel that AMP may be too vulnerable to abuse and manipulation and thus changes are needed to ensure functionality. However, given the vast investment all sides have in maintaining their role, influence and position in, as well as familiarity with, the current structure, there is concern that there will be little genuine appetite for making whatever changes may be needed.

Several spoke to a need for a clear articulation and understanding of expectations and goals, and a clear sense of what needs to happen for adaptive management to be functional. Some noted that while some standards or goals are ambiguous, others, like with CWA assurances, are clearly defined and compliance can be measured. Even where standards or goals are more ambiguous, most feel that some progress in adaptation needs to happen and is lacking. As a partial explanation for why progress isn't happening, there is a sense that the AMP and FPB structures or processes are either too rigid or not constructive enough to allow the space for a deeper reconciliation of conflict across caucuses or to promote creative problem-solving together. As such the current AMP process and how it is used is actually harming relationships, even as it hinders substantive progress. Several fear that improvements on relationships or process can't be addressed without both leadership direction and an appropriate and more constructive space for these deeper conversations. And while creative solutions are welcomed, many are frustrated when a single caucus seeks to circumvent the AMP process to advance one-sided solutions. This act results in them and others feeling like that caucus is "gaming the system" which fuels distrust and a sense of being alienated. That said, many share a sense of frustration with the slow, inefficient AMP process.

There is concern about both those who dominate and vocalize existing tensions (large and small timber and conservation), as well as those who may be quieter in comparison, but are perceived to be at the height of impatience and frustration with a lack of progress (tribes). Some are concerned that both large and small timber caucuses have sidelined more moderate or progressive viewpoints within their caucuses. There is concern that all sides have hardened their positions in recent years, resulting in a reduced space for genuine constructive problem-solving. There is wide recognition of the need for all individuals involved, within the agencies and among all caucuses, to possess a greater capacity to handle conflicts. There is a strong desire for people to be genuinely honest about their reality, as well as the outcome they seek.

Concern was expressed that budget and staff deficits, past, present, and likely future, has meant and will mean fewer staff will be expected to do more with less resources, resulting in further frustration by other caucuses with agency performance and further burn-out of staff. A lack of capacity is perceived in other realms and for other caucuses, as well. One illustration of this point was with ID teams and the frequent inability of tribes (and agency staff) to keep up with the volume of modification requests coming from industry.

There is a concern by some about a lack of monitoring compliance by DNR to ensure companies are doing what they say they are doing. One reviewer found this concern about a perceived lack of compliance perplexing since DNR's most recent biennial compliance monitoring report stated that compliance in 2016-2017 ranged from 87-100%. They further noted that the current draft for 2018-2019 indicates that compliance will be higher, approximately 92-100%.

There is concern by many agency participants of a lack of accountability and transparency by large industrial timber. There is concern that an economic recession or a perceived lack of resources or political will in federal or state agencies could create conditions for large timber to seek to evade mandated changes to improve water temperature conditions, for instance by increasing pressure on ECY to secure another ten year extension on water quality assurances without meeting requirements laid out for the extension. That said, many expressed a genuine concern for and interest in ensuring a balance so that timberlands remain viable for large and small timber, SFLO's have reduced undue burden, and land isn't converted to other less ecologically-friendly uses.

Concern was widely expressed about caucuses' efforts to lobby agency staff for action (or inaction) or voting members of AMP or FPB members for their favored solution or decision. Many reported concern that multiple caucuses, especially timber (large and small) and conservation, manipulate the process or interpretation of science if they don't like the results. Many expressed concern about disproportionate power among caucuses, giving some, most notably large timber, unfair and inequitable power to influence decisions, including within the legislature regarding their budgets. And others expressed concern about general resource inequities between aquatic and terrestrial issues.

Many are frustrated that after years of investing in scientific research which yielded solid evidence, people are not basing decisions in science, but rather are locked in on a position of refusing change or demanding change as the sole criteria for success. Within this context, consensus in AMP is often brought up as a weapon. Many expressed frustration with both individual behavior and a lack of accountability in CMER, Policy, and FPB. It was also noted that since every decision seems political or fraught with consequences if one side or another is angered by a decision, there's a lack of willingness by the FPB to engage in tough discussions and decisions.

While many point to success on the scientific side of the adaptive management process, almost no one spoke to the science sufficiently informing or translating into tangible adaptive management. As one example, many found it unacceptable that they were operating under an interim water-typing rule for such a protracted amount of time. Whether that rule is sufficient or not (there is some variation in opinion here), the fact that the rule has remained as interim for so long is a symptom of what's not working about AMP. Among those who noted that the interim rule was insufficient, some shared an additional concern that the interim rule may be being used to mistype streams and that it has a larger impact than just on timber lands since cities and counties adopted water typing rules from DNR so they are using the interim rule but without the benefit of ID teams. As a result, they worry that many streams, even off timberlands, are being mistyped. On the other hand, among the few that deem the current rule adequate, they note that there is a perception that rule changes will or should always mean making rules stricter, and that shouldn't necessarily be the case. Finally, several noted that dynamics outside of the AMP framework – ranging, for instance, from tribal access to private land, to impacts from climate change, to national politics, among others – impact receptivity for collaboration within this process.

Federal Government Caucus:

All three federal agencies expressed a sincere wish for collaborative multi-caucus leadership and action as the impetus for progress on and adherence to the HCP and the Clean Water Act assurances for reasons that extend well beyond their own legal, political and resource limitations or priorities. There is a strong sense that working well together is a more effective, efficient means to ensuring that all goals are met and that milestones are reached in a way that is satisfactory to all sides.

Opinions in terms of how much has been achieved to date range from 'some' to a 'good amount', though all perceive that some significant milestones for both the HCP and CWA assurances remain to be achieved. Issues of concern by federal agencies include: water temperature/riparian function and Clean Water Act assurances, stream typing (fish habitat vs fish presence), and rule/manual consistency with the HCP.

It was also noted that there are other HCP's with higher resource protections and those are still consistently proving economically viable. In addition, some noted that this HCP includes an

economic viability analysis and further commented that economic conditions have improved since the HCP was enacted.

There is a sense that the initial intent and concept of TFW/FFR/AMP was worthy and designed with the best intentions. However, several expressed concerns about the efficacy of its functioning over time, the perceived breakdown of relationships, and the perception that adaptive management hasn't occurred as intended in practice. Some of the reasons for this include a perceived lack of balance between an overemphasis on scientific research at the expense of making decisions on policy, a lack of clarity about who has accountability and authority over decisions, the nature and complexity of the decision-making process, a perceived breakdown in relationships and concern about ongoing obstructions and delays in the process. It was noted that less regulation in other sectors or a lack of adherence to mandates or agreements elsewhere does not legitimize failing to adhere to these agreements.

Several clarified that the HCP is with DNR, not with landowners, unlike some other HCPs, and as such it is DNR's role to support the FPB in making the right decisions to ensure adherence to agreements. There is some concern that current and diverse decision-makers, on FPB and elsewhere, do not have complete knowledge of what's in the HCP and what was agreed to. Some suggest that principals and decision-makers should refer to the HCP as a guide for determining action. There's a concern that turnover over the years has meant that prior system knowledge has been lost. Further, there's a sense that the realities of climate change increases their sense of priority and need for a closer adherence to the HCP and achieving Clean Water Act milestones. There is a concern that some WACs and board manuals, particularly those developed before the HCP was finalized, weren't updated to align with the HCP. Further, for both agreements, there is increasing concern that externally-driven legal action may be imposed if progress isn't made, as it was stated that lawsuits are the typical means for prompting federal action to ensure compliance, particularly given political, legal and resource conditions within federal agencies.

Some empathized that change is scary to people, but noted that the consequences of not following adaptive management could adversely impact all sides and all goals. Conversely, some expressed hope that if relationship and process changes result in good collaboration and tangible progress, this collaborative effort could be a model for other sectors and issues where conservation harm is greater. Some expressed hope that the diverse caucuses can be partners in the effort to tackle big picture issues and co-develop mutually-supported solutions. Federal agencies maintain an interest in higher-level collaboration if the process is productive and collaborative and as it holds promise of positive ripple effects to other programs and issues.

Multi-Caucus Perceived Challenges and Opportunities within the Adaptive Management Process (AMP) and Forest Practices Board (FPB):

Many interviewed commented on the scientific achievement within AMP and noted appreciation for the good intentions and good work of many within this process. That said, the vast majority interviewed expressed concern and a need for change in the AMP process – both in terms of relationships and process. Some thought reconciling relationships would either fix the problem or pave the way for a collective group to work on the problems in the process. The scale of process changes perceived ranged from modest to significant. Some thought an entirely new and different process and structure was needed either because the existing process was so broken or because the current structure/process was no longer relevant to today's world. Many pointed to individual behavior or relational dynamics that were eroding both the spirit of TFW and the effectiveness of the AMP/FPB. And many spoke to a need to reinvigorate leadership level relationships and functioning as a starting place to address AMP relationship and process changes. This includes, for many, having the space to reconcile relationships among those who are committed to each other and can speak for and hold their caucus accountable; and develop a shared sense of goals, priorities, and plans for accountability and shared problem-solving that can help transform all levels of engagement in the TFW/FFR/AMP realm.

Every caucus pointed to the frustrations of the consensus process as it relates to giving a single dissenting voice undue power to prevent a decision from moving forward that everyone else may be in favor of. Many spoke to their frustrations when the “other” used this decision-making process to their advantage, but they also expressed relief for the model when they could prevent a decision from going forward that they disagreed with. Some spoke to this concern in terms of the consensus process creating a lack of accountability or clear leadership in the process since everyone had an equal voice and there was no singular entity or individual who could call a halt to abuses in use of this model. Overall, many on all sides saw the consensus process as one of the key weapons used by individuals to advance their own agendas.

Regarding a lack of accountability and authority, many suggested that the process and structure, as currently designed, means that no one has authority to hold anyone accountable. It was noted that while the co-chairs of committees may try or could try to do this, they have neither formal training nor formal authority to do so. For this and other reasons, it's difficult to even recruit people to the role of chair. And while some argue that DNR could or should play this role, and that its DNR's responsibility to implement and enforce the rules, others point out that if DNR does step in in this way without clear mandate to do so or without first fixing the relationship problems, they will be accused of over-reach or that exercising authority over other caucus members, in what is supposed to be an equitable process, does not honor the collaborative intent of the process. Hence, calling out a violation of process or behavior can be turned into a perceived violation of the rules and spirit of the process. As one person pointed out, “anything gets used as a weapon”. This concern points to what many indicated which is that the relationships lack trust, individuals either act in self/group interest rather than

collective interest, or individuals are met with suspicion based on their group affiliation and the historical conflict that “their” group has had with “our” group.

With some exceptions, many reported increases in unprofessional or unproductive behavior in recent years, some indicating that the AMP has become a “hostile work environment”. A perceived lack of clear leadership and accountability within caucuses or within the AMP process or within AMP-related positions means these behaviors go unchecked, committee members grow frustrated or worn down by the dysfunctional relationship dynamics and while some have spoken directly to the caucus’ perceived leader in an effort for them to hold their staff or consultant accountable, nothing is perceived to have been done. Several people pointed to this need – for each caucus to hold their own people accountable – whether in or outside the AMP. Because many feel the process does not explicitly or clearly mandate who has authority to ensure behavioral norms (ground rules) or process guidelines are followed, nor does it offer the collective group a clear, formal means for recourse if perceived bad behavior of individuals continues, morale is impacted along with progress. Many expressed deep concern that many qualified, talented, and motivated scientists leave the AMP due to widely perceived long delays and inefficiencies in the process, the lack of tangible decisions resulting from scientific study and the lack of qualified people providing scientific input (or underqualified people challenging or undermining highly qualified people in unconstructive ways), and given the noted parallel opportunities for meaningful scientific progress in other institutions.

Many spoke to the need to establish a clear division between CMER and Policy, as well as a removal of external or political influences within and between these committees. Many people inside and outside of the AMP process pointed to concerns in CMER which include, a lack of qualified people at the table (especially as CMER work has evolved over the years to need scientific professionals with higher qualifications), a lack of preparation by participants before meetings or decisions are scheduled to occur, participants possessing a lack of time and/or mandate to dedicate time and resources to CMER work, a perception that committee members are there to intercept, advocate, or obstruct on behalf of their caucus, and a general lack of doing the objective work needed as part of this role. Overall, there was repeated expressions of concern that as voting members lack time, knowledge, and autonomy, many times decisions come down to uninformed people making party line votes.

Regarding the results of CMER work, there was wide variability in perceptions of what the results actually were, even before people expressed their broad diversity of opinions about a study’s relative value, validity and relevance to a potential rule change. As an example, perceptions of the numerical results from the hard rock study ranged from an overall decrease in temperature over time to a sustained increase in temperature over time. Where there were perceptions of sustained temperature increase, perceptions of the degree of temperature increase found in the study ranged by orders of magnitude.

Some expressed suspicions that participants appear to use issues and concerns in the AMP process to delay progress, sometimes bringing up one issue at a time over an extended time to ensure a repeated need to revisit, and thus delay, a project or process. Others noted that a lack

of or significant variability in technical capacity meant committee members were often not on the same page in how to progress. Others noted that the novel nature of this program meant a lot of learning needed to take place along the way.

Some gave other examples of delay, including that a lack of timely review of materials means a step 1 review could occur at step 3 which could trigger a need for change, thus undoing group work up until step 3. Another concern is that where timelines exist, they are too often not adhered to resulting in committee members voting “no” to buy them time for review, leading to further delay. It was noted that imposing consequences at this juncture wouldn’t help because the person who would have voted no at the current juncture could just use a “no” vote later to stop the process. In some cases, no clear timelines are given.

Several noted or reflected that even the term “adaptive management” and how it applies to this HCP implementation context is not defined or understood similarly by all. For instance, there is a chicken-egg disagreement about whether science is conducted to sufficiently (as agreed by all caucuses) reduce uncertainty before any rule is made or changed or whether the rules are made based on current available knowledge, further studied to assess validity, and the affirmed or changed. Concerns expressed throughout this assessment regarding scientific validity, certainty, risk, and shared risk are applicable and potentially amplified in the AMP process.

There is widespread concern that Policy has failed in its task of making recommendations to the Board and that this committee is too often influenced by politics from various caucuses. There is widespread concern that the Policy Committee no longer contains decision-makers at the table, which hinders progress on policy decisions. In addition, there is widespread concern that CMER no longer includes sufficient technical knowledge and expertise to be effective in its mandate (it was noted that the technical caliber requirements have increased over time according to need resulting in a need for higher caliber scientists). There is also some concern that some people are involved in too many committees, resulting in them having an outsized influence or being overloaded with work they can’t complete in a timely manner. There is concern in some cases that there hasn’t been sufficient turnover at Policy and CMER levels to allow new people to engage and in others that turnover hasn’t included sufficient onboarding for them to be effective in the relationship, technical and procedural realm. On the other hand, there is a concern about high turnover in project managers in CMER. Some expressed concern about a conflict of interest in committees where the participants benefitted directly and often financially from decisions. As far as a balance in composition in the various committees, some across multiple caucuses spoke to a perceived imbalance in group composition where they felt that timber industry interests are over-represented.

Several people spoke to a need for DNR to re-engage as a co-chair in Policy, CMER, and SAGs and that, when they did engage in this way, processes were more effective and efficient.

Many expressed concern that FPB is:

- 1) lacking sufficient, unbiased, or multi-caucus onboarding or meeting preparation on historical context and substantive issues;
- 2) lacking comprehension of larger issues or challenges within AMP;
- 3) lacking time, preparation and capacity to digest enormous amounts of technical information, collaboratively analyze proposed decisions, or address the backlog of rule-making needs
- 4) avoiding addressing difficult issues or decisions; and
- 5) influenced by and manifesting the polarization that exists among caucuses.

Interactions among board members were reported to be limited and periodic, while the structure of meetings allows limited opportunity for constructive analysis and creative dialogue across caucuses. One noted a lack of equity in tenure among FPB member positions, which was expressed as a problem not just about equity, but especially because of the years it takes to develop sufficient capacity to address highly technical decisions. Many reported that FPB preparedness is based on pre-meetings of same-side groups, or caucuses, which provides a bias of information going into decision-making. Some pointed out that those with the most resources and organization to synthesize high volumes of highly technical information and interpret that information in ways that may overly serve the interests of their caucus were at an advantage, while this practice also furthered the polarization that currently exists. As a result, they feel that members of the Forest Practices Board simply vote according to what their caucus (or their caucus of closest alignment) suggests to them. It was also noted that the Policy committee is the arena for deeper analysis and that it is their job to give the FPB consensus decisions. Thus, they feel that when Policy fails to do this work, the FPB is forced to take the burden of analysis into a decision-making structure that was not designed, in people or process, to do this level of analysis.

Concern was expressed that decisions influenced by external entities, rather than by individual assessment of information or as influenced by a well-rounded understanding of all caucus' needs and opinions, results in increased divisions within AMP/Policy and a lack of addressing difficult issues in FPB. Many expressed concern that the lack of time and other resources, typically resulted in the above reliance on external, biased influence or avoidance and delays in decision-making. There is a concern at multiple levels about either a lack of guidelines or guidance documents or that where they exist, they may contradict rules, or be written in ways that allow for multiple interpretations that increase division.

While the dispute resolution (DR) process may have been introduced to facilitate a resolution of conflict, many feel using DR is stigmatized, it is unhelpful, it simply drags out an already time-consuming process or it is threatened or used as a weapon. As such, some reported feeling that use of DR is a sign of failure or antagonism, a way for one caucus to use a weapon against others or as a means to delay, obstruct, or advance their one-sided solution. Others felt that DR shouldn't be stigmatized and that it should be used more, rather than less, though they noted that isn't how most people see it.

Frustration was widely expressed that currently circulating, proposed projects or policy changes inserted by one or another caucus for FPB approval are 1) aimed at circumventing the established AMP process, 2) lack scientific validity, 3) are developed in a non-collaborative way. Given this, there is both concern and suggestion that multiple caucuses will not trust or accept the results.

Perceptions of the Means of Influence for Each Caucus:

Author's Note: Means of influence, or power, is neither negative nor positive. Perceptions of disparity in power, as well as how one's means of influence, or power, is perceived to be used, by whom, and for what purpose, determines whether it is viewed as negative or positive, for or against the spirit and intent of collaboration or early agreements. Power can be formal (such as a law) or informal (such as relational influence) and relative power is variable, depending on the issue, and largely subject to individual or group perceptions. Both types of power, formal and informal, were commented on in the course of this assessment and those views are shared below.

Most participants of this assessment spoke to how caucuses use, could use or misuse their relative power or means of influence to prevent or provoke change in both negative and positive ways. Negative use of power was more prevalently noted, however. Perceptions of people or groups violating the “leave weapons at the door” early ground rule was frequently cited as consistently undermining a sense of trust of, safety in, and fidelity to this process or to agreements at multiple levels. Yet, many also suggested that when others fail to use their legal or mandated power, perceived by them and in this regard as positive, to ensure adherence to legal agreements or to ensure an effective process, this undermines a sense of safety, balance and trust. This was largely expressed with respect to DNR and federal agencies, but also other state agencies.

There is a sense that some use their means of influence to thwart a balance of power in their own favor, while others spoke to using their own means of influence positively and as a last resort to re-establish a balance of power to ensure agreed upon goals are met. Overall, perceptions of the most commonly cited and frequently used negative means of influence, commonly called ‘weapons’, included: the perceived use or misuse of process elements in the AMP, the effort to threaten, secure, or wield power outside of collaboration for personal or caucus gain (e.g., through the legislature or courts), the use of science as a weapon (including interpretation or perceived legitimacy of methodology and results, as well as development of science by a single caucus), and the act of engaging in unprofessional behavior.

While all caucuses are targets of concern or frustration by others for how they use or may use or don't use their power to influence change, by and large, the most concern for or expression of a current and historic use or misuse of power is directed at the large timber caucus. Widely thought by all caucuses to have the most power and/or to most regularly use its influence for one-sided gain, when compared to other caucuses, industry was also widely considered the

most effective in its current and frequent use of diverse forms of power. Largely this was framed in harmful terms, but positive use of large timber power was also noted.

Tribes, state, and federal agencies are also perceived to have significant and sometimes more power, but in general, they are perceived to hold potential power, meaning they do not yet use, or infrequently use, or under-use the power they possess. Their power is perceived to be either positive or negative, depending on the caucus. Conservation caucus power is next in line, but most likely cited by large timber, in terms of perceived strength or capacity of power. Conservation caucus is largely seen to use their power for harmful purposes, but their potential power for good is also noted, again, especially by large timber. Small forest land owners were next, and lastly, counties, which were mentioned the least in this regard.

Diverse caucuses pointed to the high degree of power – both a high capacity for and high frequency of deployment – used by large timber to influence decisions and outcomes. While most non-industry caucuses expressed concern about these actions in terms of violating both the spirit and legality of agreements, industry representatives viewed these actions mostly, but not exclusively, as a legitimate means to balance goals, to protect regulatory stability and economic viability, to assert a right or truth, particularly in the face of potentially unwarranted or unwelcomed change, or in reaction to perceived threat by others.

Means of influence cited frequently regarding **large timber** included:

- 1) Significantly influencing state agency actions, funding priorities or budgets through the legislature;
- 2) Using or suggesting potential use of legal action;
- 3) Advancing large timber caucus interests (in AMP, FPB, FP or agencies) through personal influence, vetoes in the AMP consensus model, by circumventing AMP process, through direct lobbying or through unprofessional behavior by industry representatives toward agency and AMP committee members;
- 4) Denying tribal access to land for scientific, monitoring or cultural purposes, or indirectly communicating the potential consequence of denying access to land if problems arise;
- 5) Using paid communication in the media to assert a quality of TFW collaboration or conditions that may not be shared across caucuses;
- 6) Influencing or attempting to influence high level federal administration officials in ways that would favor economic goals over ecological goals;
- 7) Pointing to what's been accomplished or pointing to other sectors perceived inadequacies or perceived lack of regulation as a means to delay progress or avoid fulfilling commitments;
- 8) One large member company in WFPA maintaining and using its outsized influence over other member companies to steer WFPA actions toward many of the actions on this list;
- 9) Helping to advance progress in other sectors or demonstrating support for tribal needs, such as in the culvert case; and
- 10) Possessing and using extensive financial resources for all the above.

Tribal power or means of influence included:

- 1) Treaty rights;
- 2) Use of legal action (which may or may not be based in treaty rights);
- 3) Legislative influence;
- 4) Influence which could result from a cohesive, unified alliance among WA tribes;
- 5) Capacity to prevent intra-tribal agreement or multi-caucus agreement because of a lack of agreement by one or more tribes;
- 6) Capacity to comment negatively on Forest Practices Applications (FPAs); and
- 7) Capacity to influence water-typing decisions in ID teams

State agencies were frequently perceived as either using or not using their power, formal and informal, to effectively influence the process. More frequently concerns expressed across caucuses had to do with state agencies perceived self-limiting use of their formal power in the fulfillment of agreements and legal mandates or to ensure compliance with established procedures.

Regarding a failure to use power, agencies are perceived to:

- 1) Not hold caucus members accountable due to:
 - a. concerns about political or budgetary retaliation;
 - b. perceived alignment with another caucus;
 - c. a lack of full engagement, clarity on role or mandate, or a lack of sense of priority.
- 2) Not honor legal or policy mandate regarding:
 - a. regulatory requirements or enforcement;
 - b. oversight and compliance regarding forest practices;
 - c. AMP, HCP or Clean Water Act assurances;
 - d. cultural resources.
- 3) Not uphold spirit and integrity of legal agreements and structures due to a fear of angering one or more caucuses; and
- 4) Not ensure consistency or accountability in AMP-related position descriptions or authority.

With reference to use, overuse, or misuse of power, these perceptions include:

- 1) To increase regulatory pressure, enforcement, or restrictions that are perceived to be overburdensome or unnecessary;
- 2) To influence AMP budgets and scientific research to benefit individual staff agendas or agency preferences;
- 3) To use the AMP consensus-based decision-making model to influence decision outcomes;
- 4) To use positional power, particularly within FPB or AMP, to control content of agendas, flow of information or resources, prioritization of motions or decisions; and
- 5) To enable an existing lack of balance of power among caucuses

Federal agencies power is perceived to range from significant, given their legal mandate, to a perception of relative insignificance due to a lack of authority to act, given political constraints or with regard to non-point source pollution. Their formal power is also devalued due to perceived lack of resources, sense of priority, or current external legal pressure or mandate to ensure compliance. Similar to state agencies, some have concern that federal agencies are not using their formal power to fulfill their legal obligations to ensure compliance.

Federal agency potential power is perceived to include the following:

- 1) To determine and articulate points of non-compliance in the HCP to balance goals being met;
- 2) To mandate compliance in current HCP where non-compliance is currently occurring; and
- 3) To only use power to uphold compliance if a lawsuit is filed on points of non-compliance with HCP or CWA assurances or, if other rights, for instance treaty rights, are deemed in violation by the courts.

The **conservation caucus** is seen to hold, use or misuse power in the following ways:

- 1) To use lawsuits or suggested use of legal action;
- 2) To influence or motivate public opinion, including through websites, social media and other venues;
- 3) To behave unprofessionally or un-collaboratively;
- 4) To influence the legislature;
- 5) To lobby agencies directly for caucus-desired actions;
- 6) To use elements of the AMP process, including vetoes in the consensus process and individual behavior, to stall or obstruct progress if it doesn't reflect caucus preferences or goals;
- 7) To take an all or nothing approach; and
- 8) To use financial resources for the above.

Small forest landowners' power includes:

- 1) To influence the legislature;
- 2) To use processes external to and not in line with AMP procedures to advance solutions;
- 3) To use the AMP consensus model of decision-making, individual behavior, and other process rules or opportunities to obstruct progress in adaptive management;
- 4) To use SFLO assertions of their position as the most marginalized or least powerful caucus to create a lack of safety for others to question or critique SFLO ideas or solutions that are perceived to violate current rules and procedures; and
- 5) To take an all or nothing approach.

Counties were mentioned with respect to their potential powers: to secure additional tax revenue within counties to comply with the need for culverts, as well as to bridge the needs and concerns of all or most other caucuses.

Common Ground and a Potential Path Forward:

There was a widespread expressed desire across caucuses for a Leadership Process (Principals Process) that:

- Engages diverse high-level decision-making leadership on all sides
- Reconciles relationship conflict and builds trust across caucuses
- Builds or strengthens genuine collaboration and shared problem-solving
- Addresses topics that are shared, relevant priorities
- Establishes clear goals, expectations, rules of engagement and agendas
- Ensures accountability and dissemination of learning, decisions and progress across leadership and throughout AMP, FP, caucuses
- Ensures learning from June 2019 workshop are imparted to and built upon for all who engage to ensure constructive, productive progress
- Ensures a process design that is inclusive, relevant, effective and respectful of the relevant governance and decision-making processes of leaders and caucuses
- Includes processes for same side alignment within caucuses before multi-caucus engagement and ongoing as needed.

Common ground. What topics and issues are addressed at each level of engagement are yet to be determined. The common ground topics most commonly noted throughout the assessment include:

- Build, re-build and revitalize **relationships** and reconcile deep-rooted, “us vs them” conflict across and within caucuses
- Establish, revisit or re-commit to multi-caucus **rules of engagement**
- Achieving shared clarity and multi-caucus **consistency in understanding about language and intent of major legal agreements and mandates**, as well as possible implications for current decision-making
- Establishing **higher level goals, expectations and criteria for decision-making** on significant, challenging or controversial issues
- Creating an **onboarding program** for new and recently new individuals in the FP/AMP/TFW space that includes history, context, spirit and substance of issues
- **Succession planning** under the HCP to ensure high-quality, long-term collaboration for the duration of the HCP and beyond
- Provide guidance, criteria and/or concrete changes (depending on level of engagement) to address **relationship, decision-making process and structural challenges in AMP**
- Establishing **consistency between guidance documents (ex. board manual), legal agreements, and/or rules**
- Once there’s shared confidence in the trust and efficacy of leadership collaboration across caucuses and the AMP process, use that improved collaboration and platform of leaders across sectors as a path to **addressing bigger landscape level challenges and opportunities, non-regulatory incentives, and/or other significant issues.**

Within the above common ground issues are several points of tension that need to be addressed collaboratively through a constructive, balanced and fair process for all.

Potential Path Forward:

1. **Establish full scope of diverse leadership receptivity for and commitment to collaborative revitalization.** (Proposed deadline: August 10, 2020)
 - a. Dissemination of this assessment report to the 139 individuals who contributed to it
 - b. Wider dissemination of this report to additional leadership and members within and across all caucuses can be achieved by these 139 individuals
 - c. Additional one-on-one conversations may be needed to provide clarity, where needed, and assess and secure leadership engagement going forward
 - d. In light of COVID-19, resource capacities and limitations need to be assessed and communicated
2. **The names of the individual leaders who will participate** in the leadership process should be documented. (Proposed deadline: August 10, 2020)
 - a. As leaders assess their willingness to engage, they should register their interest to engaging in the Principals Process with Stephen Bernath (Stephen.Bernath@dnr.wa.gov).
 - b. Principals Plus leadership composition will likely include: federal and state leadership, CEOs, tribal chair/council and/or directors, organizational leaders and other designated individuals with high-level decision-making authority
3. **Leadership will be engaged in establishing the structure, process, time commitment, and substantive priorities for dialogue and decision-making.** (Proposed deadline for scheduling first meeting: by the end of August, 2020; Proposed scheduling of first meeting: first available date for all involved between September-November, 2020)

Considerations may include:

 - a. A multi-tiered leadership process to allow the highest level leadership to engage regularly on topics most relevant to their role and capacity, while leaving high-level technical discussions to a subset of leadership with relevant technical or other knowledge. Engagement between levels of leadership will ensure relevant knowledge and capacities are able to shape shared wins at multiple levels.
 - b. Several people who participated in this assessment suggested quarterly meetings for 2-3 days each. That said, additional input will be needed. Also, COVID-19 may mandate that meetings take place in a virtual space for the foreseeable future. As such, timing and length of meetings may need to be adjusted. Technological capacity of all involved needs to be assessed.
 - c. Time between leadership meetings needs to be adequate so as to minimize burden on leadership time and ensure intra-caucus and tribal decision-making and governance processes are honored. Agendas, expectations, and goals need to be established well in advance to ensure adequate time and respect for these governance processes.

- d. Establish early a shared understanding of the relevant history, context, agreements, mandates and shared priorities, as well as a clear understanding of where progress has been made and what is needed going forward.
 - e. Assess which issues and topics need to be addressed at which level of engagement. Assess how priorities may or may not have shifted since this report or as a result of COVID-19 or other factors.
4. **Caucus needs for same side alignment meetings** need to be prioritized and addressed based on caucus desires, needs, funding, and timing. While ideally same side alignment would be done before multi-caucus engagement, given current timeline considerations and shared sense of urgency, some of this work can be done concurrently with a multi-caucus process. (Proposed dates: ASAP given caucus needs and availability)
 5. **Top down and bottom up decision-making to ensure accountability, efficiency, mutual support and long-term viability:** Given the beneficiaries of positive, shared progress include people at the leadership level, as well as those working throughout the FPB, AMP, and FP, it is recommended that processes going forward are inclusive of and enriched by the knowledge, capacities, and experience of those engaged at various levels.
 6. **Capacity building in conflict transformation** will aid and empower leaders and other key and engaged individuals to address the relationship, process and structural challenges, as well as improve efficiency, progress and stability in decision-making for long-term collaboration. (Proposed timeline: Begin in September, 2020)

Participants involved in the People, Timber, Forests, Fish, and Wildlife assessment:
(listed alphabetically by and within caucus)

Conservation Caucus:

- Manning, Jay, Cascadia Law
- Swedeen, Paula, Conservation Northwest
- Davies, Brent, Ecotrust
- Mendoza, Chris, Mendoza Environmental LLC
- Brown, Alec, Washington Environmental Council
- Kelley, Becky, formerly Washington Environmental Council
- Remlinger, Lisa, Washington Environmental Council
- Goldman, Peter, Washington Forest Law Center
- Glasgow, Jamie, Wild Fish Conservancy

County Caucus:

- Janicki, Lisa, Skagit County
- Jewell, Paul, Washington State Association of Counties
- Johnson, Eric, Washington State Association of Counties
- Swanson, Scott, Washington State Association of Counties

Federal Government Caucus:

- Brown, Dan, Environmental Protection Agency
- Wilcox, Michelle, Environmental Protection Agency
- Quan, Jennifer, National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration
- Acker, Marty, US Fish & Wildlife Service
- Romanski, Tim, US Fish & Wildlife Service
- Thompson, Brad, US Fish & Wildlife Service

State Government Caucus:

- McLain, Kelly, Department of Agriculture
- Serr, Ben, Department of Commerce
- Bartlett, Heather, Department of Ecology
- Bellon, Maia, Department of Ecology
- Doenges, Rich, Department of Ecology
- Ehinger, Bill, Department of Ecology
- Gilderleeve, Melissa, Department of Ecology
- Lizon, Patrick, Department of Ecology
- Watson, Laura, Department of Ecology
- Conklin, Chris, Department of Fish & Wildlife
- Davis, Jeff, Department of Fish & Wildlife
- Hayes, Marc, Department of Fish & Wildlife
- McIntyre, Aimee, Department of Fish & Wildlife
- Ojala-Barbour, Reed, Department of Fish & Wildlife
- Rentz, Terra, Department of Fish & Wildlife

- Susewind, Kelly, Department of Fish & Wildlife
- Bernath, Stephen, Department of Natural Resources
- Bugert, Tom, Department of Natural Resources
- Engel, Marc, Department of Natural Resources
- Flint, Ben, Department of Natural Resources*
- Franz, Hilary, Department of Natural Resources
- Gibbs, Heather, Department of Natural Resources*
- Hibbeln, Jacob, Department of Natural Resources*
- McGerr, Joenne, Department of Natural Resources
- Miskovic, Teresa, Department of Natural Resources*
- Munes, Eszter, Department of Natural Resources*
- Shramek, Joe, Department of Natural Resources
- Shramek, Patti, Department of Natural Resources*
- Hicks, Mark, Department of Natural Resources*
- Alison, Ted, Forest Practices District Manager
- Austin, JT, Governor's Office
- Ferester, Phil, Senior Council, Natural Resource Division**

*AMP Staff

**Attorney to FPB

Large Timber Industry Caucus:

- Bass, Robert, Hancock
- Smith, Carmen, Independent Logging Contractor
- Miller, Adrian, formerly Pope Resources
- Reynolds, Claudine, Port Blakeley
- Stanley, Court, Port Blakely
- Dieu, Julie, Rayonier
- Monahan, Bill, Rayonier
- Spadero, Jason, SDS Lumber
- Nelson, Tom, Sierra Pacific Industries
- Cramer, Darin, Washington Forest Protection Association
- Doumit, Mark, Washington Forest Protection Association
- Hooks, Doug, Washington Forest Protection Association
- Martin, Doug, Washington Forest Protection Association
- Mitchell, Cindy, Washington Forest Protection Association
- Wehling, Martha, formerly Washington Forest Protection Association
- Godbout, Kevin, Weyerhaeuser
- Kroll, A.J., Weyerhaeuser
- Sawin, Kristen, Weyerhaeuser
- Walter, Jason, Weyerhaeuser

Washington Hardwood Commission

- Bartelt, Randy

- Carbaugh, Brian
- Sweitzer, David
- Weiss, Rich

Small Forest Landowner Caucus:

- Murray, Joseph, Merril Ring
- Guenther, Bob, SFLO representative on Forest Practices Board
- Alescio, Dick, Small Forest Land Owner
- Barnowe-Meyer, Steve, Small Forest Land Owner
- Hendrickson, John, Small Forest Land Owner
- Miller, Ken, Small Forest Land Owner
- Musselman, Vic, Small Forest Land Owner
- Playfair, Patti, Small Forest Land Owner
- Bell, Harry, Washington Farm Forestry Association
- Oneil, Elaine, Washington Farm Forestry Association

Tribes Caucus:

- Desautel, Cody, Colville Confederated Tribes
- Friedlander, Randall, Colville Confederated Tribes
- Krausz, Eric, Colville Confederated Tribes
- Whitney, Richard, Colville Confederated Tribes
- Brownell, David, Jamestown - S'Klallam
- Hal, Hansi, Jamestown - S'Klallam
- Turnbull, Hilton, Jamestown - S'Klallam
- Baldwin, Todd, Kalispel
- Entz, Ray, Kalispel
- Osterman, Deane, Kalispel
- Beirne, Matt, Lower Elwha
- Hepfer, Russ, Lower Elwha
- McHenry, Mike, Lower Elwha
- Bob, Frank, Lummi
- Dunphy, Gregg, Lummi
- Troutt, David, Nisqually
- Peters, Jim, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
- Roorbach, Ash, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
- Schuett-Hames, Dave, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission*
- Stewart, Greg, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission*
- Daubenberger, Hans, Port Gamble
- McCollum, Paul, Port Gamble
- Veneman, Nikki, Port Gamble
- Ladley, Russ, Puyallup
- Geyer, Frank, Quileute
- Rasmussen, Garrett, Quileute
- Bingaman, Dave, Quinalt

- Fasano, Caprice, Quinalt
- MacFarland, Lauren, Quinalt
- Mobbs, Mark, Quinalt
- Ravenel, Daniel, Quinalt
- Woodard, Todd, Samish
- Veldhuisen, Curt, Skagit River System Cooperative
- Herrera, David, Skokomish
- Pavel, Joseph, Skokomish
- Kieffer, BJ, Spokane
- McRae, Chad, Spokane
- Thomas, Cody, Spokane
- Rockwell, Scott, Stillaguamish
- Stevenson, Pat, Stillaguamish
- Kay, Debbie, Suquamish
- Villaluz, Tino, Swinomish
- Gobin, Jason, Tulalip
- Marks, Derek, Tulalip
- Miller, Ryan, Tulalip
- Michele, DR, Upper Columbia United Tribes
- Sirois, John, Upper Columbia United Tribes
- Clement, Curtis, Upper Skagit
- Schuyler, Scott, Upper Skagit
- Rigdon, Phil, Yakama

*AMP Science Staff

Additional Individuals:

- Baril, Katherine, Retired
- Thompson, Tim, Thompson Consulting Group
- Anonymous participants