Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee
May 1, 2014 Meeting Summary

Decisions and Actions from Meeting

Decision	Notes
1. Accepted the April 3, 2014 meeting summary with edits.	Agreement by all caucuses
2. Accepted the Bull Trout Overlay Shade/Temperature Final Report (formal receipt, no agreement on recommendations following acceptance of the Final Report).	Agreement by all caucuses
3. Delayed further action on the Bull Trout Overlay Final Report until September 2014.	Agreement by all caucuses

Action	Assignment
1. Distribute job announcement for AMPA replacement.	All caucuses
2. Revise talking points to the Board on mass wasting.	Stephen Bernath & Adrian Miller
3. Develop a summary of initial recommendations on appropriate next steps to the Bull Trout Overlay report, send to Co-Chairs.	All caucus leads
4. Try to videotape off-channel habitat sites at the westside sites.	DNR
5. Revise the Master Project Schedule and bring revisions to the June Policy meeting.	CMER and Policy Co-Chairs
6. Draft May 1, 2014 meeting summary.	Claire Turpel & Bob Wheeler

Welcome & Introductions – Stephen Bernath and Adrian Miller, Co-Chairs of the Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee (Policy), welcomed everyone and led introductions (*please see Attachment 1 for a list of participants*). The facilitator reviewed the agenda; one caucus requested that the Type F discussion be earlier in the day because it relates to Policy's current priorities set by the Forest Practices Board (Board).

Announcements – The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) will replace Jim Hotvedt, who is retiring as the Adaptive Management Program Administrator (AMPA) at the end of May. DNR hopes that the new AMPA will be hired in time to have some overlap with Jim, but that may not be possible. The position could be covered for about a month with existing staff, but the plan is to hire an AMPA as soon as possible and not have an interim during the search.

DNR currently has five candidates from the first round of applications that came in, and will hold the position open for at least another two weeks to see if any additional applications come in. Then DNR will include the Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research (CMER) Co-Chairs on the initial interview panel. The Policy Co-Chairs and the Board Chair will be involved on the second phase of interviews.

DNR hopes that many Policy caucuses will circulate the job announcement to those they think would be qualified and interested in this position.

April 3, 2014 Meeting Summary – Several edits came through prior to this meeting but after the initial meeting summary was shared. Policy reviewed these edits, and then accepted the meeting summary with those corrections. Some edits asked for clarification instead of corrections, so those questions will be addressed through this meeting and captured in this meeting summary. One caucus requested that the meeting summary be shared in advance of the meeting if there are substantial edits from the original meeting summary sent with the meeting materials.

Mass Wasting – The Policy Co-Chairs drafted talking points for the May Board meeting based on the conversation at the April 21st additional Policy meeting. The Co-Chairs shared those talking points to allow Policy members to give feedback. Overall, the talking points were constructed to show the Board that Policy wants to respond to the landslide tragedy at Oso, but also acknowledge that if the Board wants Policy to prioritize work on mass wasting, it will take Policy off course from the current priorities.

Discussion:

- These talking points from the Policy Co-Chairs will accompany the memo from the Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring Project (MWEMP) study authors, which address the technical questions from the Board Chair delivered to Policy at the April 3 meeting.
- It is likely that the talking points will become a handout for the Board.
    - Because the draft will likely be shared with the Board, one caucus suggested that the draft clarify when there are requests to the Board for their action.
- Policy discussed whether the Board Chair "suggested" or "directed" Policy to do additional work on mass wasting. Several caucuses feel strongly that the Board Chair directed Policy to do this work without asking Policy to come to a decision about how and when they would address the topic.
    - The Co-Chairs encouraged other caucuses to express this confusion through their respective Board members and public comment.
    - The language of "suggest" or "direct" can be answered by the memo from the Board Chair to the Policy Co-Chairs that was sent as follow-up from the April 3 meeting.
- It was suggested that the draft talking points include a section explaining the depth to which Policy discussed how public safety is incorporated into the various documents (i.e., the Forests & Fish Report, the Habitat Conservation Plan, the forest practices rules, Board Manual guidance, and the SEPA rules).
- The Co-Chairs feel that Type F is still the number one priority for Policy, as directed by the Board in February 2014. Unless the Board changes priorities at the May meeting, Policy will return to working on Type F because they have responded to the questions from the Board Chair on mass wasting. However, the Co-Chairs anticipate that the Board will further direct Policy on mass wasting at the May meeting.
- It was suggested that the talking points explain what the review of the mass wasting research strategy was scheduled to be, then explain how that review will change if the Board wants Policy to incorporate public safety.

  - Policy discussed whether doing the review of the mass wasting research strategy by the August Board meeting is a realistic timeline.
  - It was suggested that Policy model the review of this research strategy after the Type N research strategy review. Policy agreed to commit to doing this by the November Board meeting due to the amount of other work that needs to happen concurrently.
  - If Policy forms a subgroup to initially review the research strategy, many caucuses agreed that it would be good to have only a small number of participants in the subgroup. Whatever the subgroup initially agrees to will be brought to Policy for approval.
- One caucus suggested that the Co-Chairs remind the Board of the next steps Policy and DNR are undertaking to follow up from the MWEMP. The Co-Chairs have been asked to review that set of recommendations again at the May Board meeting.
- Policy discussed short- and longer-term tasks:
  - Short-term (prepare for August Board meeting): Scope the glacial deep-seated landslides program. Develop the plan for how to review the full mass wasting research strategy.
  - Longer-term (prepare for November Board meeting): Review and develop the research strategy. It is important to remind the Board that while the research strategy can be reviewed in the near-term, the review will produce long-term results.
- Policy discussed whether they are the appropriate body to assess public safety. The draft talking points address this question by acknowledging that Policy would at least need additional resources and/or experts to adequately consider public safety.
  - Some caucuses feel that the right people to discuss public safety are not in Policy, while some feel that Policy can address parts of the public safety question.
  - One question about public safety is whether it is the Adaptive Management Program's role to directly address public safety or if public safety encompassed through SEPA and forest practices screening.
  - There is a difference between the process questions related to public safety and the research questions related to public safety. One caucus suggested that Policy should be mindful of the different questions and who is best suited to answer them, which might include geologists, both from UPSAG and elsewhere.
  - One caucus suggested looking at other CMER studies to see how much mass wasting events will deliver sediment to roads and houses; and then see what emergency management groups could be involved in the public safety discussion. This could be modeled after the electrofishing workshop that would involve electrofishing technical experts (originally scheduled for April).
  - Several caucuses feel that the statutes, rules, and guidance incorporate public safety so it is within Policy's purview to address public safety. However, there are shades of how much Policy can address within public safety, such as the potential for slides (i.e., zonation).

The Co-Chairs will take the discussion at this meeting and revise their draft for the Board.

Bull Trout Overlay Shade/Temperature Final Report – Bill Ehinger from the Department of Ecology reviewed the findings from the Bull Trout Overlay Shade/Temperature study, which was a consensus

recommendation from CMER. Overall, the report shows that there were changes detected in temperature due to loss of shade, but only by a very small amount.

Discussion:

- This study had an issue where some landowners did not harvest all trees marked for removal, so they had to return to remove or slash those trees.
- The Ponderosa Pine Zone was not included in the study because the nomograph (standard shade rule) did not allow for shade removal in this low elevation zone. This would essentially make the standard shade rule the same as the "all available shade rule" and negate comparison of the two shade prescriptions.
- If Policy recommends to the Board that there is no further need for the Bull Trout Overlay, it could be because the minimum tree count and basal area requirements in the standard riparian prescription is providing adequate shade.

Decision: Policy voted to accept the consensus report from CMER, which is a formal action that starts the timeline for a decision on next steps. Policy also voted later in the meeting to delay this work until fall 2014 (*see page 5*).

Recognition of AMPA – As this was his last Policy Committee meeting, Policy celebrated Jim Hotvedt's long-term commitment to the Adaptive Management Program. Jim had some parting words for Policy: "Use the WACs and Board Manual as a tool, not a weapon…Remember that you're a team, and a team plays together, not against each other."

Type F – The Co-Chairs reviewed the plan that had been on schedule to address Type F until the Oso landslide refocused attention away from Type F. The plan had been to address the direction from the Board and report to the Board at the August meeting, with a progress update at the May Board meeting. Policy had planned to do work on electrofishing and off-channel habitat, holding several meetings, workshops, and an eastside and westside field trip to tour off-channel habitat.

Discussion:

- The westside field trip to see off-channel habitat is planned, the field sites have been chosen (in Capitol State Forest). DNR planned that everyone could meet for an afternoon workshop, then go out the next day for the field trip. The optimal time to see off-channel habitat has passed for this season, but you can see evidence of the flow at the westside sites.
- The eastside field trip to see off-channel habitat is still in the works. Marc Gauthier videotaped several sites in order to capture the sites during high flow and because they are far apart from one another. Therefore, it may be an option to view those tapes instead of doing a field trip because of the travel to and from plus the travel between the sites (Policy should assume at least three full days of travel and site visits for the eastside field trip).
    - It was suggested that the westside sites be videotaped as well while there is still flow, which DNR will try to do.
- The electrofishing workshop was planned for April 21, until the landslide tragedy refocused that meeting. Depending upon the Board's direction at the May meeting, Adrian Miller is ready to re-convene the technical people for the electrofishing workshop. If Policy members want to come to

that workshop, they will be asked to sit around the outside to listen and allow the technical experts to participate.

- One caucus is interested in convening a technical group for off-channel habitat like the technical group for electrofishing. Once the Policy workshop and field trips on off-channel habitat are complete, Policy can assess if they want to convene a technical group on off-channel habitat to answer additional questions.

Next Steps: Policy will wait for more direction from the Board at the May meeting about whether to continue the Type F effort.

Potential Workload Shift – Due to the number of substantive topics currently at Policy, the Co-Chairs will acknowledge this to the Board at the May meeting and remind them that their current priorities do not include mass wasting. If the Board re-directs Policy to include mass wasting as a priority, that will shift the amount of time and resources that Policy can devote to carrying out the current priorities. At the June meeting, Policy can re-assess the workload with direction from the Board.

Decision: Due to overall workload, Policy agreed to delay any further decision-making on the Bull Trout Overlay Shade/Temperature Final Report until September 2014. Between now and September, caucuses are encouraged to develop a summary of initial recommendations on appropriate next steps to the Bull Trout Overlay report.

Forest Practices Board May Meeting – DNR reviewed expectations from the two-day Board meeting on May 12 and 13:

- The first day will be a work session on unstable slopes. The Board will review a suite of reports and Policy recommendations related to unstable slopes.
- The second day will be the regularly scheduled Board meeting with decision items.
    - The Policy Co-Chairs will discuss the work priorities for Policy, and the Board will consider approving the work plan.
    - The Board will consider the initial draft of the CMER Master Project Schedule.
    - The Board will consider the new CMER member, which has been proposed to be Harry Bell as a representative of the Washington Farm Forestry Association.

Master Project Schedule Revisions for August Board Meeting – At the April 21st meeting, Policy gave CMER parameters to work within to begin revising the Master Project Schedule. CMER started work on that at their April 22nd meeting, and Mark Hicks summarized the initial work:

- CMER kept unranked research studies as placeholders, and applied two different default templates for how much each project will cost and how long it will take depending on whether or not it would likely use a pre- vs. post-experimental study design.
- Many projects not currently budgeted in the Master Project Schedule will need further discussion because CMER does not have consensus that those projects are needed.
- CMER began to rearrange the studies into groupings: projects almost finished, critical ongoing projects, planned priority projects, projects whose purpose may be met by other projects, unranked research studies, other projects not previously budgeted for in the Master Project Schedule, and potential new projects.

- CMER identified feedback needed from Policy on: projects that appear to no longer be needed, projects that appear to be effectively complete, and projects that are not a CMER task.
- It was noted that it would help keep projects on track if CMER had more scientists who could focus on completing projects.
- CMER included extensive monitoring projects in the budget, but they currently add up to above the prescribed budget range. Extensive projects need more discussion by Policy to see if they should stay in the Master Project Schedule or not.
- CMER needs feedback from Policy about what, if anything, can CMER exclude from the Master Project Schedule. In order to do that within the timeline, Policy agreed to have a subcommittee of the two Policy and two CMER Co-Chairs to initially revise the Master Project Schedule. The revised version would have to go to Policy for approval before it moves to the Board.

Decision: The four Co-Chairs will bring a revised version of the Master Project Schedule to Policy at the June meeting. The revisions will continue to be iterative between CMER and Policy until the July Policy meeting, when hopefully a final draft can be agreed upon to go to the August Board meeting.

DNR's Revised FPA Review Process – DNR shared the flow charts with Policy at the April 21st meeting, which are meant to complement the presentations given by DNR in August 2013. Flowchart 1 is a reflection of mass wasting prescriptions from watershed analysis. Flowchart 2 is the standard process.

Discussion:

- WACs 222-16-050 and 222-10-030 govern the FPA review. 222-16-050 is explicit to trigger the SEPA process but does not lead to a certain determination.
- Policy discussed how much guidance the foresters have in making the determinations. The first decision is the initial classification, and if it is classified as Class IV-Special, there must be a geotechnical report. This requires a Qualified Expert to complete the report, which informs the answers for SEPA.
    - Foresters are not making determinations, geologists are.
- If FPAs do not include enough information, DNR will ask them to withdraw and get the rest of the information, or DNR will remove the application from consideration. DNR cannot approve an application that has the potential to deliver to a public resource.
- ID Teams can also be used to help identify potential to deliver.
- The basic strategy around unstable slopes is avoidance. Most landowners do not want to go through SEPA so once they find an unstable slope, they often withdraw their application and re-configure the area to re-apply.
- To answer additional questions, some caucuses will contact DNR outside this meeting to get more answers.
- The next step is for DNR to share with the Policy the revised FPA form. Finalizing the form is taking time because they are simultaneously revising the form to incorporate the FPHP rules.

Next Steps – Policy agreed to hold the July meeting on July 10th instead of July 3rd.

The Co-Chairs adjourned the meeting at 4:30pm.

Attachment 1 – Participants by Caucus at 5/1/14 Meeting*

Conservation Caucus
Chris Mendoza
*Mary Scurlock

County Caucus
*Kendra Smith

Federal Caucus
*Marty Acker

Landowner Caucus – Nonindustrial (small)
*Dick Miller, WFFA

Landowner Caucus – Industrial (large)
Kevin Godbout, Weyerhaeuser
Doug Hooks, WFPA
Adrian Miller, Olympic Resource Management, Co-Chair
*Karen Terwilleger, WFPA

State Caucus – DNR
Marc Engel
*Chris Hanlon-Meyer
Marc Ratcliff

State Caucus – Ecology & WDFW
Mark Hicks, Ecology
*Terry Jackson, WDFW
*Stephen Bernath, Ecology, Co-Chair

Tribal Caucus – Eastside
Ray Entz, Kalispel Tribe of Indians (phone)
*Marc Gauthier, Upper Columbia United Tribes (phone)

Tribal Caucus – Westside
Mark Mobbs, Quinault Nation
*Jim Peters, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Curt Veldhuisen, Skagit River Systems Cooperative (phone)

*Caucus leads

Others
Bill Ehinger, Ecology
Amy Kurtenbach, DNR
Leslie Lingley, DNR
Joe Stohr, WDFW, Board member (phone)
Jim Hotvedt, Adaptive Management Program Administrator (AMPA)
Claire Turpel, Triangle Associates
Bob Wheeler, Triangle Associates

Attachment 2 – Ongoing Priorities Checklist

Priority	Assignment	Status &Notes
Type N	Type N policy subgroup	On hold until other workload lessens.
Type F	Board	On hold until other workload lessens.
Adaptive Mgmt Program Reform Rule Changes		Accepted by Board at August meeting, CR-103 process initiated. Implemented initial changes at November 2013 meeting, will tweak changes for subsequent meetings.
Mass Wasting Report Findings Package	DNR	Waiting for DNR's written description of the process and revised FPA form.
Ongoing CMER reports reviewed by Policy	Mark Hicks & Todd Baldwin, CMER Co-Chairs	CMER Co-Chairs to give update(s) as needed at Policy meetings; AMPA to give quarterly reports for when CMER studies to come to Policy

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

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

Entity, Group, or Subgroup	Next Meeting Date	Notes
Forests & Fish Policy Committee	June 5, 2014	
CMER	May 27, 2014	
Type N Policy Subgroup	TBD	On hold due to workload constraints.
Type F Subcommittee(s)	TBD	On hold due to workload constraints.
Forest Practices Board	May 12 & 13, 2014	May 12: Work session (likely on Mass Wasting and Type F topics) May 13: Regular Board meeting