

Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee
 April 3, 2014 Meeting Summary

Decisions and Actions from Meeting

Decision	Notes
1. Accepted the March 6 & 7, 2014 draft meeting summary as final, with additional edits.	Full consensus of every caucus present
2. Added \$50,000 in FY15 to do initial scoping of the Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides Program.	Full consensus of every caucus present
3. Approved FY15 AMP budget with the addition of the Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides Program scoping.	Full consensus of every caucus present
4. Initially approved the Master Project Schedule; subsequent to future revisions April – July 2014.	Full consensus of every caucus present
5. Use the April 21 st meeting to address the Board Chair’s request for further consideration of Mass Wasting.	Full consensus of every caucus present

Action	Assignment
1. Designate a caucus representative to participate in strategy discussions for the AMP funding bill in 2015 session.	Each caucus lead
2. Unpack the FFSA fund balance and how the surplus from a few years ago has been spent.	Jim Hotvedt
3. Re-format the Master Project Schedule to reflect the order of the AMP budget, and include line numbers.	Jim Hotvedt
4. Revise the Master Project Schedule given changes agreed upon at April 2014 Policy meeting.	Jim Hotvedt

Welcome & Introductions – Stephen Bernath, Co-Chair of the Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee (Policy or “the Committee”), welcomed participants and led introductions (*please see Attachment 1 for a list of participants*). The Committee recognized the tragedy brought on by the landslide in Oso, Washington, on the north fork of the Stillaguamish River on March 22nd. Participants were encouraged to send money as the food banks are well stocked.

Announcements

AMP Funding Legislation

The Adaptive Management Program (AMP) funding bill (Senate Bill 6478) was not passed by the legislature this session. It passed in the Senate but never moved out of the House Appropriations Committee, though it did have strong bipartisan support if it had been moved to the House floor. A multi-stakeholder group worked hard to gain support for this bill; they received a House Republicans and a House Democrats sign-on letter supporting the bill, and the Governor was supportive, but they ran out of time and the session ended before the bill could move out of Committee. Many Policy members are

interested in developing a strategy for trying this bill in the 2015 session because several are concerned that there will not be enough funding for all the proposed projects and studies the AMP is scheduled to do in future years. Each caucus was encouraged to designate a person to be part of the coalition of stakeholders to work on a strategy for the 2015 session.

Ground Rules – Committee members were encouraged to remember the ground rules and respect the needs of other caucuses as well as the overall focus of the Committee.

Caucus Perspective – Jim Peters thanked the Committee for working hard towards common goals and outcomes. In his role, he also participates in multi-stakeholder conversations about the agriculture riparian buffers, which do not happen in the same way that the forestry discussions happen. In the forestry discussions at the Policy Committee, there is much more focus on the best available science to protect the resources and the timber industry, and he sees continued movement forward though at times it can seem slow. Another caucus lead thanked Jim for the work he is doing on the agriculture riparian buffers, and mentioned that Washington's model for multi-stakeholder conversation around forestry practices and resource management is cutting edge, likely for the entire country. The multi-stakeholder work on forestry is important but does not have a road map which makes the work trickier.

Eastside Tribal Representation – Since Chase Davis's departure, the Upper Columbia United Tribes (UCUT) has been unsure of who will be the official representative to Policy. UCUT decided to keep the science and technical roles separate, so Marc Gauthier will keep his technical role and various individuals from UCUT and the member tribes will play the Policy role. At this meeting, Ray Entz from the Kalispel Tribe of Indians represented the eastside tribal caucus, though this may rotate depending on the focus of future meetings. Marc will remain involved in the work of the Policy Committee, and Todd Baldwin will remain the Co-Chair of the Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research (CMER) Committee.

Marc 6 & 7, 2014 Meeting Summary – Many Policy members sent edits to the facilitators in advance of this meeting on the draft meeting summary from the two-day March meeting. Two more minor edits were made and the Committee accepted the summary as final with these additional changes.

AMP Budget – Jim Hotvedt, Adaptive Management Program Administrator (AMPA), noted that the focus of the meeting was to review the 2015 AMP budget and seek Policy approval, then review the Master Project Schedule and seek Policy approval. If there are changes to the budget, they will be noted in the Master Project Schedule. CMER reviewed the AMP budget in February and March this year, and initially came to a non-consensus agreement on the budget. Since the March CMER budget, the non-consensus has been changed to a consensus budget since the question holding up consensus can be answered outside the budget process.

Discussion

- When both Policy and the Forest Practices Board (Board) adopt the budget and the Master Project Schedule, they will adopt projections and not hard numbers. 2014 will be the first year that the Board will officially adopt the Master Project Schedule.

- The discussion for introducing the AMP funding bill in the 2015 legislative session will begin with the Governor's office in September, so it was suggested that the Master Project Schedule should be as accurate as possible by then so it can be used to estimate funding needs.
 - There was some discussion about the changing the Master Project Schedule, which is summarized in the Master Project Schedule section, below.
- In the past, Policy has sent a budget to the Board with projected negative balances in the future years, though enough funding has always become available.
- Every state agency is required by the Office of Financial Management to have a "working capital reserve fund" for each large-scale program with an individual budget. The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) has one for the Forest & Fish Support Account (FFSA), which currently has approximately \$900,000 in the event that bills come through for the studies and projects faster than the state revenue is available. When the AMPA does annual budgeting, he does not consider this \$900,000 to be there because it should only be used in emergencies.

Policy reviewed each project and there were comments and discussion on many:

- The **Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Hard Rock** study is a substantial project (17 topical chapters) and will take a substantial amount of time to thoroughly review. It is currently being reviewed by CMER (in individual chapters), and then the chapters will be sent in six batches to independent scientific peer review (ISPR). Once complete at ISPR, it will come to Policy, but is not anticipated to do so before the end of fiscal year 2015 (FY15). While the main report may be completed in FY16, the amphibian genetics portion of the study will be written as a separate report as field work remains since this work is to be done post-harvest after a full generational turnover of the amphibians.
 - The budget item related to amphibian demographics/channel metrics saw a decrease in budget because CMER agreed to only do one year of channel metrics, but they still intend to do the two planned years of amphibian demographics.
- The **Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Hard Rock Extended Sampling** is focused on looking at the temperature data through spring 2014. In the next fiscal year, they will go back to Year 5 and repeat the chemistry samples.
- The **Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Soft Rock** study is moving into the harvest phase. This project is partly funded through the Department of Ecology and the balance is through the AMP.
- Policy reviewed the **Eastside Type N Characterization** in late 2013 and decided to split into two components: one on the spatially intermittent Np streams (dry channels below the UMPPF) and one on the spatially continuous flowing Np streams (perennial for most of the stream length). They will use the same sites from the Forest Hydrology Study and have extended the existing contract to cover this supplemental data collection effort, so the budget figure for the dry season sampling is added to what is in the budget for completing the original Forest Hydrology Study.
 - \$80,000 will go to Rick Woodsmith to work on the study design for the spatially dry/intermittent component. He will be involved in the field collection work this summer, will do the analysis of the data, and will lead the writing team for the study design.
 - \$30,000 is to finish the Forest Hydrology Study and prepare it for ISPR.

- The **Van Dyke's Salamander** study has \$56,000 to initiate the first phase of what is proposed to be a three-phase study. This is a complicated study because the detection rate of these salamanders is low, which needs to be addressed before they can be adequately evaluated.
- The **Extensive Riparian Status & Trends Monitoring** for temperature and vegetation is a four-part study: Eastside Type N, Eastside Type F, Westside Type N, Westside Type F. Eastside Type F is complete, and the final draft report for the Westside Type N and Westside Type F is ready for completion and will be combined into a single report. The Eastside Type N study had trouble finding streams with water, so hopefully the Forest Hydrology Study sites can be used. Policy asked the Riparian Scientific Advisory Group (RSAG) to consider remote-sensing options for vegetation. RSAG sent a memo to the Policy Co-Chairs to answer this question, and now it is ready for Policy to address when the time is right. The hope is to do that in 2014.
- The **Eastern Washington Riparian Assessment Project (EWRAP)** has no funding for FY15, it has been delayed until FY16 to give SAGE time to determine if they will recommend doing a modeling analysis on forest health. A goal of EWRAP is to use data to project riparian stands to determine whether or not those stands would meet basal area targets.
- The **Westside Type F Riparian Prescription Monitoring, Unstable Slopes Criteria Evaluation and Development, and Road Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring** all have placeholder funds in FY15 in case the contractors need per diem costs.
- The **Wetlands Systematic Literature Synthesis** has \$60,000 to finish the work with the contractor, which would involve something that comes out of ISPR.
- The **Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Study** will use the \$25,000 in FY15 to go through the study design process.
- The **RMZ-Resample (Birds)** funding is to finish the bird examination. The study is at ISPR now.
- The AMP has three science positions at the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, and are interviewing for a new wetlands person. They hope to narrow down the search and hire this person soon.
- In addition to the working capital reserve fund, the AMP has a contingency fund of \$100,000 which is for unintended costs or additional help/equipment once projects are in the field. the AMPA does not use the contingency fund In a fiscal year, if one project goes over budget but another project goes under budget and can cover the other project's costs,.
- For FY15, most of the funding is a carry-forward from the previous years' fund balance. There is much less anticipated as a carry-over into FY15. This will be clarified.
- DNR suggested re-initiating scoping of the Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides Program with \$50,000 for FY15. CMER's work would be to identify the next steps for this program, which might include re-convening UPSAG. CMER will guide the science part; Policy needs to provide clear guidance for what is needed from the science.

Decision: The present Policy Committee caucuses unanimously approved the fiscal year 2015 Adaptive Management Program budget with the addition of the Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides Program scoping.

CMER Master Project Schedule – Jim Hotvedt prepared the Master Project Schedule so that it reflects the proposed FY15 AMP budget, so he will change it to reflect the budget addition. Policy must approve the Master Project Schedule at this meeting so it can be prepared for the Board's approval at their May meeting.

Discussion

- The AMPA will re-format the Master Project Schedule to reflect the order and line numbers from the AMP budget, including line numbers.
- It was suggested that in order to meet the deadline to have a Policy-approved Master Project Schedule in time for the Board in May, Policy can approve a multi-step process:
 - Initially approve the Master Project Schedule at the April Policy meeting for the Board's approval in May. This is needed to accomplish a deadline set out in the 2012 settlement agreement.
 - Between the April Policy meeting and the July Policy meeting:
 - Identify whether some projects can be moved into later years, which would help keep projected annual costs down.
 - Incorporate the projects from the CMER workplan that are not already in the Master Project Schedule, and prioritize them by including timelines and budgets.
 - Approve the revised Master Project Schedule no later than the July Policy meeting for the Board's approval in August.
- There was general agreement for this idea, especially since Policy will need input from CMER on how to delay projects in a manner that does not delay the entire AMP. It was determined that Policy should provide guidance to CMER as they consider projects to delay.
- There is some volatility with the funding associated with the B&O excise surcharge, so there should be a conversation between CMER, Policy, and DNR administration sometime about that volatility and how to adjust or plan for unexpected surpluses or deficits.

Policy agreed to initially approve a Master Project Schedule that identifies the annual budgets for 2015, 2016, and 2017, and for all subsequent years marks an "x" where there would be some funding. Throughout April, May, June, and July, Policy members will work together with recommendations from CMER on a revised version of the Master Project Schedule that includes the additional projects not yet included in the Master Project Schedule, and works to reduce the projected annual costs. An "x" would also go for the years after 2017 for projects that are just in the scoping phase in 2015. If Policy fails to agree to a revised Master Project Schedule in time for the August 2014 Board meeting, the default document to go forward will be the version prepared for the April 2014 Policy meeting.

Decision: Policy unanimously approved the following motion:

- **Update MPS for May Board meeting.** Provide Board with consensus MPS on projects, priorities, timing, and budget estimates (with caveats) at May 2014 meeting, including:
 - 2015, 2016, and 2017 #s.
 - Also include #s for ongoing projects through completion (not including TWIG scoping).
 - Include "x" for projects that begin after 2015 in years beyond 2017.
 - Include caveat that the MPS is under revision. If no agreement, acknowledge default version as the MPS dated March 27, 2014 with budget amendment from April 3, 2014 Policy meeting (this would be a Policy non-consensus MPS).
- **Consider longer-term updates.** Policy will provide direction to CMER on how to revise the MPS, including:
 - Try to reduce annual costs to approximately below \$ x

- Review 2016 and 2017 projected costs and priorities
- Add missing projects into schedule with cost/priority
- Evaluate disconnect between versions of the MPS/budget (?)
- **Finalize for August Board meeting.** Policy/CMER complete the revised MPS by August Board meeting. Report to Board at August 2014 meeting with revisions. Policy will discuss at April 21st meeting, if time, providing guidance to CMER for their April 22nd regularly scheduled meeting. CMER will try to provide recommendations to Policy by May 1 Policy meeting. Policy will finalize items at the May 1 meeting for the AMPA's Board report in May.

Mass Wasting – Aaron Everett, Chair of the Forest Practices Board, requested Policy to consider several issues following the recent landslide in Oso, Washington. He mentioned that there should be an immediate conversation about the issue of public safety surrounding mass wasting events, and what more could have been concluded in the unstable slopes approach. The Chair had reviewed the Mass Wasting study and asked Policy to:

1. Convene the study authors and CMER staff to evaluate what may be learned from further review of the public safety subpopulation of landslides in the Mass Wasting report.
2. Further inquire into the small group of glacial deep-seated landslides that were in the Mass Wasting report population.
3. Examine to what extent the study discussed or considered the rule group and resource objectives related to public safety, and how those factored into the formulation of Policy's recommendations to the Board. Consider whether those should be discussed in future deliberations on future Mass Wasting studies.
4. More broadly review the AMP's approach to the Mass Wasting research strategy.

The request from the Board Chair on Mass Wasting supersedes other priorities from the Board at this time.

Discussion

- Policy agreed to use the April 21st meeting that had been scheduled to address Type F as a special meeting to continue the Mass Wasting conversation.
- The 2-day May Board meeting will likely spend time addressing Mass Wasting.
- "Public safety" means everything from infrastructure to human lives. The Forest & Fish negotiations included public safety in the unstable slopes strategy to not limit the conversation to public improvements (e.g. infrastructure).
- Looking at deep-seated landslides includes reviewing their associated water recharge zones.
- Some Policy members expressed concern that there are not the right people around the table to adequately address public safety.

Decision: Policy agreed to put together a workplan and identify the right conversation and participants, which will start with the special meeting on April 21st.

CMER Update – Mark Hicks, CMER Co-Chair, briefly updated Policy that CMER approved the Bull Trout Overlay solar temperature report, which will likely come to Policy at the next meeting for review.

Type F

- The Policy Co-Chairs will discuss next steps and discuss with staff how to determine what work to postpone and what work to continue with, given the new Mass Wasting priority from the Board Chair. At this point, it is unclear whether the Board will take Type F off the schedule for the time being.
- Marc Gauthier is willing to make a video of off-channel habitat for both the eastside and the westside, since the water is high right now.
- The off-channel habitat field trip sites for the westside are all chosen, so when Policy is ready to schedule the field trip DNR is ready to go.
- One Policy member asked that there be a technical group convened especially for off-channel habitat, similar to the technical group convened for electrofishing.

Next Steps – Policy will use the special meeting on April 21st to address Mass Wasting and potentially address the Master Project Schedule. Plan for 10am – 5pm at the Department of Ecology.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15pm.

Attachment 1 – Participants by Caucus at 4/3/14 Meeting

Conservation Caucus

Peter Goldman
*Mary Scurlock

County Caucus

*Kendra Smith, Skagit County (phone)

Federal Caucus

*Marty Acker, USFWS (after noon only)

State Caucus – Ecology & WDFW

*Stephen Bernath, Ecology (Co-Chair)
Mark Hicks, Ecology
*Terry Jackson, WDFW

State Caucus – DNR

*Marc Engel, DNR
Chris Hanlon-Meyer, DNR
Marc Ratcliff, DNR

Landowner Caucus – Nonindustrial (small)

*Dick Miller, WFFA

*Caucus leads

Others

Bill Ehinger, Ecology
Howard Haemmerle, DNR
Jim Hotvedt, Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Amy Kurtenbach, DNR
Aimee McIntyre, WDFW
Greg Stewart, CMER
Claire Turpel, Triangle Associates
Bob Wheeler, Triangle Associates

Landowner Caucus – Industrial (large)

Doug Hooks, WFPA
Kevin Godbout, Weyerhaeuser
*Karen Terwilleger, WFPA

Tribal Caucus – Eastside

Todd Baldwin, Kalispel Tribe
Ray Entz, Kalispel Tribe (phone)
*Marc Gauthier, Upper Columbia United Tribes
(phone)

Tribal Caucus – Westside

Mark Mobbs, Quinault Nation
*Jim Peters, Northwest Indian Fisheries
Commission
Nancy Sturhan, Northwest Indian Fisheries
Commission
Curt Veldhuisen, Skagit River Systems
Cooperative (phone)

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	Special meeting: April 21, 2014 Regular meeting: May 1, 2014	April 21 st to focus on Mass Wasting and the Master Project Schedule
CMER	April 22, 2014	
Type N Policy Subgroup	TBD	On hold.
Type F Subcommittee(s)	TBD	On hold.
Forest Practices Board	May 12 & 13, 2014	May 12: Work session (likely on Mass Wasting and Type F topics) May 13: Regular Board meeting