

Timber, Fish, and Wildlife Policy Committee
February 6-7 Meeting Summary

Final Version 3.6.2020

February 6, 2020	
Action	Responsibility
Presentation on P-values will be tabled until a future meeting due to full agenda in March.	Co-chairs, Jacob Hibbeln
Add contract presentation on AMP contracting by Patti Shramek to a future meeting agenda.	Jacob Hibbeln
Mark Hicks will get one pagers for remaining below the line projects; lead time should be clear for additional projects.	AMPA
Policy will finalize CMER project rankings at the April meeting to present at the May FPB meeting.	Policy
Policy will want to hear from Ben Flint regarding changes to the Roads Prescription-scale Project budget as the project proceeds.	Ben Flint
Scientific Advisory Groups (SAGs) should have one pagers for projects proposed for using unspent funds.	Appropriate Project Managers
A ranking strategy for spending on projects needs to be developed.	Co-chairs, Mark Hicks
Table discussion on Extended Riparian Vegetation Monitoring (ERVM) Transferability project until March, subject to availability of contractor Andrew Cooke.	Co-chairs, Jacob Hibbeln

Introductions

- Melissa Gildersleeve (Ecology) introduced Brandon Austin as her replacement. This will be her final month sitting at the Policy table.

CMER Project Briefings by AMP Staff

Terra Rentz (WDFW, Policy co-chair) reviewed the agenda for the all-day Budget Workshop. She urged members to ask questions about projects. There is no longer extra funding because of new estimates by PMs. Instead of prioritizing how to use funds Policy will be going through CMER rankings.

Extended Riparian Vegetation Monitoring

PM: Teresa Miskovic (DNR); PI: Teodora Minkova (DNR), Dr. Monika Moskal and Andrew Cooke (Precision Forestry Cooperative, PFC)

- Miskovic first covered the basic history of the project, all of which are covered on the one pager. This is currently testing model created for the Mashel Watershed and sites in the Olympic Experimental State? Forest. The final report for the study was approved by CMER in January and RSAG is currently working on answering the 6 questions which are needed before the study is sent to ISPR. RSAG is currently working on an agenda for the workshop requested by Policy. Andrew Cooke will be available for questions and will provide a presentation at the workshop. Funds for this project came from FY19 unspent funds and some additional FY20 funds. At the January meeting, CMER approved an additional \$4,000 for PFC to give up to 3 presentations on the results of the final report.

Proposals for new projects include a Western Washington focus that builds on what PFC is currently working on. No future funds have been allocated because there needs to be a strategy moving forward. Total estimated budget is \$15,000.

Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project in Soft Rock Lithologies

PM: Teresa Miskovic (DNR); PI: Bill Ehinger (ECY)

- This is a companion to the Hard Rock project of which Bill Ehinger is the PI. Post-Harvest monitoring is underway and will be completed in the fall. Extended data collection has funding approved through September of 2020. It is assumed that the report will be scaled down in FY21. A clean copy of the report should be sent to ISPR soon. However, this process will take longer than usual because they are having a hard time finding reviewers as it is such a large study. Scott Swanson, Counties Caucus, asked if the budget would change because of this. Mark Hicks, AMPA, said this is not the case. Terra Rentz, co-chair, asked if the harvest of the reference sites fit within the discussed timeline. Bill Ehinger (ECY), lead PI, replied that it is unchanged.

Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project in Hard Rock Lithologies

PM: Heather Gibbs; PI: Aimee McIntyre (WDFW), Bill Ehinger (ECY)

- CMER requested that parts of the report be broken up in an effort to get reviewers. There is a conflict of interest with many reviewers due to people's involvement with various scientific advisory groups. The Department of Ecology pulled out all the sensors this past fall and is analyzing data. This analysis should be completed by May. The methods for testing have already gone through both CMER and ISPR, so a final decision on the study should come by March. PI's have proposed additional data collection for stream-associated amphibians. The proposed start time is summer 2022.

Policy decided that the co-chairs would work with the project PI's on how to deal with the issues related to extended monitoring using the recently approved request process.

Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness Project (ENREP) (CWA Project)

PM: Teresa Miskovic; PI: Timothy Link (University of Idaho), Charles Hawkins (Utah State University), Bill Ehinger (Ecology).

- This is an eastern Washington companion study to the Soft and Hard Rock studies. Recently, two of the East Cascade Basin Pairs were lost due to their being potential Spotted Owl habitat protection. The project scientists are currently searching for new sites, one of which seems promising although some ground work needs to be done before confirmation. Teresa is hoping to have a better budget estimate and to have all sites selected by this summer. As of now, there is an extra \$150,000 due to lost basins, minus the \$10,000. Additional costs needed for compensation to State Lands is not reflected on the project description provided to Policy and needs to be reflected in the Budget. The budget for FY 21 includes six sites, so if any are not acquired the cost will drop.

The co-chairs requested that regular updates on this project be provided to Policy due to complications with site selection.

Westside Type F Riparian Prescriptions Monitoring- Miskovic

- West Fork Environmental was hired to complete site studies. Data analysis is currently being worked on by Jenelle Black and Greg Stewart. An exploratory report will be done by the end of the fiscal year. In response to a question, Miskovic noted that CMER staff time is not accounted for in budget estimates. The anticipated budget changes based on the final study design which will be completed in FY 22.

Roads Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring

PM: Ben Flint (DNR); PI: Charlie Luce (USFS)

- This project is currently in data collection and implementation. 78 data collection sites have been installed and are functioning. There is a variable budget because things such as the cost of water testing was not accounted for in the original project charter. Currently, this is done by a direct-buy but AMP staff are searching for a contractor. There have been a number of site repairs needed because of rain damage and general site uncertainties. Public Works teams are currently doing site repairs. The budget for this project was originally reduced by 15% by the previous AMPA, hence adding to budget inaccuracies. \$76,000 has been approved for FY21. In FY23, \$60-70,000 is needed. Overall, there is a large amount of uncertainties associated with this project which explains the change in budget. Based on this, Policy will want to hear from Ben Flint again in the summer or fall.

Unstable Slopes Criteria (CWA Project)

PM: Ben Flint (DNR); Project Team Members: Greg Stewart, Dan Miller, Julie Dieu, Ted Turner

- This project is currently underway with the object-mapping portion having recently initiated. The project team is currently will be developing project designs for the other five study phases referenced in the project summary document. Much of this is being done by internal CMER staff. The study design for phase 2 is due to start soon and a final product is expected in FY 22. Phase 1 was bypassed because it was deemed unnecessary.
- Studies which this project is based on are outlined on page 16 of the Project Summary Sheets which was sent out in the mailing.

Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project (FWEP)

PM: Eszter Munes (DNR); PI: Nate Hough Snee, Four Peaks Environmental

- This is a WetSAG project and currently underway. The scope was recently reduced after it went through ISPR last year. It was limited to ecoregions rather than statewide to give it a narrowed focus which was deemed to be more effective. The associated literature review was revised to reflect this change in scope. A study design was accepted by CMER in December 2019 and then sent to ISPR. Currently, WetSAG is working on answering the six questions which should be complete by February and presented to CMER in March and Policy in April. \$8001 was approved by CMER recently to complete the literature review.

Riparian Characteristics and Shade Response

PM: Teresa Miskovic (DNR); PI: Siskowet (Contractor)

- This project has gone through several rounds of revision and review in an effort to get the study design through RSAG and CMER. RSAG is currently working on the last round of revisions after which it will be presented to CMER for approval and sent to ISPR. The budget has not changed much except that it was been pushed out a year. Currently, there is no budget for the project in FY21. Outside expertise might be used in finalizing the study design which would cost \$10-15,000; this is reflected in the MPS.

Don Nauer, WDFW, asked why the study only focused on shade, seeing as there are many other factors involved with riparian characteristics. Miskovic stated that this was to make it a more cost-effective study. The results of this study could be used to inform other temperature studies. Shade seems to be the most applicable to stream temperature although it is not the only factor.

Deep Seated Landslides Research Strategy Projects

PM: Ben Flint (DNR); PI: TBD; CMER Scientist: Greg Stewart (NWIFC)

- This study was broken into 10 sections. 1-3 were completed before Ben Flint came on board and 4-6 will be completed together. The scoping document is currently being drafted and should be completed by June or July. Because of this, there is no more money left for this project in FY20. There should be no expenditures for FY21.

Regarding Lidar acquisition and maintaining a full FTE: Lidar is a one-time additional funds request which is estimated at \$65,000. The original intent was to hire an FTE, but it was decided not to do this. An update on real cost is set to happen in the summer.

Amphibians in Intermittent Streams

PM: Heather Gibbs (DNR); PI: Aimee McIntyre (WDFW); CMER Scientist: Greg Stewart

- Funding was made available for a literature synthesis and scoping document. This was delayed until the Type N project was completed. Currently, data needs to be collected from both Ecology and WDFW cooperators. Once the charter is approved, the PM will begin working on the contract. Aimee McIntyre, WDFW, discussed how the name of the charter is misleading because

the study is not limited strictly to amphibians. McIntyre and Heather Gibbs, WADNR, will create a more fitting title.

McIntyre and Gibbs have reached out to RSAG regarding questions about temperature. Bill Ehinger, Ecology, has agreed to participate on the project team. Pertinent data has been drawn from both the Hard and Soft Rock studies although nothing has been done with it yet so it is more of a summary than an analysis. The plan is to first use available data, which matches what was previously expected for this project according to Mark Hicks, AMPA.

The idea was brought up of using hydrology data from the Hunter Study which was done 15 years ago.

Water Typing Strategy- Munes

PM: Eszter Munes (DNR)

- The CMER Water Typing Strategy will include the following elements: Default Physical Criteria Assessment, Potential Habitat Breaks (PHB), LiDAR Based Water Typing Model, Fish/Habitat Detection Using eDNA. ISAG will determine how to combine these elements and if there need to be additional elements. A strategy needs to be developed by the May meeting per orders from the Forest Practices Board. A charter will be drafted outlining said strategies. In total, there is far more spending needed than originally anticipated.

Don Nauer, WDFW, pointed out that there is controversy within the associated elements and ISAG will only be able to deliver a clear strategy to assess the workload and that study plans are far off. This will be included in the Charter.

Currently, Policy does not have a role with the projects and Board sub-committees are serving in Policy's normal role. However, funding is still Policy's responsibility. Policy will need consistent updates on this. There was discussion about this abnormal process during which some members expressed caution about how Policy interacts with the Forest Practices Board.

WIP Tool Updates (Wetlands Intrinsic Mapping Tool)

PM: Heather Gibbs (DNR)

- This is meant to identify forested wetlands. At this point, the project is closing up. As of last June, 77% was completed. In July 2019, \$~11,000 (coming out of contingency funds) was approved by CMER to finalize deliverables and complete the project.

Projects Receiving Funding in Future Biennium:

Wetlands Management Zone (WMZ) Effectiveness Monitoring

PM: Eszter Munes (DNR);

- This hasn't moved in a couple years. The project exists and the Adaptive Management Program is hoping for help from the Wetlands Scientist which will soon be hired by the NWIFC. Heather Gibbs, WADNR, gave a brief history of the project describing how the previous AMPA pulled all funding from WetSAG. It is hoped that the CMER scientist who starts in March will be the continuous link as this project moves from scoping to study design to implementation. There

could be movement on this project in FY21 or 22. In FY 22, there is \$100,000 for study design on the MPS.

Wetlands Intensive Monitoring Project

- This does not yet have a PM assigned but was explained by Heather Gibbs. It was originally a CWA assurance project. Work on the precursor studies has taken longer than expected and there is still a need for a study design for standing water wetlands. This is still a CWA project and is supposed to be prioritized after FWEP and the two other Wetlands study projects previously mentioned.

Eastside Modeling Effectiveness Project (EMEP)

PM: Heather Gibbs (DNR); PI: Kevin Ceder (Cramer Fish Sciences)

- This was lost in ISPR for a year. The contract was supposed to be finalized in December, but it was hard to find a new Associate Editor to complete the review. Due to the expiration of the original contract, \$4,000 is needed to get the project back on track and through ISPR.

Roads Sub-Basin-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project

PM: Ben Flint (DNR)

- Pending finalization of roads project. It is indefinitely on hold and probably won't happen until 2029.

Eastside Timber Harvest Types Evaluation Project (ETHEP)

PM: Teresa Miskovic (DNR)

- This project rose in priority? based on the results of the Bull Trout studies. It was determined that habitat types are incorrectly categorized. SAGE is currently developing a scoping document and looking at alternatives. This should be completed by December 2020 and the study design should be done sometime in 2021. There is no budget allocated at this point. This project will be the focus of the Eastside CMER Scientist who starts in mid-March.

Master Project Schedule (MPS) Spending Review and Update

Mark Hicks, AMPA, reviewed basic formatting changes he made and added a comments section explaining why said changes were made. Anything highlighted in blue reflects item that have been revised. To get current expenditures, he worked with DNR budget experts and commission staff. Overall, Program Administration costs fell from \$261,500 to \$254,600. New additions included expenses for PM, an Administrative Assistant, and the Eastside CMER Scientist who starts in March.

After going through the MPS line by line the main point is that at the end of the fiscal year the Adaptive Management Program is in the red by \$9898 at the end of the first biennium. However, this is nothing to worry about since we are still in the first year of the biennium.

The main tenets of the discussion about the Master Project Schedule are as follows:

- ISPR costs went up
- Information Management System update costs were added at \$4,000 to help the Adaptive Management Program (AMP) get all the materials uploaded. The actual costs can vary year to year.

- The CMER conference is budgeted for every other year. Current cost is \$5,000.
- Contingency funds for the biennium have already been spent. However the AMPA refilled the first Fiscal Year by 40k given there are several likely small additional ongoing-project needs this biennium, and money can roll from first year of biennium into the next.
- Regarding Policy non-CMER initiatives, the Type Np Workgroup budget has not changed and \$150,000 has gone towards the Center for Conservation and Peacebuilding

Research and Monitoring Projects

- There have been no changes for studies near completion
- There is money left for the Soft Rock study for ISPR costs. True cost will depend on whether or not it's an addendum to the Hard Rock study.
- The Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness Project (ENREP) budget is still volatile.
 - o Overall cost doesn't necessarily change, it just changes the way money is spent.
- Eastside Timber Harvests Effectiveness Project (ETHEP) study design work will likely be done in house. No additional costs are estimated yet so the estimate is staying at zero.
- Water Typing Strategy: \$75,000 is a placeholder. There is ~552,000\$ extra which the AMP is unlikely to use.
- Steve Barnowe-Meyer, Small Forest Landowners Caucus, expressed his concern about the overhead costs associated with studies that are carried by universities outside of the state and wanted to ensure that the Adaptive Management Program have searched thoroughly for vendors who would be able to carry out the work for less money. Mark Hicks, AMPA, responded that nothing can be done until next biennium when contracts are renegotiated and that despite the overhead costs work carried out by universities is very high quality and deemed to be worth the additional costs.

After Mark Hicks, AMPA, finished going through the projects of greatest priority, he discussed complete projects or discreet budgeted phases, details of which can be found beginning on line 90 of the MPS.

Following this, Hicks discussed The "Possible New Projects for Funding Opportunities" section of the MPS, details of which can be found starting on line 104 of the MPS. They fit under the following categories:

- Short term Projects for Investments
- Extended Monitoring
- Projects Needing Study Design
- Projects Needing Scoping
- New CMER-Proposed Short-Term Projects January 2020.

Hicks then discussed projects needing study design, details of which can be found starting on line 110 of the MPS. After this he listed the projects which needed scoping (line 115).

Afterwards, Hicks discussed the new CMER-Proposed Short-Term Projects for January 2020. A full list of the projects can be found beginning on line 117 of the MPS. For the sake of housekeeping, all projects needing LiDAR purchases should be identified accordingly.

CMER Project Ranking

The goal of today is to review the projects which CMER already ranked and take advantage of the presence of the AMP PMs. There is time to learn more about the unfunded projects before they are ranked by TFW Policy. It will be at least a couple months before Policy has to rank the unfunded (AKA ‘below-the-line’) projects. Curt Veldhuisen, co-chair, commented that it’s not necessary to have a specific number ranking like what CMER did and it can even be a priority ranking (high, medium, low).

Steve Barnowe-Meyer, SFL Caucus, mentioned that from a Forest Practices standpoint, having good LiDAR coverage across the timbered portion of the state is something worth having for many purposes.

During this time, Terra Rentz, co-chair, asked Doug Hooks, CMER co-chair, for a recap of how CMER prioritized the unfunded projects. Doug stated that rankings were based on the questions stated on the bottom of the ranking document which was sent out to Policy.

Main points of the CMER Short-Term Project Descriptions are as follows:

Windthrow Spatial Data Extraction and Compilation

PM: TBD, presented by Teresa Miskovic

The idea was to scope future windthrow studies. This could be done in FY20 if the process was started now, as it has a 4-5 month timeline. The contract period would take about 6 months. This was ranked first mainly because of the uncertainty associated with the project. Barnowe-Meyer asked a question about the data would be used and that it seems retroactive to him. In response Teresa Miskovic, DNR, stated that this depends on the study and the data. Don Nauer, WDFW, sees this study as important due to the influence that windthrow has on all the buffers that Policy works with and it could significantly inform a rule.

LWAG Strategy Development

PM: Heather Gibbs (DNR)

WetSAG and UPSAG have a strategy in place, which creates an opportunity for LWAG to develop one for future work under the AMP. Members are trying to capture as much of his knowledge as possible before Mark Hayes retires. CMER is currently trying to connect this strategy with the other projects that LWAG is working on. This is a longer term project for which ideas are being formed, but it is difficult to get these on paper. The \$17,000 which was allocated to LWAG is paying for contractor costs to investigate landslides.

LiDAR Acquisition

PM: Ben Flint (DNR)

There are 3 blocks prioritized because they have glacial sediment deposits (One in Lewis County, 2 in King). These three areas are priority for mapping and analysis of a variety of deep-seated landslides, and evaluating the effects of forest practices on different types of deep-seated slides. These could be split into three separate projects, depending on available funding. Currently, there is not enough LiDAR data because they are not quality enough to identify unstable slopes.

Policy would like more details on all three of the LiDAR projects. Curt Veldhuisen, co-chair, commented that LiDAR needs to contribute to specific projects if budget is being allocated towards them. Terra Rentz, co-chair, asked for a breakdown of whether or not LiDAR acquisition was done in sections. Flint elaborated: \$1 per acre in King County, which is the first preference. After this, the Lewis County lands would be priority.

Extended Riparian Vegetation Monitoring Transferability

PM: Teresa Miskovic (DNR)

Miskovic reviewed the costs of data management and how they can be applied to the state. Rentz stated that she was uncomfortable receiving projects in pieces because it's harder to see the connection between all of them. Doug Hooks, CMER co-chair, stated that Andrew Cooke of Precision Forestry can present at the March meeting and RSAG is also working on a workshop for this. Veldhuisen reminded AMP that the presentations need to serve a policy purpose and not just be about technology. Rentz proposed that Policy table this discussion until the March meeting.

Eastside Amphibian Evaluation Project

PM: TBD Presented by?

All projects have comments regarding how strategy should come first. Said strategies don't need to be mutually exclusive. The proposed work is to do a literature review and a data grab of all the existing information. Timing is negotiable, but it could definitely be done by the end of the biennium.

Van Dyke's Salamander

PM: Heather Gibbs (DNR)

The proposed work for this project is scoping for potential future work and streamlining the CMER work plan. As part of the literature review, phase one involves pulling together all data points across the state.

Washington.

Sensitive site and Amphibian Use Investigation from Existing Study Data

PM: Heather Gibbs

Veldhuisen commented that this is appealing because it informs the rule for Type Np buffers. Hicks asked if the habitat types have been characterized, which McIntyre confirmed.

Conclusions

Terra Rentz asked that Policy read through materials for each project and let the co-chairs or AMPA know if they have any questions. She also requested write-ups on the other two LiDAR projects. Curt, Terra, and Hicks will work out a ranking strategy for Policy. The budget does not have to be ranked until May.