

Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee
February 6-7, 2020 Meeting Summary
Final Version 3.6.20

Motions February 7, 2020	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
Move to defer meeting minutes from January until March Policy meeting.	Move by Swanson/Second by Barnowe-Meyer (All caucuses up, Eastside Tribes and Federal Caucuses absent)
Move to accept the Amphibians in Intermittent Streams Charter	Move by Cramer/Second by Nauer (All caucuses up, Eastside Tribes and Federal Caucuses absent)
Move to recommend to the Forest Practices Board (FPB) that the Buffer Characteristics Integrity and Findings (BCIF) Findings do not warrant action by the FPB but that the findings be transmitted to the Type Np Workgroup for informational purposes.	Move by Swanson/Second by Peters (All caucuses up, Eastside Tribes and Federal Caucuses absent)
Move to recommend to the Forest Practices Board (FPB) that the Bull Trout Overlay (BTO) Add-on findings do not warrant action by the FPB. Further, TFW commits to completing the Policy process associated with the original BTO Temperature study with a formal recommendation to the FPB.	Move by Cramer/Second by Barnowe-Meyer (Counties sideways; all other caucuses up; Eastside Tribes and Federal Caucuses absent)
Move to approve Technical Small Forest Landowners Prescriptions Workgroup Charter as amended.	Move by Swanson/Second by Nauer (DNR, SFL, DFW/ECY, Counties, Industry up; Westside Tribes and Conservation caucuses sideways; Eastside Tribes and Federal Caucuses absent)
Move to approve Alternative Harvest Prescriptions Workgroup charter with amendment of an end date of 9/24/2020.	Move by Barnowe-Meyer/Second by Swanson (DNR, DFL, DFW/ECY, Counties, Industry up; Westside Tribes and Conservation caucuses sideways; Eastside Tribes and Federal Caucuses absent)
Move to approve composition of the Technical Small Forest Landowner Prescriptions Workgroup to include the following: Brown (Chair), Nauer, Engel, Barnowe-Meyer Westside Tribes TBD	Move by Barnowe-Meyer/Second by Brown (All caucuses up, Eastside Tribes and Federal Caucuses absent)
Move to approve composition of the Experimental Harvest Prescriptions Workgroup to include the following: Barnowe-Meyer (Chair), Austin, Engel, Westside Tribes TBD	Move by Barnowe-Meyer/Second by Cramer (All caucuses up, Eastside Tribes and Federal Caucuses absent)

Action Items February 7, 2020	
Action	Responsibility
Hicks will give presentation on proposal initiation process at next month's meeting.	Hicks
Hibbeln will send out track changes version of January's meeting minutes. Policy will review, send comments to Hibbeln and aim to approve the minutes at next month's meeting.	Hibbeln
Mendoza will send Hibbeln CMER document regarding the use of non-CMER sciences which will then be forwarded to Policy.	Mendoza, Hibbeln
Hicks, Veldhuisen, Rentz will decide what specific decision should be made regarding WDFW Proposal initiation at the next meeting. This needs to be made specific on the agenda for March. Will have to be ranked against other projects if it ends up being accepted by Policy. Decisions will happen at the next Policy meeting in March once Policy has reviewed the document.	Co-chairs, Hicks
Regarding the Bull Trout Overlay Add-on project, Hicks will go back and find the date that Policy proposed this to the board as well as the associated decision path.	Hicks
Regarding Riparian Literature Review, Brown, Gildersleeve, Rentz, and Hicks will work on possible paths for moving forward.	Brown, Gildersleeve, Rentz, Hicks

Minutes

Welcome, Introductions, Old Business

Introductions

- Peters, Westside Tribal Caucus, announced he was leaving by 3:00 PM and nominated Ash Roorbach as designee, if necessary.

Caucus Updates

- Engel, DNR Caucus, announced that there is a Board Water Typing Committee meeting next Tuesday from 1:00 to 2:00 at NRB 172. The eastside data technical group and anadromous fish floor workgroup/work plan/scope of work will be discussed.
 - o Swanson, County Caucus, asked if these meetings can be scheduled out the next 3 or 4 meetings and then cancel if necessary.
- Cramer, Industrial Timber Caucus, has a proposal initiation for a new buffer effectiveness study. The summary report is posted on the DNR website as part of the Board meeting materials.
- Gildersleeve, ECY, asked about the process for bringing proposal initiations to the board. Hicks, AMPA, responded.
 - o Members of the public can bring a proposal to the Forest Practices Board (FPB), but the Board can also initiate a Proposal Initiation in fulfilling the normal course of its duties and thus they would have the discretion to start a PI in response to the request from the public.
 - o A caucus member can bring a proposal to the AMPA, after which he presents it to the FPB.

- At the next policy meeting, Hicks offered to do a presentation on the proposal initiation process which is described in the Board Manual Section 22.
Cramer stated nothing precludes a caucus from going to the FPB. He is asking the FPB to authorize treatments and if the FPB accepts his proposal, he will take it to Policy.

January 6th Meeting Minutes

Rentz, Veldhuisen, & Hibbeln

The minutes from January 6th were tabled until March so that everyone has the chance to go through and make the necessary edits with clarifications to help Jacob calibrate expectations. Policy will submit comments to Jacob after which they will be brought forward for approval. This was approved via Motion #1 above.

Motion 1 ***Move to defer meeting minutes from January until March Policy meeting.***
 Moved by Swanson/Second by Barnowe-Meyer (All caucuses up, Eastside Tribes and Federal Caucuses absent)

CMER SAG Updates

Hooks and Mendoza

CMER co-chair Mendoza gave a general summary of the January CMER meeting, details of which can be found in the summary created by the co-chairs. Main points included the formation of a CMER sub-group to discuss if/when the answers to the 6 questions in the CMER/Policy Interaction Framework that might impact Forest Practices rules and/or Board Manual Guidance. Additionally, CMER approved sending the Type N Hard Rock study to ISPR, and approved the Amphibians in Intermittent Streams Charter (now ready for Policy's approval).

Regarding the budget, the Roads BMP Effectiveness Project, Forest Wetlands Literature Review, and Eastside Modeling Evaluation Project (EMEP) were approved for more funding. Details for this can be found in the Project Summary sheets provided to Policy in the mailing.

Type Np Workgroup Updates

Cramer and Peters

- On January 9th, Aimee McIntyre and Bill Ehinger spoke to the group about the Hard Rock study.
- There is a new decision-making process the group will be using to organize and document decision.
- At the next meeting, the topic is the Buffer Shade Amphibian Study at which Mark Hayes will present. The meetings for the workgroup are scheduled out until June.
- There was a discussion regarding the proper usage of non-CMER science in the AMP brought up by Cramer, Industrial Timber. A document that CMER produced several years ago regarding non-CMER science will be sent to Policy.
- Mendoza: regarding Cramer's comments at looking at other non-CMER sciences: CMER did develop a guidance memo that addresses Cramer's issue; Peters asked that it be sent to Gibbs; Gibbs will send to Np workgroup.

Amphibians in Intermittent Streams Charter

Presentation by Aimee McIntyre

This project was touched on yesterday (February 6) during the presentation by Aimee McIntyre, WDFW. For this project, it is important to observe existing data from CMER studies and take those that have any relevant information regarding intermittent streams, amphibian use, etc. The title is slightly misleading because this study will focus on discontinuous wetted reaches of Type Np streams and the study focuses on more than just amphibians.

The current proposal is to look through all available data, pull out relevant information (both CMER and non-CMER science), and summarize/identify whether or not there are questions relevant to CMER and TFW. This will be more of a summation rather than an analysis of available work. The next step is to develop a scoping document.

There is a placeholder on the Master Project Schedule (MPS) for \$80,000 next year which could be used for study design. McIntyre thinks that this is a high estimate and it will not take this much money.

Questions:

Nauer, WDFW, stated that from a field perspective, the biggest complaint from landowners is that they do not understand why they have to leave trees along intermittent stretches. In the research, the basis for the buffer rule needs to be communicated clearly.

Veldhuisen, co-chair, added that he has found the most stable water sources to be near the top of channels. It's so contentious because it is common to have long dry stretches below wet stretches and what happens downstream is variable from year to year. He offered his help with providing references for hydrology studies if necessary.

Veldhuisen also commented that the critical question about whether or not to buffer spatially intermittent streams doesn't seem like a critical question for the new study. McIntyre said that was a pre-existing critical questions and will be modified during study design. Hicks, AMPA, stated that the standard practice is to begin with broader questions and then narrow the questions as the project progresses.

Overall, Policy members found the Charter is well done and does a fine job utilizing available data.

In response, Motion #2 above was passed.

Legislative Updates:

Terra noted that the cutoff for new bills was today. Other than that, there are no updates.

Transmittal from AMPA of Proposal Initiation from WDFW: Assessing Changes in Uncertainty

Mark Hicks, AMPA

The goal is to bring this proposal initiation in line with other standard processes. Hicks spent time reviewing the main points of the document. Overall, he said that the Proposal Initiation is not a perfect fit to the directives to the AMP but does warrant further consideration from Policy. If Policy wants to move forward with this, a charter and workgroup will be needed. It will move forward when Policy provides the money.

Tim Quinn, WDFW, was available to answer any questions that Policy had about the proposal. Swanson, Counties Caucus, asked about the Policy track. Quinn stated that the Policy track is in the first iteration and there is still work to be done. Over time, more detail will be provided.

Rentz, co-chair, commented that this is a social science research project that is different than any research that CMER does. It is not generating new science in the way that the AMP normally does. Hicks noted that if this does start going down the hard science path, this needs to be a CMER project. Policy will need to monitor this to make sure the correct committee is handling this.

Cramer asked if the co-chairs are precluding Policy from taking action today. Rentz responded that if people are ready, a decision can be made today. However, some people have not had the opportunity to consult with caucus members and it might be beneficial to wait. Cramer expressed that he would like to see the proposal move forward today, to which Peters, Westside Tribes caucus agreed. Several caucus members thought that the proposal looks good but need more time to review. Engel, DNR Caucus, said that a decision should wait because there is no funding for this currently. Additionally, a workgroup and charter cannot be formed anytime soon due to caucus members being busy with other workgroups. Although a decision may not be made soon, this can continuously sit at the top of the unfunded priority list. Hicks wants Policy to be realistic on budget and more exact on time frames.

Overall, the AMPA and co-chairs will decide what specific decision should be made at the Policy meeting in March. If this ends up being a priority it will have to be ranked against other projects.

Buffer Characteristics Integrity and Function (BCIF) Study Action Warranted Determination

Veldhuisen and Rentz

The co-chairs reminded Policy that the motion should be deciding whether the findings warrant action by the board. The concern is that if Policy decides the study does not warrant action by the Board, there should be a statement clarifying that no action is recommended by the Board the study findings may still warrant other follow-up action by Policy. One concern of not recommending action is that to an outsider, this might be viewed as Policy being ineffective. The reasoning for not recommending action needs to be carefully worded to acknowledge the merits of the study.

Final wording of the study: "Recommend to the Forest Practices Board that the BCIF Findings do not warrant action by the FPB but that the findings be transmitted to the Type Np Workgroup for informational purposes."

Motion #3 above was passed.

*Ken Miller voted on behalf of the SFL Caucus. Barnowe-Meyer abstained because of his involvement with Type Np Workgroup.

Bull Trout Overlay Add-on Project Action Warranted

Veldhuisen and Rentz

There was a brief discussion on the Bull-Trout Overlay Temperature Study that was completed about six years ago. Forest Practices Board did get a recommendation for this, but no formal motion occurred. Hicks stated is the project did not follow the normal process for going to the Board. Policy provided updates to the Board that included their decision not to take action and noting an agreement that a subcommittee would be formed to answer some specific follow up questions that Policy members had. Hicks agreed to provide this documentation to Policy.

In regard to the current BTO Add-On study, the co-chairs reminded Policy that whatever decision is made today, it will not have to be presented to the FPB until May. Policy has the option of approving the 'Add-

on' project and then go back to prior temperature study. Although today's determination is specific to the Add-on study, it doesn't limit the scope of what else can be done later.

Discussion on the status of Riparian Literature Review

Veldhuisen and Rentz

The next three agenda items are a result of motions made at the December Policy meeting. The purpose of this discussion is to turn these motions into actions. One of these topics is to reinstate the Riparian Literature Review and attempt to complete a product. This is important for work relating to the broader AMP process. \$95,000 is available next FY.

Hicks stated that it's harder to get CMER to agree on an entire synthesis document and that if Policy wants something done quickly, they are better off with a literature review. It is important for this to be created to serve a larger purpose, to identify what we have, why it was selected and the surrounding parameters. It is also important to clearly identify what the product might look like, be it a literature review, synthesis, annotated bibliography, etc.

Mendoza noted CMER did a limited literature review when they scoped the Type F Effectiveness Study, which is currently in motion. There is an extensive literature review available for Policy's use. It was agreed that Brown, Conservation Caucus, Gildersleeve, EY, Rentz, co-chair, and Hicks, AMPA, will work on possible pathways.

Technical SFL Prescriptions Workgroup Charter

Veldhuisen and Rentz

The co-chairs and Engel, DNR Caucus, started with Barnowe-Meyer's draft of the charter and edited it to clearly identify the goal, purpose, and what a technical recommendation is. The task is to define what the project outcomes should be as well as the metrics associated with prescriptions. The workgroup needs to identify both the science and non-science goals. Temperature was not specified in this because the charter was not specific enough to include things like this; the goal of the charter is to meet state water quality standards. The intent is to give silvicultural prescriptions.

Hicks does not think that Policy can make science-based rule and Board Manual recommendations without those recommendations and supporting information going through CMER. All science is to go through a CMER review, and a board subcommittee is essentially a process of asking some outside specialists to help them develop some ideas.

Brown, Conservation Caucus, expressed concern that the workgroup will have recommendations for site-specific conditions, and they will come back to Policy which is not qualified to determine if it meets scientific standards. It is important to keep in mind that this is **not** a science product.

Mendoza, Conservation Caucus, stated that "acceptable prescriptions" should be clearly identified. Miller, SFL Caucus, expressed that as long as members of the workgroup have experience with ID teams and forestry, he has confidence in the results.

There was an amendment that made clear that the workgroup would only deliver the results to Policy.

The resulting motion (#5 above) passed.

SFL Experimental Alternate Harvest Prescriptions Workgroup Charter

Veldhuisen and Rentz

Barnowe-Meyer, SFL Caucus, moved to approve the draft Experimental Alternate Harvest Prescriptions Workgroup Charter. There was an amendment to this motion to stagger the timeline so the finish date is **9/24/2020**. This amendment was made in an effort to reduce the workload of caucus members as there is potential for overlap in participants in the two workgroups. Each workgroup still has the same amount of time to work.

Policy requested volunteers to serve on the two SFL Template workgroups outlined in the approved charters. Westside Tribes will identify a participant within two weeks and encouraged the group to begin work without their immediate involvement.

Technical Prescriptions Workgroup: Chair: Alec Brown (Conservation); General Members: Marc Engel (DNR), Don Nauer (DFW/ECY), Steve Barnowe-Meyer (SFL), Westside Tribes

Alternative Harvest Prescriptions Workgroup: Chair: Steve Barnowe-Meyer (SFL); General Members: Marc Engel (DNR), Brandon Austin (DFW/ECY), Westside Tribes

Membership lists for the two Workgroups were approved in Motions #7 and #8 above.

After action items were reviewed, the meeting was adjourned.

Participants by Caucus at 2/7/20 Meeting

Adaptive Management Program

Mark Hicks, Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Jacob Hibbeln, AMP Staff
Ben Flint, AMP Staff
Teresa Miskovic, AMP Staff

Conservation Caucus

*Alec Brown, Washington Environmental Coalition
Chris Mendoza, Conservation Caucus, CMER Co-chair

County Caucus

*Scott Swanson, WSAC

Industrial Landowner Caucus

*Darin Cramer, WFPA
Doug Hooks, WFPA, CMER Co-chair

Small Forest Landowner Caucus

*Steve Barnowe-Meyer, WFFA
*Ken Miller, WFFA

State Caucus, DNR

*Marc Engel, WADNR

State Caucus, Ecology and WDFW

*Don Nauer, WDFW
*Melissa Gildersleeve, WECY
Terra Rentz, WDFW/ Policy Co-chair

Tribal Caucus – Westside

Ash Roorbach, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
*Jim Peters, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Curt Veldhuisen, Skagit River System Cooperative/ Policy Co-chair

*caucus representative