

TFW Policy Committee Meeting
January 4, 2018 Meeting Summary

Decisions and Actions from Meeting

Action	Assignment
1. Share finalized 2017 Accomplishments document with the TFW Policy Committee report to the Board.	Scott Swanson
2. Meet as a subgroup and determine next steps for technical work and timelines.	SFLs Template Subgroup
3. Meet as a subgroup and develop a final set of recommended criteria for the February 1 Policy meeting (to be shared in January 25 meeting packet).	Prioritization Subgroup
4. Develop the report to the Board on Policy's ongoing forest health and wildfire discussion.	Scott Swanson & Hans Berge
5. Update the biennial budget for the February 1 Policy meeting (to be shared in January 25 meeting packet).	Hans Berge
6. Mark your calendar for February 28 <u>and</u> March 1 as the two-day budget meeting.	Caucus representatives
7. Fill out a Doodle poll by January 12 th to set extra day for April, June, and October meetings with field tours.	Caucus representatives

Decision	Notes
1. Approved December 7, 2017 meeting summary with edits.	Consensus by all caucuses present
2. Approved 2017 Accomplishments for forwarding to the Board with the Co-Chair's report.	Consensus by all caucuses present
3. Directed CMER to prepare documents for the February 28/March 1 Policy budget meeting (see page 5).	Consensus by all caucuses present

Welcome, Introductions, and Old Business – Scott Swanson, Chair of the Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee (“Policy”), welcomed participants and led introductions (*please see Attachment 1 for a list of participants*).

Announcements

- The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) will have two rulemaking hearings today from 4:30-5:30pm. The two topics are on electronic business interactions and the fee for public disclosure. The Forest Practices Board (Board) will consider adopting these rules at their February 2018 meeting.
- The Chair shared that so far, he has been unable to secure a second Co-Chair to fill Ray Entz's position. He is hopeful to find another Co-Chair soon and also noted that Policy will need to find a replacement for his position when he has to rotate out of the Co-Chair position by June 2019.

He suggested that at some point, Policy create a schedule of rotation so each caucus has a chance to be a Co-Chair every four to five years, although caucuses can always volunteer.

- The conservation caucus representative noted that she will soon transition out of her role. Their caucus has chosen to restructure the caucus representative position so that it will be a staff position at Washington Environmental Council (WEC) in Seattle, one of the five organizations that make up the conservation caucus. WEC will soon post the job position and they hope to have the position filled by the March Policy meeting. Mary Scurlock's last appearance at a Policy meeting will likely be March or April, though she will be available through June as a resource to their new caucus representative.
- At the November 2017 Board meeting, the Department of Ecology (Ecology) gave the latest update on the Clean Water Act Assurances. One of the milestones is to survey the status of small forest landowners' roads in order to assess effectiveness of relying on the checklist RMAP process to bring roads into conformance with current standards. The Washington Farm Forestry Association (WFFA) offered to work with Ecology and DNR to ensure the best information possible for completing this task. They have met twice since November and gave an update, including:
 - The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) sends out regular surveys, which are administered by the University of Massachusetts. Ecology, DNR, and WFFA thought it would make sense to add questions to the USFS survey to collect information to gain a better understanding on the condition of small forest landowners' roads.
 - They hope that WFFA, American Tree Farm Association, and the Northwest Natural Resource Group can help disseminate a survey that is focused only on road issues; they also plan to work with WSU Extension and DNR's Small Forest Landowners Office (which DNR hopes to increase funding to make this a full statewide office again, restoring to pre-2009 levels).
 - Once the survey has been sent, they anticipate an on-the-ground subsample component to help verify the self-reported information.
 - The westside tribal caucus representative noted that historically, the tribes had offered to help landowners with the survey in the spirit of the Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Agreement (TFW). The representative will circle back with the tribes to confirm if the tribes are still willing to help in this current endeavor. Those working on the survey agreed to keep the tribes updated to see if and how they can help.
- The Chair thanked caucuses for filling out the doodle poll to schedule the two-day budget meeting in March. The original date for the regular meeting is March 1; the doodle poll availability showed the best way to make that a two-day meeting is February 28 and March 1. The Chair anticipates using the two days to review the projects on the Master Project Schedule (MPS); tweak the biennial budget as necessary, and make any changes necessary to the long-term MPS to avoid any anticipated funding problems. Policy discussed whether to invite the technical people (project managers, principal investigators, and/or TWIG members) to come to the first day to provide details on the MPS projects. This was also discussed and decided during the Program Priorities topic (see page 5). The Chair requested that all Policy caucus representatives read the CMER workplan in full prior to this two-day budget retreat.
- The Chair noted that he will call into the February 1 Policy meeting since he will be out of the state. The Adaptive Management Program Administrator (AMPA) will run the meeting with support from the facilitator unless there is another Co-Chair in place by that time.
- The AMPA updated the Committee on progress made for the contract to manage Policy meetings and mediate potential disputes. The interview panel (Terwilleger, Swanson, Engel, Berge, and

Patti Shramek) selected Triangle Associates as the successful candidate for the meeting management portion of the contract. The mediation task will be handled in a separate solicitation.

- The small forest landowners caucus representative shared that the annual Washington Farm Forestry Association (WFFA) meeting will be May 20-22 in Winthrop and will focus on eastside issues brought up in 2017. They will share the full invitation once finalized.

December 7, 2017 Meeting Summary – Policy reviewed substantive edits from several caucus representatives, who primarily offered edits on the sections that summarized their own comments at the December meeting. All edits were ultimately accepted or tweaked and then accepted, but the federal caucus representative suggested that the purpose of meeting summaries should be revisited and agreed upon.

Decision: Policy approved the draft meeting summary as final with the edits proposed or tweaked. Consensus by all caucuses except the absent eastside tribal caucus.

2017 Accomplishments – Policy reviewed edits to the list of accomplishments compiled from the 2017 meeting summaries. These edits were discussed, added to, and ultimately agreed to. The conservation caucus requested that the final version be sent out to all caucuses with the Chair’s memo to the Board.

Decision: Policy approved the 2017 Accomplishments with edits proposed or tweaked. Consensus by all caucuses except the absent eastside tribal caucus.

CMER Update – Doug Hooks, CMER Co-Chair, introduced the new Co-Chair Jenny Knoth. Doug also gave updates from the mid-December CMER meeting, including:

- The Instream Scientific Advisory Group (ISAG) has been working on an eDNA literature synthesis and decided that a pilot project would be more informative than a literature synthesis. CMER requested that ISAG write up a formalized proposal for this requested change and this could require Policy approval as well.
- CMER agreed to convene their bi-annual science session around the May Board meeting. DNR requested that CMER be in touch with DNR about the dates since the Board is thinking of turning their May meeting into another two-day meeting. Board members will be invited to the science session and the science session will be publicly noticed, as usual.
- The Bull Trout Overlay Add-On project has been approved to send the report to independent scientific peer review (ISPR).
- CMER successfully resolved the dispute on the Hardwood Conversion report.
- CMER is aiming to have the Findings Reports on the Type N Hard Rock study for the March Policy meeting.
- CMER anticipates having more discussion on the Hard Rock extended report; because it uses the same methodology as the Type N Hard Rock study, it is possible that the extended report may not need to go to ISPR.
- CMER anticipates approving the Fire Salvage Literature Synthesis at their January meeting, at which point it will go to Policy for presentation and acceptance.
- The AMPA clarified that the unstable slopes research strategy will be presented to CMER at their January meeting, but will not be approved until the February meeting at the earliest. At that time, CMER will consider when to present the product to Policy.

The CMER Co-Chair also requested that Policy clarify their direction to CMER on what to provide Policy for the two-day budget meeting in March. This was discussed later (see page 5).

Small Forest Landowners' Templates – Ken Miller and Marc Engel updated Policy that while the subcommittee has not met since the December Policy meeting, they have scheduled their next meeting for January 23. They plan to continue their discussion on the proposed westside low-impact harvest alternate template as well as the Conifer Restoration and Conifer Thinning templates that the Board requested be revisited. The federal caucus representative asked if the Board's direction will delay Policy's receipt of the subcommittee's recommendations; the members agreed that it will make more work for their subcommittee but at this point did not anticipate that it will delay the timeline. DNR clarified that when the Board directed revisiting the two historical templates, they directed Policy and not the subcommittee; it therefore means that Policy should discuss what they want the subcommittee to do. This Policy discussion did not occur and the subcommittee is taking the Board direction.

The AMPA updated Policy on the contractor's technical work, and Policy discussed next steps.

- The contractor continued to provide inadequate and insufficient products, which resulted in more work for the subcommittee with concerns that the contractor may not be able to restore confidence. After receiving a third product that was of poor quality, the DNR terminated the contract for cause.
- The subcommittee now must discuss if or how to best proceed to finish the technical work. If the decision from the subcommittee is to move forward, there are several options. One would be to go to the original list of bidders, or potentially consider other options to get what they need.
- The existing work available from the contractor includes:
 - A poorly written draft literature synthesis, which was planning to go through a review by the Riparian Scientific Advisory Group (RSAG).
 - A partially complete annotated bibliography (the abstracts copied into a database) with papers.
 - A list of pre-1994 citations that were deemed relevant by the contractor.
- There is \$70,000 left in the biennial budget for this line item (spent about \$40,000 so far).
- The Ecology representative suggested that the full subcommittee be a part of the selection process for the next contractor, if that is the way the subcommittee will proceed.
- The small landowner caucus representative suggested that there is enough content in the alternate template proposal that he hopes the subcommittee can discuss the content sooner than later.
- The conservation caucus representative noted that the subcommittee had previously gone through each prescription in the template and agreed on how those prescriptions could be evaluated. That was when WFFA requested to have a more technical evaluation of the prescriptions.
- The federal caucus representative noted that the subcommittee has taken on some tasks that are beyond the original scope that Policy agreed to for the subcommittee. He hoped for the subcommittee's evaluation of potential other tasks and expected that the subcommittee would propose those additional tasks back to Policy with a request. He hoped that any additional work would not delay the timeline. He also asked the small forest landowners caucus to help the subcommittee identify the tasks most likely to help the production of a future template and which tasks are related to addressing a prior request that may no longer be relevant.
- Policy agreed to have the subcommittee meet on January 23, with caucus bringing their thoughts on potential next steps and any opinions on the WACs/RCWs. They will bring a report back to Policy at the February 1 meeting.

Program Priorities – The Chair reminded Policy to give CMER adequate direction so Policy receives useful information for the two-day budget meeting on February 28/March 1.

Updates from the Prioritization Subgroup members included:

- The subgroup could benefit from one more month of work to review the feedback from those caucuses who test-drove the criteria with the existing MPS.
- The Ecology representative suggested that conveying the critical questions along with the projects would be helpful in evaluating the projects against the criteria. He also noted that the subgroup should consider creating a criterion about the Board-directed priorities.
- The industrial timber landowner caucus noted that the task in 2018 is not as big a lift as in odd-numbered years; Policy only needs to tweak the biennial budget and MPS at the minimum. She suggested that means that Policy can have a trial-run of the criteria this year and apply lessons learned to the criteria for future years' work.
 - The AMPA clarified that this year's MPS discussion should weigh heavily the investments Policy is making that may start soon but have expenditures for several subsequent years. He suggested this is an important discussion in 2018 about the future and direction of the AMP, especially with several expensive TWIG studies starting in the current biennium.
- The conservation caucus representative suggested that the feedback so far about creating a tool that allows for shades of gray instead of binary yes/no answers is helpful.
- Mark Hicks volunteered to draft the next revised version of the criteria based on all feedback. Karen Terwilleger volunteered to schedule the next subgroup meeting.

Policy then discussed the timelines between the CMER meetings and Policy meetings leading up to the February 28/March 1 Policy meeting to review the budget and MPS. Several Policy members shared ideas for how much direction to give CMER, especially about prioritizing projects within a balanced budget. Policy also considered what is reasonable to direct CMER to do, recognizing their other workload demands before February 28.

Decision: The DNR caucus representative made a motion to direct CMER to prepare a few documents for Policy; the industrial timber landowner caucus seconded the motion. There were friendly edits to the motion and Policy approved the motion below with full consensus except the absent eastside tribal caucus.

TFW Policy Committee requests CMER to:

- *Prepare a draft MPS/budget for Policy Feb 28/March 1 meeting.*
- *Prepare concise summaries of each project, including:*
 - *Concise summary and status of the project;*
 - *Critical questions and objectives;*
 - *Estimated budget by year (and accuracy of that estimate);*
 - *Timelines (if known)*
 - *Connection to other projects/phases, including essential work that has to be done prior to this project (if any)*
- *Invite PIs/PMs (specific ones to be identified later by the AMPA, Policy Chair, CMER Co-Chair) to the Feb 28/March 1 meeting.*

Forest Health and Wildfires – At their November 2017 meeting, the Board directed the AMPA and stakeholders to scope out and make process/timing recommendations for forest health and wildfires. The following outlines Policy's discussion as input to the AMPA and Chair for their report to the February 2018 Board meeting. DNR clarified that while there was no specific Board motion or vote on this

direction, it was included in the Board's 2018 workplan and there was a motion and vote to approve the Board's workplan.

- The westside tribal caucus representative shared several ideas, including:
 - DNR bring their Forest Health Program and other partners to a future Policy meeting to inform this discussion.
 - Recent years have seen intense firestorms unlike previous years, likely due to more understory fuel and climate change. That means the riparian areas no longer provide escape routes or areas to stop or slow fires.
 - If there is a study to compare smoke emissions from fire management (prescribed burning) versus smoke emissions from intense firestorms, that would be helpful in future Policy discussions on this topic.
 - Fire management could be tied to a jobs bill that the legislature might be more interested in.
- The industrial timber landowner caucus representative shared several ideas, including:
 - The report to the Board should clarify that the overlap between this broad topic and the focus of the Adaptive Management Program (AMP) and TFW Policy is management of and effect on riparian areas.
 - The problem of forest health and wildfires is relevant to private, DNR, tribal, federal, and local governments' forests, and should include all those stakeholders in any subsequent discussion. Wildfire does not stop at any specific political boundary.
 - DNR recently published their [20-year Forest Health Strategic Plan](#), and they have a draft update of the [Smoke Management Plan](#). She agreed with the westside tribal caucus that bringing in DNR's Forest Health Program for any subsequent Policy discussion would be helpful.
- The small forest landowners caucus representative appreciated the recent focus on forest health, particularly the field tours in 2017 that focused on this issue. They have had internal caucus discussions about this topic and hope to bring a well-thought-out proposal to Policy to consider at a later meeting. Their concerns include consistency with the AMP, economics, increase of ladder fuels, and tree species in the forest that are not very fire resilient. Their caucus is committed to working with whomever to scope out the process and timing recommendations for the Board.
- The DNR representative explained the mission of the 20-year Forest Health Strategic Plan; the Plan recognizes this issue as a landscape-level problem which includes aquatic resources (hence the overlap with TFW and the AMP). He also explained that in the last ten years, DNR has had four biomass sales to help reduce the amount of understory and ladder fuels. All sales were in the Olympic region and DNR found that the market was largely flooded with the availability of cheap fuels elsewhere, so they have not done another sale since.
- The conservation caucus representative noted that without a succinct question or direction from the Board, it is difficult for Policy to make a succinct answer or recommendation. She supported the AMPA gathering input from stakeholders at this meeting but does not support further discussion at Policy meetings unless and until the Board gives a more direct question to Policy. She suggested that Policy look at riparian management and consider if those rules need updating to be consistent with a fire resilient approach, if also consistent with the best available science.
- The WDFW representatives shared that his agency has spent a lot of time and money trying to restore ecological integrity and identified five ecosystems on the eastside that they are managing for. The WDFW/Ecology caucus sees this issue as a landscape issue, not just riparian or upland in a vacuum.

- The small landowner caucus representatives shared that in the past, the AMP looked at a forest health alternate template which was never fully approved. They anticipate bringing forward an eastside low-impact harvest alternate template similar to the westside template currently under discussion, and that could relate to this larger conversation on forest health. They also noted that the EWRAP modeling work is done but is not yet published because they are using that as part of their eastside template development and analysis. They could share that information if helpful to this discussion, too.
- An eastside tribal caucus member agreed that this is a landscape issue and Dr. Paul Hessburg has been invited to SAGE to discuss this issue. Perhaps he could present to Policy, or maybe there is a better forum for him to speak to more than just SAGE. Marc Gauthier volunteered to help organize that if Policy so desires.
- The DNR representative shared that they have invited Chuck Hersey from the Forest Health Program to speak at the February Board meeting about the 20-year Strategic Plan and could also speak to Policy. He also suggested that Policy's role could be at this meeting to recognize that there is a set of eastside rules that are difficult to understand and it is in the Board's best interest to put together a strategy for the AMP to revise those.
- The AMPA reminded Policy that they are about to have a discussion at the March meeting about prioritizing important projects for Policy so if this is a priority Policy wants to prioritize, this is a perfect phase to address that. He said there are many ways to approach the topic, but a logical first step may be to complete a retrospective study to look at the composition of riparian forests when they were "more fire resilient". That type of study could provide a target condition to advance the discussion around evaluating how eastside rules could help achieve the overall goal of fire resilient riparian areas. He also said he knows there is interest at SAGE in this topic as well as from eastside tribes.
- The Ecology representative suggested that new eastside rules should be based on something logical and not be overly complicated, and if it is important to the AMP than the priority should be reflected in the CMER workplan. He also suggested to think about what outside partners could be brought into this discussion.
- The small landowner caucus representative noted that from his perspective, the difference between eastside and westside is risk management, including disease, over-crowding, wrong species, and overall risk of fire. He also suggested that the evidence from the 2017 field tours shows that the prescriptions, if implemented correctly, can help make riparian areas more resilient to fire.
- The suggestions back to the Board include:
 - Clarification from the Board what parts of the rule they have authority over, what parts DNR has authority over, and where fire protection fits in.
 - Ask for direction to Policy to take the time necessary to discuss this issue fully, bring in outside partners/experts, and formulate questions that are relevant to the AMP, and then report back to the Board.
 - Explain to the Board that Policy has started the discussion but needs more time to talk about critical questions, studies, recommendations, etc.
- The conservation caucus representative noted that her caucus still has questions on this issue yet unanswered, regardless of whether Policy is granted more time to work on this or not.

Quarterly Budget Update – The AMPA did not have an updated biennial budget to share with Policy at this meeting due to vacation and sick time from the project management staff. They anticipate updating the budget and sharing that with Policy at the February meeting.

Potential Habitat Break (PHB) Update – The AMPA updated Policy on the technical work ongoing.

- The science panel's analysis and initial report was released on December 8 and then the science panel and stakeholder technical representatives met on December 14. The stakeholders gave feedback at the meeting and several also submitted written comments. The panel is now revising the report based on the feedback; the AMPA anticipates the report will change.
- The next step for the report is the science panel will send a revised report by January 16, giving a month before the Board meeting for more time for inter- and intra-caucus discussions and enough time for the Board members to digest the report.
- The AMPA assumes the Board will take action on the report at their February meeting, but it is uncertain whether the Board will take any specific recommendation from the report or make their own decision informed by the report.
- The science panel is also working on the study design for the validation study and hope to have a draft in January to share with stakeholders. They may also share the draft with ISAG before it goes to ISPR. After the study design returns from ISPR, it will go to the Board at their May 2018 meeting but before then, the stakeholder technical representatives will have a chance to discuss the study design.

Board Subcommittee on AMP Improvements – The AMPA shared that the Board Subcommittee selected the successful contractor for the interviews and facilitation of the principals. They are in contract negotiations and once complete, will schedule a meeting with the Board Subcommittee after the February Board meeting. Then the interviews will happen, including mostly everyone involved in the AMP. The AMPA anticipates the first principals' meeting might happen in late April or around the May Board meeting.

Next Steps

- Policy agreed on a number of topics to discuss at the February 1 meeting.
- The conservation caucus noted that the Unstable Slopes PI Subgroup did not meet before this meeting because of the uncertain timeline of the approval of the unstable slopes research strategy. Policy agreed that in order for the subgroup to prepare for the budget discussion at the March meeting, maybe the subgroup could receive a draft of the research strategy before CMER would approve it at their February 27 meeting.
- Policy agreed to have the October meeting in Vancouver, not Bellingham.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15pm.

Attachment 1 – Participants by Caucus at 1/4/18 Meeting*

Conservation Caucus

Mary Scurlock, M. Scurlock & Associates

County Caucus

*Scott Swanson, Washington State Association
of Counties, Chair
Kendra Smith, Skagit County (phone)

Federal Caucus

*Marty Acker, US Fish & Wildlife Service
*Michelle Wilcox, EPA

Industrial Timber Landowner Caucus

Doug Hooks, Washington Forest Protection
Association, CMER Co-Chair
Jenny Knoth, Green Crow, CMER Co-Chair
*Karen Terwilleger, Washington Forest
Protection Association

Small Forest Landowner Caucus

*Steve Barnowe-Meyer, Washington Farm
Forestry Association
*Ken Miller, Washington Farm Forestry
Association

*caucus representative(s)

Others

Hans Berge, Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Howard Haemmerle, Adaptive Management Program
Claire Chase, Triangle Associates

State Caucus – DNR

Marc Engel, DNR

State Caucus – Ecology and Fish & Wildlife

*Mark Hicks, Department of Ecology
*Don Nauer, Department of Fish & Wildlife

Tribal Caucus – Eastside

Marc Gauthier, Upper Columbia United Tribes
(phone)

Tribal Caucus – Westside

Mark Mobbs, Quinault Indian Nation
*Jim Peters, Northwest Indian Fisheries
Commission
Ash Roorbach, Northwest Indian Fisheries
Commission
Curt Veldhuisen, Skagit River System
Cooperative (phone)

Attachment 2 – Ongoing Priorities Checklist

Priority	Assignment	Status &Notes
Type N	Policy to Board	Policy agreed by consensus on recommendations to the Board which were presented in November 2017.
Type F	Board & Technical Group	Policy delivered consensus recommendations to the Board in May 2017; the Board determined some areas that needed work by a technical group (primarily on potential habitat break criteria). DNR is developing the rule language.
Small Forest Landowners Westside Template	SFLOs Template Subgroup	Subgroup is meeting separately; co-chaired by Marc Engel and Ken Miller.
Unstable Slopes	Policy	UPSAG hired a contractor to do a glacial deep-seated literature synthesis. Policy presented their perspective on the unstable slopes proposal initiation to the Board in May 2017 and convened an Unstable Slopes PI subgroup to attend to those issues.
Ongoing CMER reports reviewed by Policy	Doug Hooks & Jenny Knoth, CMER Co-Chairs	CMER Co-Chairs give regular written and/or verbal update(s) to Policy.

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

Entity/Group/Subgroup	Next Meeting Date	Notes
TFW Policy Committee	February 1	
CMER	January 23	
Forest Practices Board	February 13-14	
Small Forest Landowners Template Subgroup	January 23	
Budget Subgroup	Quarterly meetings with AMPA	Quarterly reports at Policy meetings.