

# Timber, Fish and Wildlife Policy Committee

Thursday, March 7, 2024 // 9:00AM – 3:50PM

Hybrid Meeting

In-Person: WA State Light Industrial Park at 801 88th Ave. SE, Tumwater, WA 98512

Virtual: Zoom (Link Listed Below)

Motions	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
<p><b>February 2024 Meeting Notes</b></p> <p><b><u>Motion:</u></b> Ken Miller moved to approve the February 2024 meeting notes as amended.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p><b>Seconded:</b> Brandon Austin</p> <p><b>Up:</b> Brandon Austin, Chris Briggs, Darin Cramer, Marc Engel, Ken Miller, Court Stanley, Cody Thomas, and Rico Vinh.</p> <p><b>Absent:</b> Westside Tribes</p>
<p><b>Schedule L-1 Prioritization Memo</b></p> <p><b><u>Motion:</u></b> Brandon Austin moved to approve the Schedule L-1 Prioritization memo and table as delivered to Policy today.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p><b>Seconded:</b> Court Stanley</p> <p><b>Up:</b> Brandon Austin, Chris Briggs, Marc Engel, Ken Miller, Court Stanley, Cody Thomas, and Rico Vinh.</p> <p><b>Sideways:</b> Darin Cramer (Reason in notes below)</p> <p><b>Absent:</b> Westside Tribes</p>
<p><b>Non CMER Science</b></p> <p><b><u>Motion:</u></b> Cody Thomas moved to have this topic be sent to the SAO workgroup with the intention of clarifying the language of the Proposal Initiation process.</p> <p><b><u>Friendly Amendment</u></b> Cody Thomas moved to have the non-CMER science topic be sent to the SAO workgroup with the intention of clarifying the language in the Board Manual 22 describing the Proposal Initiation (PI) process.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p><b>Seconded:</b> Rico Vinh</p> <p><b>Up:</b> Brandon Austin, Chris Briggs, Marc Engel, Ken Miller, Kendra Smith (Proxy for Court Stanley), Cody Thomas, and Rico Vinh.</p> <p><b>Abstain:</b> Darin Cramer (most of this conversation is unnecessary)</p> <p><b>Absent:</b> Westside Tribes</p>

<b>Action Items</b>	
<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
Check with DNR about providing Schedule L-1 update progress to the Federal Services.	Lori Clark
Budget work group meet for 2 hours.	March Workgroup Meeting.
Alexander Prescott to attend budget work group meeting to present Roads Project budget adjustments.	Alexander Prescott
Revise Eastside Tribes Riparian and Characteristics Shade (RCS) Memo to take out NS.	Cody Thomas
Send out Non-CMER Science PowerPoint Presentation.	Natalie Church
Update TFW Policy website with July 11, 2024, as the date for the July TFW Policy meeting.	Natalie Church
Compass work with AMP Staff to produce tangible options to be discussed at the May TFW Policy meeting.	Compass/AMP Staff

### **Caucus Updates**

- Cody Thomas read the following ground rule:
  - Participants state needs, problems and opportunities first and positions last, and avoid hidden agendas.
- Cody Thomas asked whether June 27<sup>th</sup> or July 11<sup>th</sup> works best for the July TFW Policy. It was decided to have the meeting on July 11<sup>th</sup> with decision items to be done before 2:00PM.
- Ken Miller mentioned that SB 5667 passed and read a paragraph from a letter being sent to the Governor.

### **Staff Updates**

- Natalie is working behind the scenes to come up with a new format for AMP mailings to make it more streamlined and easier for participants. It is the same format the Forest Practices Board uses. Policy participants will automatically be added to this distribution list. Starting April, Policy participants will receive an email from GovDelivery. Natalie will still send Policy members an email with SPO links for CMER meeting materials.
- Washington Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit at the University of Washington will be hosting a two-day Structured Decision-Making workshop for the AMP at the NRB. RSVP has closed.

### **CMER Updates**

A.J. Kroll, CMER co-chair, reviewed the CMER SAG Updates document and what was discussed at last month's CMER meeting.

### **Public Comments**

No public comments.

### **Schedule L-1 Prioritization Memo**

Theryn Henkel shared her screen and reviewed the Schedule L-1 Prioritization memo and Prioritization table. Cody Thomas wanted to remind the project team to keep in mind why we are doing this, that there was some discussion at the beginning of this process about formulating interim targets where the science is not currently available or complete, rather than wait for science to be complete. He wanted to remind the workgroup of that original intent. Darin Cramer explained that the table and the memo has misleading information when it says that CMER has projects will directly inform the performance targets. He contends that there are no, or very few CMER validation studies that directly address performance targets but did concede that current and past studies could provide information. Chris Mendoza gave examples of validation studies that CMER has completed and explained that the first question of the prospective 6 questions which Schedule L-1 Performance Targets the study could inform. Chris also indicated that numerous validation studies were brought to Policy from CMER, and they were not funded, Policy determines what science is funded. Darin indicated that he did not agree with most of Chris's comment but did not elaborate on which points he disagreed with or the nature of the disagreement. Court Stanley stated that he felt the approach that CMER is taking a good approach to this topic. Rico Vinh asked about the process for informing the Federal agencies and what kind of oversight they have. Lori Clark explained that we would need to report out to federal. Darin explained that Feds approve process not the outcome. Lori will check with DNR to report out the Schedule L-1 process. Darin said that he is not going to hold up the process, and that he hopes that the project team can update the memo and table with more clear information.

### **Master Project Schedule (MPS) Adjustments**

Lori presented the draft FY24-25 revisions to the MPS. The Budget Workgroup reviewed these revisions in February and Lori will continue to work with the Budget Workgroup on finalizing the FY25 revisions and on the FY26-27 budget. CMER is in support of the Roads Project request for an increase in budget to cover implementation costs for FY24 and FY25. Alexander, Roads Project manager, will be attending the upcoming Budget Workgroup meeting to share more details regarding the Roads Project budget request. The FY25 revisions and the draft FY26-27 MPS budgets will go to the Forest Practices Board in May for consideration and approval so that there is time for DNR to put in a decision package representing the full budget needs of the AMP. Caucus' will need to go to the legislature to promote this request to ensure the AMP as adequate funding to implement the current active projects.

### **Eastside Tribes Riparian and Characteristics Shade (RCS) Memo**

Cody Thomas gave a brief background of Eastern Washington Tribal Government concerns and how they worked with WDFW and Ecology to find sites on the eastside. They then asked CMER to review the memo and CMER gave their feedback. Brandon Austin explained that this is not a decision item, the decision will be next month. The concern is coming from Tribal Fish Biologist. Darin Cramer explained that he sees this as a Policy discussion, and he doesn't feel CMER needs to give input. He says that there is an issue with changing the study design after there was approval by everyone including Eastside Tribes. He understands that caucus' can bring concerns to the table but if they do they need to bring a solid well backed reason and he doesn't feel that is the case in this situation. But he is willing to help address the concerns that the Eastside Tribes have. Darin doesn't see how it will affect fish. He feels that this is a process foul. Cody Thomas explained that he and even CMER and RSAG said that it doesn't change the study design it is influencing how they choose the sites. Court Stanley asked when this project is done what are we going to do with it? Cody explained that he doesn't think that it will be made into rule, more of a nice to know not a need to know. It could be useful and could inform other studies. Concern the rules are thought to be the minimum. Ken Miller said as long as it is on perennial water. Cody said that he is willing to take out "seasonal" to help with that issue. Rico asked if Policy is planning on using CMER's thoughts or are we going to open the door to other topics. Lori reminded everyone that Policy did ask for CMER's input and CMER did give their thoughts. Rachel Rubin gave her input explaining that the study

design states Type F or Type Np and that is because of the physical characteristics. Main objective that finds sites that work for the study design. Need all sites to be on the same stream to avoid bias. She doesn't support restricting the site selection. As they make progress in the study, she hopes they can inform and help alleviate concerns.

### **Public Dashboard**

Alexander Prescott shared his screen and walked through the Public Dashboard. He explained that the project managers plan on updating the information quarterly. This dashboard should be up and running by the end of the month. The link for the dashboard will be available on the multiple Adaptive Management Program websites and will be shared directly with TFW Policy upon completion.

### **Structured Decision-Making**

Dan Ohlson, Rae Failing, and Philip Halteman gave an update and what the plan is going to be moving forward.

### **Riparian Management Tool**

Keith Folkerts and Robin Hale gave a presentation on the Riparian Management Tool and answered questions as they came up.

### **Non CMER Science**

Lori presented on the current Proposal Initiation Process, how CMER is currently using non-CMER science, and Policy's role in addressing the net gains option recommendation to clarify how the AMP uses non-CMER science/outside science.

Cody Thomas explained that we are hoping for a decision on this item because we can continue to have this conversation for quite some time. Court Stanley said that he needs some clarity on how we go about writing down peer reviewed non-CMER science. We should use non-CMER science to inform decisions. Ken Miller agrees with Court to him the only question is how we use non-CMER science and what he objects to when a landowner wants to use some science they are told "well it hasn't gone through CMER". Rico Vinh explained that he sees CMER as a less bias because it is collaborative. He doesn't think we should bring in a study that "I like" to the program. Chris Briggs suggested that we ask if there is a space that it can help answer a question or can we send it to CMER to insert into a literature synthesis or can we create a literature synthesis. His reaction is to send it to CMER. Rico responded saying that if we open that up CMER could be flooded with studies, and they don't have the time for that, and we are already behind on timelines. He said that he feels that each Policy person has a CMER rep that they can ask if they are looking into specific topics. Cody explained that since Lori presented the information, we know all know that we already use outside science the question is are we wanting to restructure. It could give the opportunity to circumnavigate the whole collaborative process. He said if there is a unicorn study there is already a way to have it into the program and if we find a study we can share with CMER rep, and they can decide if they want to start a PI process. He doesn't see the need for CMER if we accept too many studies besides being literature reviewers. Ken said that he should be able to bring a study into a discussion to help prove where he is coming from. Marc Engel doesn't think that Policy can make a decision today and he agrees that CMER does use outside science extensively and that we need to remember that this discussion isn't what CMER is doing but what Policy does. He would suggest that we have further discussion and not make a decision today. Darin Cramer stated that he made a consensus recommendation to the Board and doesn't think we need a motion. We need to implement the recommendation. He would argue that there are some trying to this shut down and keep it as status quo. He understands perspectives it is something that we need to hash out in the PI process. He is not okay

with shutting this down we need to go through the process and see. Marc explained that if is an issue with the PI process then that is something that needs to be addressed as it was stated that we would. Brandon suggested that if we are looking for clarification on the PI process the SAO workgroup develop a statement to clarify the process and bring that back to full Policy. Cody recommends that if it goes back to the workgroup to have it be a joint CMER/Policy workgroup. Lori explained that she doesn't think that will work. It was decided to send this to the SAO workgroup with the intention of clarifying the language in the Board Manual 22 describing the Proposal Initiation (PI) process.

## List of Attendees

<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Representing</b>
§Austin, Brandon	WDFW/TFW Policy Co-chair
§ Briggs, Chris	Department of Ecology
§Cramer, Darin	Large Industrial Landowner Caucus/WFPA
§Engel, Marc	State Caucus/DNR
§Miller, Ken	Small Forest Landowner/WFFA
§Stanley, Court	TFW Policy Co-chair/WSAC
§Thomas, Cody	Eastside Tribe Caucus/UCUT
§Vinh, Rico	WCA/Conservation Caucus
Anderson, Patricia	Forest Practices Board Coordinator
Bretherton, Welles	CMER Voting Member/Department of Ecology
Church, Natalie	Administrative Assistant/DNR
Clark, Lori	Adaptive Management Administrator
Failing, Rae	Compass Resources Management
Franquemont, Maggie	DNR
Halteman, Philip	Compass Resources Management
Heimburg, John	WDFW
Henkel, Theryn	Supervisory Project Manager/DNR
Hooks, Doug	WFPA
Kay, Debbie	CMER Member/WetSAG Co-chair
Knoth, Jenny	CMER Voting Member
Kroll, A.J.	CMER Co-chair
McIntyre, Aimee	WDFW/CMER Voting Member
Mendoza, Chris	CMER Voting Member/Conservation Caucus
Mitchell, Robert	Member of the Public
Murray, Joe	RSAG Co-chair
Ohlson, Dan	Compass Resources Management
Prescott, Alexander	Project Manager/DNR
Roberts, Dave	Small Forest Landowner/WFFA
Rubin, Rachel	AMP Scientist
Roorbach, Ash	Westside Tribes/NWIFC
Schofield, Jenny	Project Manager/DNR
Smith, Kendra	Skagit
Toledo, Anna	Project Manager/DNR
Zirkle, Karen	DNR

§TFW Policy Voting Member