

Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee
 May 4 & 5, 2016 Meeting Summary

Decisions and Actions from Meeting

Decision	Notes
1. Accepted the April meeting summary as final with two edits.	
2. General agreement that Policy reviews and accepts (but does not approve) the CMER work plan; decisions about priorities for projects in the work plan happens during Policy's budget discussion.	Agreement by all caucuses present.

Action	Assignment
1. Confirm ability to serve as Co-Chair.	Ray Entz
2. Send questions to Claire Chase by May 13 on DNR's hydro-layer spreadsheet.	Caucus representatives
3. Use comments from Policy's May 4 meeting and UPSAG's May 3 meeting to determine an outline of how to move forward on the unstable slopes proposal initiation. Prepare for Policy's July meeting, if not sooner.	Mary Scurlock, Karen Terwilleger, & Marc Engel
4. Finalize recommendations to Policy on the SFLOs' westside alternate template proposal.	SFLOs Template Subgroup
5. Reformat and update Policy's Task List and prepare to present at an upcoming Policy meeting.	Rich Doenges, Mary Scurlock, Mark Hicks, Hans Berge, Adrian Miller, Karen Terwilleger, & Claire Chase
6. Finalize a document outlining odd- and even-numbered years for when to review the MPS, biennial budget, and CMER workplan. Include accompanying narrative.	Adrian Miller, Ray Entz, Todd Baldwin, Doug Hooks, Hans Berge, & Claire Chase
7. Send ideas for off-channel habitat field tour sites to Hans Berge (for OCH Technical Group).	Caucus representatives
8. Draft proposal(s) for trust-building and caucus leader meetings.	Adrian Miller, Ray Entz, Hans Berge, & Claire Chase
9. Ask Electrofishing Technical Group participants to make themselves available for the final ETG meeting, and to understand that this will be the final meeting and last opportunity for input on the summary report.	Caucus representatives, as appropriate

-----**Day 1: May 4**-----

Welcome, Introductions, & Old Business – Adrian Miller, Chair of the Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee (Policy), welcomed participants and led introductions (*please see Attachment 1 for a list of participants*). There were no changes to the draft agenda.

Announcements – Some questions have been collected for the hydro-layer spreadsheet created by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), and have been shared with DNR so that they can prepare for a stakeholder meeting to address those questions. One caucus asked for more time to provide questions, which DNR agreed to. All caucuses have until May 13 to provide those questions to Claire Chase.

April 7, 2016 Draft Meeting Summary – The conservation caucus provided some edits to the write-up of the SFLOs Template Subgroup part of the summary. With those edits, the draft meeting summary was accepted as final.

Ground Rule of the Month – Ray Entz highlighted the importance of consensus for this group, and that it is a founding principle. He encouraged caucuses to think of consensus as a high standard instead of as a veto power. Ray also encouraged that non-consensus must be in TFW agreements (policies, resource objectives, etc.). He suggested that unjustified non-consensus, or non-consensus based on consideration unrelated to the TFW agreement, the Forests & Fish Report, and the Habitat Conservation Plan, should not prevent TFW decisions.

Co-Chair Position – Adrian Miller reminded Policy about the need for another Co-Chair, which could be done through several options: 1) Have someone step into the Co-Chair role with Adrian, 2) distribute Co-Chair duties among many Policy members, or 3) expand Triangle’s contract to have a facilitator play the Co-Chair role. Ray Entz recognized how hard Adrian is working to play both Co-Chair roles simultaneously. Ray volunteered to do the Co-Chair role with Adrian at meetings, but if he could rely on more help from Claire Chase between the meetings. Several caucus representatives discussed this, including:

- There was general support and appreciation for Ray stepping into this role, assuming his employer supports him.
- There was general support for expanding Claire’s role between meetings to support Ray becoming the new Co-Chair. The Ecology representative suggested that this expanded role could include helping the group work through an issue where they seem to be stuck. This would not replace the work the Co-Chairs do but could complement their work with the outside help.
- Ray mentioned he would be willing to come to more meetings, though not all due to travel constraints.
- The conservation caucus suggested that when possible, the Co-Chairs should look to other caucus representatives to be the leader on a specific issue and thereby reduce the reliance on Co-Chairs.
- The AMPA noted that if the expansion of the current Triangle contract would amend the budget, he would need to talk with Policy for budget approval. However, he noted that it would likely be under the limit where it would not need approval from the Forest Practices Board (Board).

Policy also discussed the idea of “succession planning”, wherein caucus representatives who are not in the Co-Chair role help or are “in line” so they can move into that position more smoothly. Adrian Miller encouraged caucus representatives to think about where they can prep to be Co-Chair.

Unstable Slopes Proposal Initiation – Howard Haemmerle gave a report from the Upland Scientific Advisory Group (UPSAG) meeting the day before. This was the first time UPSAG had met since DNR had drafted the proposal initiation, the Board reviewed it, and the AMPA wrote recommendations for how

to address the proposal initiation. UPSAG was requested to look at the set of recommendations in four ways: 1) will the recommendations gain useful scientific answers? 2) are the time periods realistic? 3) is the estimate cost realistic? and 4) does UPSAG have the capacity to do the work? For the fourth question, UPSAG considered hiring contractors for any work that would reasonably take more than six months.

To answer the questions, UPSAG developed a spreadsheet which will be shared with a sub-set of Policy members who will work on recommendations to Policy about what to do first. Points and discussion about this spreadsheet included:

- There was some overlap in the questions from the AMPA's recommendations, so they recommend batching some together so that the time is used most strategically.
- UPSAG recommended that doing a literature review of deep-seated landforms would not be effective, unless Policy clarified the scope of the review.
- A literature review about evaluating and assessing reactivation potential for all dormant or relict deep-seated landslides and associated groundwater would take 12 months, so any other work beyond that would have to wait for the review to be complete. However, they felt the feasibility to do this work is high.
- Another highly feasible literature review would be to assess the reactivation potential for dormant bedrock and glacial deep-seated landslides (GDSLs), but UPSAG agreed that the output would only be moderately helpful. They considered if this could be added to the scope of work of the ongoing GDSL literature review, but it cannot.
- UPSAG agreed that reviewing the reactivation potential of relict slides should be included in all sub-bullets of 6.2 of the AMPA's recommendations.
- They thought that the idea of forming a Technical Writing & Implementation Group (TWIG) to develop a study to determine what runout distances should be used in a shallow-rapid landslide coarse screen flow chart could happen, but they were unsure about whether that could be tied in with the ongoing Unstable Slopes Criteria TWIG. This TWIG might also be able to incorporate the work of estimating the acceptable level of risk.

Karen Terwilleger, Marc Engel, and Mary Scurlock met before this Policy meeting to review the AMPA's recommendations without the input from UPSAG. They tried to simplify and consolidate the questions in the AMPA's recommendations, and this input from UPSAG will help. They will continue to meet, at least one more time before the July Policy meeting, so that they can bring back a set of refined recommendations for Policy. The federal caucus noted that they are willing to have this work be done, but are cautious because their priorities for Policy remain with covered species and clean water. DNR noted that this proposal initiation is from the Board, and there is a rule that requires no tolerance for an impact to a public resource (including streams). Several caucuses also noted that the importance of Policy's work on this partly lies in the conveyance to the Board and the broader public that Policy recognizes the issue about public safety, but that they largely remain focused on risk-avoidance strategies, regardless of whether the downstream impact is on public safety or public resources.

Small Forest Landowners (SFLOs) Template Subgroup – Marc Engel reported from the subgroup. The subgroup has reviewed 13 prescriptions related to the SFLOs proposal, and the next step is to analyze the prescriptions to determine whether any meets the criteria for an alternate template. They will then bring recommendations to Policy for how to move forward. Various subgroup members have differing

opinions about how much time to spend analyzing the prescriptions since it took several meetings to organize the 13 prescriptions from the original proposal. The subgroup next meets on May 23rd and they hope to know at that meeting or soon thereafter whether any of the 13 prescriptions should be included in a recommendation to Policy as meriting further assessment for becoming possible templates.

Several caucuses mentioned that it would be best to continue this discussion with the full Policy Committee once someone from the non-industrial timber landowner caucus is present (no one from that caucus was present at this meeting). DNR also noted that they will bring an update to the Board at the May meeting the following week.

Policy also identified the need for clarifying specific decision protocols and accountability for alternate plans, so that stakeholders feel more comfortable creating alternate plans instead of alternate templates.

Policy's Task List – Mark Hicks reviewed the history and need for Policy's Task List. Several years ago, Policy developed a list of tasks from a 2-day workshop about strengths, opportunities, weaknesses, and threats. While that list was captured at the time, it has not been well maintained over the years. The intent of having this task list as a Clean Water Act Milestone is to not lose sight of the important issues.

In February, a small group including Mark Hicks, Mary Scurlock, Rich Doenges, Adrian Miller, and Hans Berge reviewed the list and organized the tasks into three categories as a recommendation to Policy: what to remove from the list, what to keep on the list, and several topics they wanted Policy's input on.

Policy discussed several items in the first category of what to keep on the list, and made some changes and updates. They suggested that the small group re-format the list in the following ways:

- Use the "Kanban" approach, which would show what tasks Policy wants to do, what they are currently doing, and what they have accomplished.
- Reflect Policy's ongoing priorities (including the Board's work plan).
- Include items from the parking lot, and add forest health and fire prevention to that.
- Be thoughtful in how a list such as this could be helpful but not a distraction for Policy.
- Once re-formatted and reviewed by Policy, the Co-Chair hoped that this could serve Policy as a work plan.

Kalispel's Forest Management Plan – Bob Gilrein and Tim Larkoski from the Kalispel Tribe of Indians presented to Policy about their Forest Management Plan. Points included:

- Their Continuous Forest Inventory (CFI) has shown general trends, including:
 - Overstocking,
 - Encroachment of shade-tolerant species,
 - Increased stocking of large diameter trees, and
 - No significant harvest in the last 25 years.
- Kalispel has had a lack of harvest since 1992 due to a variety of reasons, which impacts the forest lands.
- About 60% of the reservation is within an active floodplain and most of their CFI plots are in coniferous forests.

- All tribal members were part of a decision to determine the preferred alternative for maximum allowable amount of harvest.

After the presentation, Kalispel guided Policy on a field tour for the afternoon. Some photos:



Prescribed burn



Kalispel firefighters with TFW Policy Committee



Tree canopy



Forest near wetlands



Culturally modified tree



Wetlands

-----**Day 2: May 5**-----

Planning For Future Budget Decisions – Adrian Miller noted the need to confirm when Policy does approvals of various pieces of budget decisions, including the CMER work plan, the biennial budget, and the Master Project Schedule. Discussion included:

- General agreement that Policy reviews and accepts (but does not approve) the CMER work plan but decisions about priorities between projects in the work plan happens when Policy discusses the budget.
- Policy made some changes to a document that outlines when decisions are made. Adrian suggested that the Policy Co-Chairs and CMER Co-Chairs finalize this document by confirming all dates with the Board Manual, WAC, and CMER Protocols & Standards Manual.
- Policy agreed that if one caucus does not support a project, that could jeopardize consensus on the full budget. If that happens, the AMPA suggested that Policy would note that in their presentation of the majority/minority opinions on the budget and would bring that along with the budget to the Board. This will be noted in the accompanying narrative to the timeline document.

Type F: Off-Channel Habitat Technical Group – The AMPA reported on the status of the OCH Technical Group, which had its first meeting on April 8. They are planning a field trip to validate some of their ideas and perspectives. The field trip is only for the group members. They hope to have the field trip in May and be ready to deliver a draft report to Policy in June. Phil Roni is planning to give Policy a presentation on their draft report at the June Policy meeting, and both Phil and Pete Bisson will be available through the remaining biennium for any other questions that come up for Type F. Overall, the group feels that the questions identified by Policy are straightforward except for one question related to the flood return interval, so that will be one focus of the field trip. Policy caucuses were encouraged to send any ideas for field trip sites to the AMPA soon.

Type F: Model/Map Update – The AMPA provided an update on this effort. The University of Washington lab is working to get this pilot complete by the end of June, using the two pilot watershed units. They have already parameterized the original model, and have spent a lot of time talking with the people who were involved with creating that original model because the software between then and now has advanced so much. Now they are inputting the LiDAR results along with the 10-meter DEM data. The lab will give a presentation to the Board at their August meeting.

While this work is not done directly by Policy, the conservation caucus and Co-Chair noted that it will be important for Policy to remember to leave a budget placeholder for more of this work in future years. Policy also requested the AMPA to ask the UW lab to present to Policy at the July meeting before their presentation to the Board in August.

Type F: Physicals Proposal Initiation – The industrial timber landowner caucus representative shared that she has reviewed the comments she received from other caucuses on the draft proposal initiation their caucus wrote on evaluating the default physical criteria. She is finalizing the proposal initiation and hopes to do so and submit to the AMPA before the next Policy meeting. At that point, it will be up to the AMPA to review the proposal initiation for completeness and then he would write recommendations and submit to Policy for review.

Clean Water Act (CWA) Milestones Update to the Board – Mark Hicks updated Policy on the update he will give to the Board at the May meeting about the CWA Milestones.

- The CWA assurances outline the agreement that Ecology will rely on the rules as adopted and consistent with the Forests & Fish Report (FFR), in association with a well-funded Adaptive Management Program (AMP), and with implementation of the rules by DNR.
- In 2007, Ecology realized that by 2009 (the 10-year anniversary of the FFR), that not all the rules would be tested. Therefore, they granted an extension on the condition that certain milestones were met. DNR is completing the majority of these milestones, and the AMP is responsible for the remaining. Since then, the Board receives semi-annual updates from Ecology on the progress of these milestones.
- The Ecology memo to the Board notes that:
 - The AMP did not accomplish much beyond one intermediary step in the last year,
 - The Lean Process does not seem that “lean”,
 - In order to re-energize the idea of “owning each other’s’ problems”, the Board should encourage a meeting between caucus leaders to agree that true science is what should move this program along.
 - The Uppermost Point of Perennial Flow (UMPPF) discussion is still waiting on Policy’s workload, and
 - Having an independent review of the AMP would be helpful in the near future.

Policy discussed how to re-energize using true science to inform the AMP, and how to keep the science and policy discussions separate within the program. This discussion included:

- The eastside tribal caucus noted that the system that kept science and policy separate seems broken and there needs to be a “re-set”. He suggested that the Board ask every CMER representative to re-apply to stay in CMER.
- An Ecology representative agreed, stating that the specific personalities can lead to more dysfunction instead of the quantity of highly-qualified participants. He also suggested that the AMP may need to be more realistic about the timeframe it takes to get high-quality products, despite that being different than how the Lean Process was set up.
- The industrial landowner caucus noted that the TWIG process is doing good work, and recently the AMP improved communications between TWIGs and Policy. She also encouraged Policy to be willing to take on more of the policy discussion if they are going to ask CMER to stop having policy-level discussions.
- The conservation caucus encouraged Policy to be creative in proposing solutions, regardless of whether that solution has certain constraints. She suggested that before getting the caucus leaders together, there is more work to be done in crafting creative solutions.
- Several caucuses seemed open to the idea of a caucus leaders meeting, but encouraged Policy to be thoughtful about the specific focus of that meeting before calling those people together (e.g., who would be involved as caucus leaders and what would the specific topics be?).
- The westside tribal caucus noted that good qualifications of potential CMER members do not always correlate to a willingness to leave policy at the door.
- The next steps include:
 - Recognize there is a problem (starting with this discussion),

- Give the Co-Chairs at CMER and Policy more tools to address behaviors that are not contributing to the success of the AMP,
- Each caucus should consider their CMER member and if that person is the best to represent the caucus at CMER and in the Scientific Advisory Groups,
- Consider how to request more rigor when the Board approves CMER members, and
- Consider if and how to convene the caucus leaders with a specific focus.
- The eastside tribal caucus suggested having a separate Policy meeting dedicated to this discussion without other distractions.

Type F: Electrofishing Technical Group – The AMPA presented the draft report from the Electrofishing Technical Group and highlighted some pieces of the report, noting that it is not final at this point. The Technical Group worked on a report to Policy that they understood would likely not be consensus, but would inform the questions Policy raised. The Technical Group then broke apart the questions and answered them individually. He noted that as the members self-selected to work on different questions, people from different perspectives naturally gravitated to work on the same issue, which helped bring people closer together. This draft report is the product of all those smaller conversations, and has some input from the full group but ultimately it is a product from the AMPA. At this point, the AMPA hopes to convene one final meeting of the Technical Group to make any last changes to the document before it is finalized and presented to Policy.

Policy members asked the AMPA several questions related to the report:

- The conservation caucus was concerned by the level of discomfort she heard from members about how the most recent meeting on April 29th ended. The AMPA assured her that the members will have one final time to provide edits on the document. Policy members agreed to emphasize to any Technical Group member in their caucus that this will be the final time for comments.
- To finalize the draft report, the Technical Group members will submit final comments and then the AMPA will finalize the report based on all those comments. If caucuses have other technical people who want to comment on the report, those comments can be brought by the Policy caucus representative once the final report is presented to Policy.
- The westside tribal caucus noted that a lot of the responses in the draft report note that “this works fine most of the time”, but the details may disagree. He asked when Policy might expect more visibility of the opportunities to recognize where electrofishing or the protocol does not work. The AMPA noted that the answer to that is outside the scope of the Technical Group but within the scope of what Policy is working on for the complete Type F discussion. It will be up to Policy to determine how to address those issues.
- After the report is finalized, Policy can pick the pieces they want to focus on, which might not be all of the issues.
- The eastside tribal caucus suggested that the report could better capture the idea of the single tool, perhaps in the Executive Summary or in the Alternatives section.
- The AMPA noted that the eastside was not well represented in this Technical Group, so that is a disclaimer everyone should understand.

CMER Update – Todd Baldwin and Doug Hooks, CMER Co-Chairs, provided an update to Policy of the last CMER meeting:

- CMER reviewed the Master Project Schedule, which Policy subsequently reviewed at the special April 29th meeting.
- LWAG has worked on a study design that somehow did not get full CMER approval in the past, so CMER asked the AMPA to send the study design to a peer review (though not the ISPR process through UW).
- LWAG also updated Task 3 of the Van Dykes Salamander scope of work and though CMER had previously approved Tasks 1 and 2 at a meeting earlier this year, at the April meeting CMER approved Task 3.
- CMER is starting to receive the results from ISPR on the Hard Rock study chapters.
- CMER approved the request for Chapter 15 of the Type N Experimental Buffer Study to move to ISPR.
- A subset of CMER is still working on updating the Protocols & Standards Manual, and comments on Chapter 7 will be taken through May 17.
- Ecology submitted a memo to the AMPA requesting dispute resolution on the ENREP study. At this point, it is at CMER to decide how to proceed, and does not yet involve Policy. It has the potential to get to Policy, so the Co-Chair encouraged Policy representatives to review the dispute resolution process in rule and Board Manual Section 22. If this issue comes to Policy, it will affect their existing workload and timelines.

Next Steps – Claire Chase reviewed the action items from this meeting, as well as the agenda topics for the next meeting in June. Curt Veldhuisen and Kendra Smith are working to identify sites for the field tour on June 9, and will focus on Type F issues. Caucuses were encouraged to send site ideas to Curt and Kendra soon. The June meeting will be June 10 at the Skagit County Hearings Room.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 12:15pm.

Attachment 1 – Participants at 5/4 & 5/5/16 Meeting

Conservation Caucus

Chris Mendoza, Mendoza Environmental
(phone)
*Mary Scurlock, M. Scurlock & Associates

County Caucus

Kendra Smith, Skagit County

Federal Caucus

*Marty Acker, USFWS (phone)
*Lucy Edmondson, EPA (phone)

Industrial Timber Landowner Caucus

Adrian Miller, Olympic Resource Management,
Chair
*Karen Terwilleger, WFPA
Doug Hooks, WFPA

Non-Industrial Landowner Caucus

No representative present

Others

Hans Berge, AMPA
Howard Haemmerle, DNR
Claire Chase, Triangle Associates

State Caucus – DNR

*Marc Engel, DNR
Marc Ratcliff, DNR

State Caucus – Ecology and Fish & Wildlife

*Rich Doenges, Ecology
Mark Hicks, Ecology
*Terry Jackson, WDFW

Tribal Caucus – Eastside

Todd Baldwin, Kalispel Tribe
*Ray Entz, Kalispel Tribe/UCUT
Marc Gauthier, UCUT

Tribal Caucus - Westside

Mark Mobbs, Quinault Tribe (phone)
*Joseph Pavel, Skokomish Tribe
*Jim Peters, NWIFC (phone)
Ash Roorbach, NWIFC
Curt Veldhuisen, Skagit River System
Cooperative (phone)

Attachment 2 – Ongoing Priorities Checklist

Priority	Assignment	Status &Notes
Type N	Type N policy subgroup	Caucuses are encouraged to talk offline about the wet season default methodology.
Type F	Policy	At regular meetings, Policy is working towards responding to the February 2014 Board motions (specific to off-channel habitat and electrofishing) in addition to other related water typing issues (such as default physical criteria, recovery, habitat, etc.).
Small Forest Landowners Westside Template	SFLOs Template Subgroup	Subgroup is meeting separately; co-chaired by Marc Engel and Dick Miller. Next meeting is May 23.
Unstable Slopes	Policy	UPSAG hired a contractor to do a glacial deep-seated literature synthesis. Policy is also considering how to respond to the AMPA’s recommendations on the unstable slopes proposal initiation, presented to the Board in February 2016.
Ongoing CMER reports reviewed by Policy	Doug Hooks & 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/Subgroup	Next Meeting Date	Notes
TFW Policy Committee	June 9 & 10	Mt. Vernon
CMER	May 24	
Type N Policy Subgroup	TBD	
Type F		To be addressed at regular Policy meetings.
Forest Practices Board	May 11	
Small Forest Landowners Template Subgroup	May 23	As workload allows.