

Timber, Fish and Wildlife Policy Committee

Tuesday, October 19, 2022 // 8:00-10:50AM

Remotely held using Zoom

Action Items	
Items	Action
Possible workgroup for AMP Studies: scope of inference, performance targets and decision thresholds or criteria	
Wetlands to be added to next TFW Policy Meeting Language of document	November agenda
RCS Field Trial Results	November agenda
Riparian Function Literature Synthesis	November agenda
What questions and revisions would need to be done for approval on Riparian Literature Synthesis	Darin Cramer

NOTES

Updates

Court Stanley explained that TFW Policy is going to stay on top of questions and concerns.

AMP Studies: scope of inference, performance targets, and decision thresholds or criteria

Darin Cramer gave a brief introduction of the topic and shared that he wanted to start the discussion early so we can make sure to be clear and not wait until the 180-day timeline. He explained that he feels like this is not a new issue and TFW Policy is not informed about the study until it is completed. There needs to be a way to find areas of agreement and disagreement, and if there is going to be strong disagreement then we need to decide if we need to move forward. Tom O'Brien suggest to possibly have written responses to this. Darin explained that he feels that we don't need to have written responses or have it become more formal, he just feels that a discussion could be sufficient. Brandon Austin asked what the common operational practices are. Darin responded that it is mentioned in the WAC and explained that just because it is written doesn't mean it is going to need to be used. Cody explained that it is important to test the rules no matter how it is implemented. That could be a way to incorporate the rule and also look at the rules and how they could be changed. Lori Clark explained that there are perspective 6 questions and suggested that we use what is already there and adjust as needed. Brandon suggested a workgroup to discuss this and bring it back to TFW Policy with the suggestions. It was decided to have a workgroup to work on this.

Interpretation of Wetland Rules in CMER Study Designs and Documents

Darin gave a brief introduction to this topic. Alec Brown discussed that no net loss is not the same as written. He stated in the chat box “the wetland management zone and wetland requirements specified in this chapter are designed to protect these wetland functions through the length of a harvest rotation, although some of the functions may be reduced until the midpoint of the timber rotation cycle”. Court Stanley said that the half of a timber rotation cycle is one that he feels is different. Marc Engel said that wetland function is another one. Alec shared that no net loss is in the Roads Project as well so maybe that is the reasoning. Brandon said that in the Roads Project it is possibly listed as a suggestion but it doesn’t have the same goal in the current study. Alec asked about the no loss of function after half of a timber rotation cycle. Lori explained that the projects have been written based off of language in the Policy-approved work plan and that the no net loss comes from the DNR Forest Resources Plan and the Habitat Conservation Plan. Darin explained that he wanted to put this topic out there to see how other people feel and if decided that there is an issue then we can decide what to do from there. Saboor Jawad asked what the next steps should be and it was decided that this topic will be on the TFW Policy November meeting agenda.

Riparian Characteristics and Shade Response Study

Cody Thomas gave a brief explanation of the issues that his caucus has with the RCS study. He discussed the different options that he listed in his document. He suggested that we could possibly implement the study in a different location than a stream. Court asked if roads will have consistent shade. Cody explained that it is a one-variable study so we could possibly be able to find a different location for this study. Ray Entz stated in chat box “the original intent was from DOE to inform the XLS shade model. It has been significantly changed down to include the measurement of a single variable with the fish-eye lens to measure effect to effective shade”. He also explained that “some of the concerns are also over the fact that given it is just Effective Shade, it is likely a better candidate for using an analogue rather than on a Type F stream. Outside scientists have indicated to use that an analogue would be suitable given the limited data collection and study design. This would probably reduce costs as well as you could “design” the analogue within an actual harvest”. It was decided that there would be a discussion on this at the November TFW Policy meeting.

Riparian Function Literature Synthesis

Brandon gave a brief introduction of the topic. He explained that this project came about as a response to WFFA’s template alternate plan proposal and how it wasn’t completed for various reasons. He explained that there needs to be a decision on whether or not this will be helpful and if the focus questions address the concerns. Darin discussed his concerns with the project. He explained that some of the questions are broad/open ended and some are specific with terms that are not clear and could likely have different meanings. He also posed the question if this is the best use of the resources at this particular time. Ken Miller asked about the money, whether if we don’t use it do we lose it or could it be used somewhere else, that could help make the decision of whether or not we should move forward with this. Saboor responded that he is not sure if we would lose the money. He explained that that is something that we would find out early next year from the legislature. This project is not on the MPS for the next biennium and if Policy decides to move forward there would need to be another discussion on whether it needs to be added on to the next biennium’s MPS. He has a concern that we might be running out of time to complete it this fiscal year. Cody explained that he likes how the questions are broad because it could help to inform our priorities in the future as well. It was decided that Darin Cramer will create a document that explains what questions and revisions would need to be done for approval on Riparian Literature Synthesis and have a discussion on this at the November TFW Policy meeting.

Attendees by Caucus

Conservation Caucus

*Alec Brown (WEC)

County Caucus

*Court Stanley (Co-chair)

Kendra Smith (Skagit)

Large Industrial Landowner Caucus

*Darin Cramer (WFPA)

Doug Hooks (WFPA)

Small Forest Landowner

*Ken Miller (WFFA)

State Caucus

*Brandon Austin (ECY/ Co-chair)

Darric Lowery (WDFW)

*Tom O'Brien (WDFW)

Westside Tribal Caucus

Ash Roorbach (NWIFC)

Eastside Tribal Caucus

*Cody Thomas (UCUT)

Ray Entz

Adaptive Management Program

Saboor Jawad (AMPA)

Lori Clark (DNR)

Natalie Church (DNR)

Jenny Schofield (DNR)

Anna Toledo (DNR)

Rachel Rubin (DNR)

Jenelle Black

Tanner Williamson

DNR Staff:

*Marc Engel (DNR)

Tracy Hawkins

CMER:

Joe Murray (WFPA)

A.J. Kroll (CMER Co-chair)

Aimee McIntyre

John Heimburg

Doug Martin

Debbie Kay