

Timber, Fish, & Wildlife (TFW) Policy Committee
 March 2, 2017 Meeting Summary

Decisions and Action Items

Decision	Notes
Policy voted to take no action on the Glacial Deep-Seated Landslide Literature Synthesis and Findings Report	Consensus from all caucuses
<p>Policy agreed on the following next steps related to the water typing dispute:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conservation and Industrial Timber Landowner Caucuses will jointly work on OCH language in next 2 weeks. 2. Mediation calls with individual parties will happen March 6-13. 3. FHTG (practitioners' group) will continue working on the joint FHAM proposal. This work includes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Fiscal and resource support from AMPA. Policy authorizes AMPA up to \$20,000 for third-party review, collate, and analyze existing data. b. Iterative work with reviewer team (Roni et al). c. Articulate Policy questions back to Policy as they come up. 4. 4 caucuses will revise their FHAM proposal, as desired (for iterative work with reviewer team). Reviewers communicate with individual proposers as quickly as possible. 5. Reviewer team to review proposals and report back to Policy in April. 6. Agreement to Mediate established before end of March. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Topics for the rule (not metrics) to be developed by May. 7. Policy mediation on FHAM and OCH content will start by end of March. 	Eastside tribes absent, all other caucuses thumbs up.

Action	Assignment
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet to develop a report at April Policy meeting on: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Remaining issues in Unstable Slopes Proposal Initiation b. Relict vs. dormant issue 	Unstable Slopes PI subcommittee (Marc Engel, Mary Scurlock, Karen Terwilleger, & Scott Swanson)

c. Coarse screening tool d. Prepare draft report to Board at May meeting	
2. By March 29, send any questions on Unstable Slopes Criteria TWIG BAS & Alternatives Analysis to Howard Haemmerle. (Policy will vote on this at the April meeting.)	All caucus representatives
3. Continue developing joint FHAM proposal, working with Roni et al.	Fish Habitat Technical Group
4. Revise individual FHAM proposals and meet with Roni et al. for feedback (as desired).	Conservation, Eastside tribes, Industrial Timber Landowners and WDFW/Ecology caucuses
5. Budget Subgroup to meet (March 14), send out updated budget by March 15 to all caucuses for review.	Karen Terwilleger, Rich Doenges, Ray Entz, Hans Berge
6. Review draft budget from Budget Subgroup before April meeting.	All caucuses
7. Schedule mediation meetings.	Triangle

Opening – Ray Entz and Scott Swanson, Co-Chairs of the Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee (“Policy”), welcomed participants and led introductions (*please see Attachment 1 for a list of participants*). The goal of this meeting was to focus on continuing the discussions on outstanding issues of the permanent water typing system, and to take action on other Policy workload items.

Announcements and Co-Chairs’ Updates –

- Randy Kinley Sr., of the Lummi Nation, passed away in February 2017. Randy had been a Policy Analyst for the Lummi Nation and involved in TFW Policy.
- DNR released the 2017 Protocol Stream Survey Memo, effective as of 3/1. This memo describes DNR’s expectations regarding submittal of proposed water type changes based upon stream surveys, reiterates expectations about the role of water type review teams, and provides a forecast of 2017 water abundance.

Meeting Summaries – The meeting summary from February 2nd, 2017 was revised per Policy comments and accepted by vote as final.

Unstable Slopes Proposal Initiation (PI) – In February 2016, the Board adopted the Unstable Slopes PI and assigned the work to Policy. The AMPA made recommendations to address the issues within the PI; these recommendations were adopted and a Policy subgroup was formed. This subgroup met and brought recommendations to Policy. Policy and the Board agreed with the subgroup recommendations, and the recommendations were directed to UPSAG.

The Unstable Slopes PI subgroup (Scurlock, Terwilleger, Engel) have met several times. The subgroup reviewed the UPSAG report, and addressed the two outstanding issues from the PI:

1) *To establish a public safety protocol.* The subgroup has not reached agreement yet on how to establish this protocol.

2) *To potentially address climate change through Board Manual.* A literature review was suggested but the subgroup did not come to agreement on it as a specific recommendation.

Next steps: Policy identified a need to track the status of the PI topics and the subgroup will report on that at the next Policy meeting. The Board requested an update at the May Board meeting, so Policy will review a draft report to the Board at the April meeting.

Policy discussed that an amendment may be proposed to the PI and come back to Policy for review. The AMPA reminded Policy that if Policy makes edits to the AMPA's recommendations, the edited recommendations have to go back to the Board. Policy discussed how climate change should be addressed through the AMP. A new or amended PI can be brought directly to Policy or to the Board. Policy then has to report back to the board.

Report from UPSAG – Casey Hanell reported to Policy on behalf of UPSAG.

1. *Topic #1, Potential Instability and Failure Mechanisms of Deep Seated Landslides (DSL)*
 - a. UPSAG has the results of the literature review regarding potential effects of forest practices on glacial deep-seated landslides. UPSAG expects to have the results of a literature review on the potential effects of timber harvest on non-glacial deep-seated landslides by June 30, 2017. These two literature reviews will form the basis for answering the Topic 1 questions. UPSAG anticipates being able to provide feedback to Policy at the August Policy meeting.
2. *Topic #2, Terminology related to Reactivation Potential of Relict v. Dormant DSL*
 - a. There is disagreement within UPSAG within this issue. The group is unaware of a better classification than that in the board manual.
 - b. To UPSAG's knowledge, there is no published literature that supports the hypothesis that timber harvest leads to reactivation of relict or dormant-indistinct deep-seated landslides (the first literature review did not find published literature; the second literature review is ongoing and is looking for any such literature). This leads practitioners to the conclusion that there is a low probability that future harvest will reactivate landslides that have not been active for more than 100 years. This conclusion is modified on a site-specific basis depending on the geomorphic setting.
 - c. Policy agreed that the subgroup will consider next steps and report back to Policy at the April meeting.
3. *Topic #3, Scope potential for empirically-based runout risk screening tools for Shallow Rapid RIL Identification and Analysis*
 - a. Currently, there are 11 options for assessing runout potential for shallow-rapid landslides in Board Manual Section 16, the majority of which are empirically-based. In UPSAG, there was no knowledge of additional published resources available that would provide superior screening or would supersede methods currently described in the Board Manual.
 - b. There is disagreement in UPSAG about the utility of the coarse shallow-rapid screen.
 - c. The Unstable Slopes Criteria TWIG has scoped a project to address this question and potentially update the state of the knowledge on shallow-rapid landslide runout potential. It is estimated that it would take a contractor approximately two months to develop a coarse screening tool that is based on existing runout assessment tools. This is completely

dependent on scope. For instance, it may take much longer if significant validation of the screening tool is desired.

- d. If Policy changes the RIL definitions in the future, a new coarse screen tool should be revisited.
- e. Policy agreed that the subgroup will consider next steps and report back to Policy at the April meeting.

Policy thanked UPSAG for bringing forward the requested information.

Chris Mendoza (Conservation Caucus UPSAG member) reminded Policy that the coarse screen was developed by a group of stakeholders because those members thought it would be useful. It took 3-4 months and used the Tolt watershed as a template. This coarse screen was not adopted because of limits on time and resources. The Industrial Timber Landowners Caucus noted that there was not consensus on the utility of the coarse screen or its output, thus it was not included in the Board Manual.

Unstable Slopes Criteria TWIG BAS & Alternatives Analysis – Howard Haemmerle introduced Policy to the work of the TWIG. The Forest Practices Rules are intended to limit the impact of management-induced landslides on public resources and public safety. It remains unclear whether the unstable slopes criteria are “adequate” for identifying features potentially susceptible to slope instability from forest practices.

The objective of this work is to evaluate unstable slopes criteria and recommend specific modifications to the criteria so that those landforms sensitive to forest practices can be identified consistently.

The best available science (BAS) Summary shows that the literature contains a large body of research related to landslide initiation and runout, for both shallow and deep-seated landslides, but not the right type of research to answer the critical questions.

Information needed includes consistent, objective landform maps, the proportion of landslides originating from each landform, the proportion of those landslides that travel to public resources or threaten public safety, the change in those proportions induced by forest practices, and variability of those proportions in space and time.

The group came up with seven alternatives that in part or combination could answer these questions. None will answer the question on its own. It may save money to undertake multiple alternatives concurrently rather than sequentially.

Individual Projects (Alternatives)

1. Compare/Contrast Landslide Hazard Zonation Mass Wasting Map Units with RIL.
2. Regional Assessment of Missing RIL by QE. (Not recommended by UPSAG)
3. Object-Based Landform Mapping with High-Resolution Topography.
4. Empirical Evaluation of Shallow Landslide Susceptibility and Frequency by Landform.
5. Empirical Evaluation of Shallow Landslide Runout.
6. Physical Models to Identify Landforms and Shallow Landslides Most Susceptible to Management.
7. Empirical Evaluation of Deep-Seated Landslide Density, Frequency, and Runout by Landform. (Currently being worked on by UPSAG)

Policy will be asked at the April meeting to make a decision on the alternative(s) they direct the TWIG to develop into a study design. Over the next month, caucuses can send questions to Howard before the next meeting.

Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides Literature Synthesis and Findings Report (GDSL LS&FR) – Policy addressed the question of taking action on the Literature Synthesis/Findings Report. At a minimum, the Synthesis will be available to inform all future studies in this research strategy.

Decision: Policy voted to take no action on the GDSL LS&FR (all caucuses thumbs up). Policy thanked UPSAG for their work in bringing this forward for the research strategy.

Off-Channel Habitat – The Conservation and Industrial Timber Landowners Caucuses met to clarify the language based on the forest practices rules. The Conservation Caucus noted that there is some movement towards consensus between the two caucuses. The caucuses will meet again, with the mediator, before the first mediation session begins.

Fish Habitat Assessment Method (FHAM) – Phil Roni, Pete Bisson and Ray Timm presented on their review of the FHAM proposals. Their goal was to review and score the proposals to determine if they adequately address objectives of fish habitat in WAC 222-16-10 to identify the F/N break, to provide recommendations, and to propose alternative methods. Their approach was to review proposals and background material (including the interim rule, Board Manual 13, a memo from the Fish Habitat Technical Group, and criteria from Policy), develop criteria to objectively compare proposals, summarize strengths and weaknesses, and provide overall recommendations.

The team reviewed four proposals from the Conservation, the Eastside Tribal, the Industrial Timber Landowners, and the WDFW/Ecology Caucuses. They found that all proposals had merit but were more outlines of methodologies than proposals. They also found the proposals to be incomplete and inconsistent in their background, objectives, methods and documentation. This challenged the review team in rating and scoring. No proposal provided enough detail to determine if they met the criteria; objective comparison and ranking were not possible.

The review team recommends the following next steps:

- 1) The review team to provide feedback to the proposal writers on strengths/weaknesses/what is missing.
- 2) The review team to provide a list of criteria that all proposals should include.
- 3) Caucuses to revise proposals.
- 4) Caucuses to send proposals to review team for review and scoring with an interactive presentation.
- 5) Review team to undertake traditional scientific review process on revised proposals.

The review team felt that the FHTG memo identified places where they could not get to consensus, and that these issues need to be resolved.

Discussion

The WDFW/Ecology Caucus asked why the review team was unable to evaluate the proposals or suggest their own FHAM to Policy. The review team noted that the concepts all seemed good, but none of the proposals contained an implementable methodology and insufficient information was provided to make a

determination on the best method. A barrier to creating a hybrid method was that the tolerance for risk varies among the caucuses. The AMPA suggested that if Policy could agree on a concept of risk, the review team could do more with the proposals. The review team is looking for both qualitative and quantitative information on risk from Policy.

The DNR Caucus noted that the Board has to hear from Policy what elements or topics are in the FHAM, but that the metrics could be developed after the presentation to the Board in May.

The Industrial Timber Landowners Caucus noted that science should support any changes to the FHAM protocol.

Water Typing Mediation – Betsy Daniels, mediator, introduced herself to Policy. Betsy has done interest-based negotiation, conflict resolution and negotiation for over 20 years. She has worked on civil rights mediations on air and water quality under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. Betsy has done research on tribal/county interactions and has experience working with similar dynamics as at the Policy table. Betsy clarified that the parties are not in mediation at this meeting.

Betsy discussed the role of the mediator. A mediator tests the parties to see if the mediation is really their best alternative. It is hard to mediate on science, because there is infinite research that can be done. Mediation has to be finite, and create a decision space for a binding decision and a plan for what happens if the parties do not reach agreement. The mediator clarified that a binding decision means a decision that will actually be implemented once it leaves the hands of the people at the table. Betsy reminded the parties that she will be seeking consensus among the parties. If a party or parties would prefer to work on a majority/minority report, they should inform the mediator.

In Betsy's experience, the number of bodies at the table is the single biggest factor in delaying mediation. The mediator coached parties in thinking through if they or people from their caucuses really need to be at the table or in the room and why.

The mediator discussed how the mediation table is different than the Policy table. There will be no Co-Chairs, and no or limited participation from people who are not the caucus representatives. The mediation team will have individual calls with the parties and then create a draft agreement for mediation.

Discussion

One party inquired if the parties can merely report that they are in progress with mediation at the May Board meeting. DNR said that this is not an option.

The parties and the mediator discussed key dates: May 1 is the end of Stage 2 Dispute Resolution, unless the parties extend it. The Board meeting is May 10, and the mailing date for that meeting is April 26.

The parties discussed how they may reach agreement on guidelines for FHAM without having total agreement on the metrics of the methodology

Decision: All caucuses voted thumbs up on the following items. Eastside tribes were absent for the vote.

1. Conservation and Industrial Timber Landowner Caucuses will jointly work on OCH language in next 2 weeks.
2. Mediation calls with individual parties will happen March 6-13.

3. FHTG (practitioners' group) will continue working on the joint FHAM proposal. This work includes:
 - a. Fiscal and resource support from AMPA. Policy authorizes AMPA up to \$20,000 for third-party review, collate, and analyze existing data.
 - b. Iterative work with reviewer team (Roni et al).
 - c. Articulate Policy questions back to Policy as they come up.
4. 4 caucuses will revise their FHAM proposal, as desired (for iterative work with reviewer team). Reviewers communicate with individual proposers as quickly as possible.
5. Reviewer team to review proposals and report back to Policy in April.
6. Agreement to Mediate established before end of March.
 - a. Topics for the rule (not metrics) to be developed by May.
7. Policy mediation on FHAM and OCH content will start by end of March.

Budget Review – The Budget Subgroup has met once to review the budget. CMER approved the biennial budget on February 28, so the Budget Subgroup plans to meet again on March 14. The CMER workplan will be provided to Policy for the next meeting, though Policy only approves the budget, not the workplan. The AMPA noted that the budget does not currently include any prioritization from Policy, so that will be part of Policy's work at the next meeting.

Legislative Updates – Joe Shramek (DNR) noted that a few bills remain that are of interest. The main legislative items for DNR at this point in the session are the operating and capital budgets. The Senate is due to release its budget after the economic forecast comes out (this may be in late March). Jim Peters noted that the Westside Tribal Caucus supports WDFW in protecting salmon habitat. The Westside Tribal Caucus is concerned that people want to continue to whittle away the protection of salmon.

CMER Update – Doug Hooks, CMER Co-Chair, gave the CMER update. This update will be moved to the beginning of the agenda at future meetings. Policy let Doug Hooks know that occasionally the CMER meeting summaries need more detail; Doug offered to Policy that he is always happy to provide further detail. CMER accomplished a lot of business at their February meeting. The State Lands AMP (adaptive management program?) gave a presentation. That AMP functions as an effectiveness monitoring organization. The State Lands AMP is looking to potentially collaborate with CMER. The CMER workplan was refined and updated and will be available when the technical edits are approved. CMER has been using the same process as presentation and decision a month apart as Policy and that is working well. CMER got approval for three different TWIG items: unstable slopes BAS and alternatives analysis (Policy decision in April), Roads TWIG study design (goes to ISPR), and Type F TWIG study design (goes to ISPR).

Doug Hooks encouraged the Policy caucus representatives to coordinate with their CMER representatives, especially prior to Policy decisions.

The Co-Chairs adjourned the meeting at 4:05 PM.

Attachment 1 – Attendance by Caucus at 3/2/17 Meeting

Conservation Caucus

*Mary Scurlock, M. Scurlock & Associates
Chris Mendoza, Mendoza Environmental
Jamie Glasgow, Wild Fish Conservancy

County Caucus

*Scott Swanson, Washington State Association
of Counties, Co-Chair
Kendra Smith, Skagit County

Federal Caucus

*Marty Acker, USFWS
Michelle Wilcox, EPA
Scott Anderson, NMFS

Industrial Timber Landowners Caucus

*Karen Terwilliger, Washington Forest
Protection Association (WFPA)
Doug Hooks, WFPA
Brian Franzen, Weyerhaeuser
Ted Turner, Weyerhaeuser

Small Forest Landowners Caucus

*Steve Barnowe-Meyer, WFFA
Ken Miller, WFFA
Jason Abston (phone)

DNR Caucus

*Marc Engel, DNR
Joe Shramek, DNR
Marc Ratcliff, DNR

WDFW/Ecology Caucus

*Rich Doenges, Ecology

*Terry Jackson, WDFW
Mark Hicks, Ecology

Tribal Caucus – Eastside

*Ray Entz, Kalispel/UCUT, Co-Chair
Marc Gauthier, UCUT (phone)

Tribal Caucus – Westside

*Jim Peters, Northwest Indian Fisheries
Commission (NWIFC)
*Joseph Pavel, Skokomish Tribe
Derek Marks, Tulalip Tribes
Sarah Zaniewski, Squaxin Island Tribe (phone)

*Caucus representative

Others

Hans Berge, AMPA
Casey Hanell, DNR, UPSAG
Colleen Gronberg, DNR
Howard Haemmerle, DNR
Netra Regmi, CMER (phone)
Greg Stewart, CMER
Dave Schuett-Hanes, CMER
Phil Roni, Cramer Fish Sciences
Ray Timm, Cramer Fish Sciences
Pete Bisson, Cramer Fish Sciences

Claire Chase, Triangle Associates
Rachel Aronson, Triangle Associates
Betsy Daniels, Triangle Associates

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 and in mediation, 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 Ken Miller.
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	April 6	
CMER	March 28	
Type N Policy Subgroup	TBD	
Type F		To be addressed at regular Policy meetings and in mediation.
Forest Practices Board	May 10	
Small Forest Landowners Template Subgroup	TBD	As workload allows.