

Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee  
 October 1, 2015 Meeting Summary

Decisions & Actions from Meeting

Decision	Notes
1. Revised the AMPA's off-channel habitat proposal review packet, and approved with those changes.	Approval from all caucuses with three "sideways thumbs".
2. Provided direction back to the Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Program TWIG to revise the problem statement, objectives, and critical questions (see page 5).	
3. Initially approved the Co-Chair Selection Process & Duties document to be edited and finalized for the Board's November meeting.	

Action	Assignment
4. Revise Sept 10 & 11 meeting summary; send with Nov meeting materials.	Claire Chase
5. Send names of unstable slopes experts to Howard, Doug, and/or Hans for including on the Unstable Slopes TWIG.	All caucuses, as appropriate
6. Send Adrian/Claire clarifications on the Co-Chair Selection Process document, if any (by October 13).	All caucuses, as desired
7. Revise the Co-Chair Selection Process document for submitting to the Board.	Adrian Miller & Claire Chase
8. Draft October 1 meeting summary.	Claire Chase

**Welcome & Introductions** – Adrian Miller, Co-Chair of the Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee (Policy), welcomed participants and led introductions (*see Attachment 1 for a list of participants*). The Co-Chair made some revisions to the agenda to allow enough time for every topic.

*Announcement* – Charlene Andrade introduced herself as the new DNR Project Manager with Howard Haemmerle. Before joining DNR, she most recently worked with the Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council.

*Updates*

- **Board Manual Section 16** – DNR's stakeholder group met on September 30, and will meet once more on October 2. They are addressing the Board's motion from the August 2015 meeting, and also addressed delivery and run-out. They expect no technical changes to the text already delivered to the Board, though perhaps some changes to how concepts are introduced. They expect a product to be delivered to the Board at the November meeting.
- **Small Forest Landowners Template Subgroup** – The Subgroup Chairs asked for more time to address this topic, so it was moved later in the meeting. Due to a lack of time at the end of the meeting, Policy agreed to address this at the November meeting.

**September Meeting Summary** – Policy reviewed many edits to the draft summary. It was noted that the meeting summaries can sometimes have too many details. Due to the amount of edits, Policy agreed to review a revised version at the November meeting.

**Off-Channel Habitat Proposal Review Packet** – The Adaptive Management Program Administrator (AMPA) reviewed the proposal review packet he submitted to the Co-Chair after receiving the off-channel habitat proposal initiation from the DNR caucus:

- Now that the AMPA has formally responded to the proposal initiation, it is Policy's job to evaluate the response. If there are specific pieces that are problematic for any caucus, Policy should discuss that. Otherwise, this set of recommendations from the AMPA could serve as the recommendations from Policy.
- The AMPA made several recommendations (in three tracks), but no sequencing because he left that for Policy to determine after discussing the recommendations.

Policy's discussion on Track 1 (policy track), which is meant to review the clarity of the existing rule language:

- DNR noted that they wrote the proposal initiation so that this task would be to review the current rule language and make sure it is clear. Their focus was not to begin fixing the existing language, though that could come at a later stage. Doing the review would serve as a baseline moving forward. It was noted that the work the eastside tribal and small landowner caucuses did can serve as the beginning of this work.
- A caucus noted that each caucus might have a different reading of the guiding documents (such as the Forests & Fish Report) that would lead to different perspectives on how clear or unclear the existing rule language is.
- A caucus noted that the science track might be really important to happen before this rule language review, because it might be challenging for Policy to look at confusing language without identifying ways to improve it.
- A caucus noted that the adaptive management process requires analysis of the current rule in effect (222-16-031). This includes that adaptive management requires that any proposed changes to current rules must include a review of how the proposal meets the four goals of FFR.

Policy's discussion on Track 2 (science track), which is meant to answer several technical questions:

- It was noted that the language in Task 4 was unclear about how the bankfull width includes off-channel habitat.
- The AMPA clarified that the technical tasks, especially the first one, should not be constrained by the hypothetical definition of off-channel habitat in the WACs – they should consider everything (biological, fluvial, geomorphological, etc.) so that they can consider ideas that might not already be incorporated in the WACs.
- It was noted by several caucuses and the AMPA that some Tasks in this Track might be redundant, or at least similar. However, it was suggested that these remain the same because they are answering a particular caucus's question that came up in the development of the proposal initiation. And because these are technical questions to be answered by a technical group, all the information will still go to Policy for a discussion about what to do with that information and if/how to change the status quo.
- A caucus cautioned against identifying the 95% flood return interval in Task 5 because using arbitrary numbers has caused problems in the past.
  - The Co-Chair noted that this Task could be informed by the scientific understanding of what is off-channel habitat (from Task 1).

- The AMPA noted that finding 95% (or 75%, or 85%) could be determined once the “baseline” of 100% of off-channel habitat is outlined in Task 1.

Policy’s discussion on Track 3 (combined science and policy track):

- The AMPA’s recommendation for this Track was to take the information provided to full Policy and then figure out next steps, actions, etc.
- It was noted that the technical group for Track 3 would be different than the technical group for Track 2. For Track 3, he suggested inviting participants familiar with Forest Practices Applications (FPAs) and Water Type Modification Forms (WTMFs). He also suggested talking with DNR Region staff to see where there might be WTMFs or other geomorphologic complex areas. All caucuses are able to access FPARS and are knowledgeable about certain areas so they can help identify areas of interest. The AMPA recommended starting with all stakeholders to determine how to collect the right data, since FPARS may not be the easiest way to collect data.
- A caucus expressed concern about doing a cost-benefit analysis. The Co-Chair clarified that Policy never does a full cost-benefit analysis, but that it is helpful to know estimated implications of costs.

After the initial Policy discussion, the AMPA made edits to the document and provided a revised version after lunch. Policy discussion continued on the revised version:

- A caucus expressed hope that the technical group for Track 2 would not be precluded from considering off-channel habitat that is above the floodplain elevation, or in the 1.5 flood year return interval. It was clarified that that kind of water most likely would be included in regular Type F protection, not off-channel habitat protection, so it would already be covered. However, this would be validated during this process.
- A caucus noted that given historical documents and negotiations, they thought off-channel habitat was already protected. So if the agreement made years ago turns out not to include some off-channel habitat that was intended to be included, it should be included. If the work identifies elements of off-channel habitat that are not currently protected that were not in the original agreements, then it would likely go through an assessment.
- A caucus asked whether the review of the rule language is for 222-16-030 or -031. It was noted that the review would likely have to be of the current interim rule.

**Decision:** After discussion and additional edits, Policy approved the revised recommendations with three “sideways thumbs” from the DNR, Conservation, and Eastside Tribes caucuses and “thumbs up” from the rest of the caucuses.

**CMER Update** – Doug Hooks, CMER Co-Chair, provided Policy with numerous updates from CMER:

- Lean Process Improvements: CMER has begun discussing how to improve the Lean Process but has not yet finalized recommendations for Policy. Policy should expect those recommendations from CMER in the next few months. CMER is also thinking of ways to improve their communications to Policy, especially when presenting about CMER studies and making sure Policy has all the necessary information to make decisions.
- Budget: CMER expects to have recommendations for Policy at the November meeting with additional tasks to spend the current fiscal year budget.
- As Co-Chair, Doug is more actively involved in encouraging participation from landowners in CMER studies.

- Updates on specific projects:
  - Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Study: CMER continues to review comments from ISPR on various chapters. The summary chapter has yet to be written, but does not go to ISPR. The CMER Co-Chairs encouraged Policy to consider how to direct CMER to deliver this 17-chapter study to Policy (e.g., all at once, or staggered).
  - Forest Hydrology Study: The ISPR comments have been returned and circulated to CMER members, which will be discussed at the October CMER meeting. CMER expects that this will be delivered soon to Policy.
  - Remote Sensing Pilot Project: RSAG is soliciting comments on the proposed budget and scope and hopes to have the pilot started by November.
  - Westside Extensive Temperature Study: Will soon go to ISPR.
  - Eastern Washington Riparian Assessment Study: SAGE will address this at their October meeting and likely CMER will too at the October meeting.
  - Unstable Slopes TWIG: Lost a few TWIG members, but having replacements fill at least one of those spots.
  - Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides literature synthesis: a scope has been drafted, and now the SAG hopes to hire a contractor by the end of the year to do that work.
  - Roads Best Management Practices TWIG: will re-start their work in October, and they are working on a BAS alternatives analysis that will go to Policy soon.
  - Eastern Washington Type N Riparian Effectiveness Program TWIG: The TWIG is developing the study design, and after going to CMER for approval it will be packaged with the budget for Policy approval. Policy will not review the study design piece by itself.
- The October CMER meeting will be changed from October 27 to October 26.
- A caucus expressed concern that the TWIG process is not being followed. It was noted that with recommendations soon from CMER about the Lean Process, Policy could have a discussion about the most effective way to address TWIG work.

**Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Program TWIG** – Policy briefly reviewed the TWIG process and clarified that this TWIG is going to Policy with the problem statement, objectives, and critical questions document. It is up to Policy to approve it or provide suggested changes to the TWIG to ensure that their work is so far answering the right policy question(s). After Policy approval, the TWIG will develop the BAS alternatives analysis and it will go through the CMER and Policy approval process again, and then they will develop a study design.

Lea Beckett, CMER wetlands scientist, presented to Policy about the problem statement, objectives, and critical questions. Points included:

- This project came out of the Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Program in the CMER workplan. The hope is to learn more about the effects of timber harvest or other forest practices in forested wetlands. While there is good literature about the effects on wetlands, there is little literature to specifically understand the effects on forested wetlands.
- Due to the lack of literature on forested wetlands, the TWIG realized they do not even have a clear understanding about the types of forested wetlands. What is known is that they can occur at the headwaters of streams and in the floodplains, but those are functionally different parts of the watershed. This study will help the Adaptive Management Program understand which functions of forested wetlands are the most important to investigate.
- The first critical question came from the *Wetland Research and Monitoring Strategy* approved by Policy in January 2015. Dr. Paul Adamus wrote the Strategy and is also participating on the TWIG. The second critical question came from the Forests & Fish Report.

Policy's discussion on the document included:

- The TWIG will gather enough information to put together a strong study design alternatives analysis. They will gather information by learning where the majority of forested wetlands are harvested or affected, and then determine if it is a stream-associated or a hydrologically isolated wetland. Then they will figure out which function(s) to investigate.
- Lea has been creating a database from FPAs to understand where known wetlands exist, which will be a good basis for the future work. That database is still under development.
- The study will likely include haul roads and temporary landings. That goes outside what is written in the CMER workplan, but was of interest to three of the TWIG members. The TWIG might also look at harvest within forested wetlands, but the TWIG has not yet determined that.
- It was noted that mitigation does not relate to this specific piece of the Wetlands Research Strategy.
- Policy generally agreed that the document from the TWIG should be re-worked to include other considerations, and to clarify some of the existing language. The direction back to the TWIG is:
  - Consider Schedule L-1 resource objectives and the CMER workplan. Use the priorities within the Wetlands Research Strategy (including project rankings).
  - Consider the budget allocated in the Master Project Schedule.
  - Consider a staggered process: start with harvest, then add roads, then herbicide.
  - Consider how to create baselines.
- The TWIG will take this direction from Policy to revise the problem statement, objectives, and critical questions.

**Co-Chair Selection Process & Duties** – Adrian Miller presented this document which he, Mary Scurlock, and Dick Miller revised based on the discussion at the September Policy meeting. This should be finalized by mid-October to provide in the Board packet for their November meeting.

Overall, Policy provided direction back to Adrian to significantly reduce the specificity. Many caucuses expressed concern that if the Co-Chair description included too much detail, it would be too cumbersome for any person or employer to volunteer time to the position. Caucuses were asked to send any final edits to Adrian by October 13, and otherwise Adrian will edit and finalize for the Board packet. It will come back to Policy at the December meeting to finalize once there is approval from the Board at their November meeting.

The Co-Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:45pm.

Attachment 1 – Participants by Caucus at 10/1/15 Meeting

**Conservation Caucus**

Chris Mendoza  
\*Mary Scurlock

**County Caucus**

\*Kendra Smith, Skagit County

**Federal Caucus**

\*Marty Acker, USFWS

**Industrial Timber Landowners (Large)**

Doug Hooks, WFPA  
Jenny Knoth, Green Crow  
Adrian Miller, Olympia Resource Management,  
Co-Chair  
\*Karen Terwilliger, WFPA

**Non-Industrial Timber Landowners (Small)**

Harry Bell, WFFA  
\*Dick Miller, WFFA

\*caucus leads

**Others**

Charlene Andrade, DNR  
Lea Beckett, DNR  
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**

\*Ray Entz, Kalispel/UCUT (phone)  
Marc Gauthier, UCUT (phone)

**Tribal Caucus – Westside**

\*Joseph Pavel, Skokomish

Attachment 2 – Ongoing Priorities Checklist

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Assignment</b>	<b>Status &amp;Notes</b>
<b>Type N</b>	Type N policy subgroup	Caucuses are encouraged to talk offline about the wet season default methodology.
<b>Type F</b>	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 physical criteria, risk reduction, etc.).
<b>Small Forest Landowners Westside Template</b>	SFLOs Template Subgroup	To set first meeting when workload allows.
<b>Unstable Slopes</b>	Policy	Board accepted Policy’s recommendations; now DNR and UPSAG are working on implementing those recommendations. UPSAG is hiring a contractor to do a literature synthesis.
<b>Ongoing CMER reports reviewed by Policy</b>	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

<b>Entity, Group, or Subgroup</b>	<b>Next Meeting Date</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>TFW Policy Committee</b>	November 4	Wednesday instead of Thursday, at the Nisqually Refuge building
<b>CMER</b>	October 26	
<b>Type N Policy Subgroup</b>	TBD	
<b>Type F</b>		To be addressed at regular Policy meetings.
<b>Forest Practices Board</b>	November 10	
<b>Small Forest Landowners Template Subgroup</b>	TBD	As workload allows