

Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee
May 3, 2018 Meeting Summary

Decisions and Actions from Meeting

Action	Responsibility
Reach out to caucuses for contact information for their climate point person	Terra Rentz
Bring information on the pending financial audit to the June meeting	Hans Berge
Meet before June meeting	Budget subgroup

Decision	Notes
Approve the March and April meeting summaries with edits	The federal caucus was absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.

Welcome, Introductions, & Old Business- Policy Chair Scott Swanson opened the meeting, joined by temporary Chair Karen Terwilleger. In July, Curt Veldhuisen will step forward as Chair to replace Karen. Scott will step away as Chair in July or August, to be replaced by Terra Rentz.

Policy welcomed Alec Brown as the Conservation Caucus Representative.

Terra Rentz picked up the theme of integrating climate change vulnerability into forest practices from a previous meeting. Terra offered to be a point person for inter-caucus work on a presentation on how to incorporate climate change into science context in which Policy works at the August meeting or later. Several caucuses offered to connect a caucus member with Terra to collaborate on that presentation.

Policy reviewed the March 1 and April 5 draft meeting summaries with suggested edits from Policy members. It was noted that any caucus can enter additional comments into the record that are not part of the meeting summary.

Decision:

The March meeting summary was approved with edits. The federal caucus was absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.

The April meeting summary was approved with edits. The federal caucus was absent; all other caucuses voted thumbs up.

Update from CMER Co-Chairs on April CMER Meeting- Doug Hooks, CMER Co-Chair, presented the CMER meeting summary. The Wetland Management Zone Effectiveness study is on hold. The Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness Project (ENREP) is moving towards implementation. The Buffer Shade Study and the Unstable Slopes Criteria TWIG is at Independent Scientific Peer Review (ISPR). There are no updates from ISAG or LWAG at this time.

Update on Water Typing Rule Progress- Marc Engel, Department of Natural Resources (DNR) informed Policy that the draft rule and guidance to implement the rule are underway. Stakeholder meetings have been completed and these two elements of the Water Typing Rule should be done by June 2018. DNR is also at work on a cost-benefit analysis of the draft rule, and convening a panel of economists on May 3, 2018 to determine what elements of the rule need to be

evaluated. DNR is collecting data to perform the analysis of the comparison of the effects of the new rule to the current rule. The Forest Practices Board approved three possible Potential Habitat Break (PHB) options to consider for the rule. DNR is behind schedule on data collection. DNR is carrying out the requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act (APA) and the State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) simultaneously.

Small Forest Land Owner (SFLO) Roads Survey Update- One of the Clean Water Act (CWA) milestones is for DNR to gain an understanding of the status of roads belonging to SFLOs, and what progress has been made to bring those roads up to the standards of the Forests and Fish Report (FFR). Under FFR, SFLOs must make Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plans (RMAPs). The Washington legislature passed a RMAP reform in 2003 so that SFLOs make a checklist RMAP when they harvest timber. Washington Farm Forestry Association (WFFA), Ecology and DNR have put together voluntary surveys for landowners. The surveys will be distributed as described in the April Policy meeting summary. DNR is also close to completing the voluntary field survey protocol. DNR will submit the survey to Ecology to fulfill the CWA milestone. DNR is hoping for a 10% response rate, with enough responses for statistically valid sampling. DNR will do targeted geographic recruitment if needed.

Deep-Seated Landslides (DSL) Strategy Presentation- Angela Johnson, DNR, reminded Policy that UPSAG has been working on this strategy for several months. Michael Maudlin, UPSAG co-chair, presented on the development of the strategy and the projects that make up the strategy (see attached presentation).

While landslide classification has been done for shallow rapid landslides, it has not been attempted for DSLs. The DSL Strategy will include the research to learn if DSLs can indeed be classified.

The preferred option for the budget includes 1 FTE at \$125,000. This amount is split between all the projects. The budget includes \$75,000 for additional contracting needs. UPSAG believes the FTE is needed, but that it is not in their purview to say if a CMER scientist is designated to this work full-time, or if someone new is hired. Maudlin did note that a simple way to fill the personnel needs would be to fill the empty geologist position at NWIFC. The responsibility for guiding the strategy and making adjustments as needed could fall to UPSAG or a project manager or team.

Master Project Schedule and Budget- The Chairs reminded Policy that they agreed on the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 budget at their last meeting. Policy's next decision is to plan the FY 2020-2021 budget at the May and June meetings, reach agreement in July and meet the July mailing date for the August Board meeting. The Chairs also reminded Policy of the additional points that Policy had agreed to discuss at the April meeting. While the Chairs had originally put some points on the agenda to structure the conversation, they suggested to Policy that the group set those aside and start with budget thoughts from Hans Berge, and then move to input from all caucuses.

Hans Berge noted that the Board meeting version of the 2019 budget was formatted without the out years and the "green box" because Policy had not come to consensus on those sections. The Board does have the decision space to shift priorities and individual caucuses are welcome to speak to the Board to inform them about Policy discussions. The AMP will not present informal Policy agreements to the Board as consensus. Some caucuses suggested that Policy should consider how to convey the implications of a consensus budget for out years to the Board while being clear that those out years do not yet have consensus.

Themes of Policy's conversation around the budget included:

PHB Validation:

- The study costs will be refined to the least expensive alternative.
- The study design is in review, and comments will be reconciled before the August Policy meeting.
- The PHB validation study is a large contributor to the budget imbalance.
- Policy may wish to consider how to communicate to the Board the financial impacts of the study and other Board-directed projects.

Extended Monitoring:

- Some caucuses would like a brief summary of the new information that has been learned from the temperature and amphibian extended monitoring, although it has not been captured in a findings report or reviewed by CMER. There were concerns about making long-term project decisions without this information.
- Some caucuses felt that extended monitoring supports adaptive decision-making.
- Some caucuses felt that extended monitoring is important, but should not be funded out of the AMP's budget.
- Some caucuses expressed concern about the total cost of the extended monitoring projects and the implications for the out year budgets.

CWA Projects:

- CWA Projects are the highest priority for some caucuses.
- Caucuses discussed the relative prioritization of CWA projects by Policy and the Board.

Budget Process:

- Caucuses agreed that “owning each other’s issues” remains a core value.
- If Policy does not have consensus on the budget, the budget could go to dispute resolution, and/or the Co-Chairs could report to the Board that Policy is not in consensus on parts or all of the budget, and why. Caucus representatives could then follow up with the Board individually. However, the budget deadline of August is based on the time that it takes to prepare the AMP budget for the legislature, which makes the dispute resolution process inadvisable.
- One option would be to set aside any decision on projects that do not need funding in the next biennium.
- Hans reminded the group that projects removed from the MPS could be added back on through a CMER request in the future.
- It was suggested that caucus representatives with strong feelings about particular projects should continue to share those with the group.
- Policy will continue to address the topics added to the 2019 budget approved in April.
- A performance and financial audit of the AMP by the State Auditor’s Office would be a prerequisite to asking the legislature for more funds.

Legislative outreach:

- Some caucuses recommended re-engaging a subcommittee to work with committee chairs in the legislature, others disagreed.
- One potential option for Policy is to include unfunded priority items in the budget so that the legislature understands what additional funds could buy.

Budget amounts:

- Several caucuses agreed that part of the budget imbalance at this time is due to Policy’s selection of more expensive alternatives for projects at a time when the budget forecast did not include the PHB Validation Study.

- Caucuses discussed the continued need to look for opportunities to minimize the cost of MPS projects on an ongoing basis, not just during budget decisions.
- Some caucuses expressed concern that a budget that was fully committed for the next several biennia would not allow the AMP and Policy caucuses to respond resiliently to emerging concerns, or to pursue next steps when one study ends.
- Participation funds could be addressed by a subcommittee.
- The AMP will continue to talk to universities about leveraging funding.
- Some caucuses cautioned that an expensive project may still be worth doing, or that funding cuts may make some projects less useful.
- Some large projects need commitment past the next biennium to be worthwhile.

Forest Practices Board May Meeting- Marc Engel reviewed the preparations for the May Board meeting. The Board may make a decision on PHB options at their November meeting. If they do not make a decision, DNR will try to finish the rule package with all PHB options by May. The Board will also hear updates on the FY 19 budget, the subcommittee for AMP efficiency, the northern spotted owl implementation team voluntary strategy and the western grey squirrel annual report.

Attachment 1 – Participants by Caucus at 5/3 Meeting*

Conservation Caucus

Mary Scurlock, M. Scurlock & Associates

*Alec Brown

County Caucus

Kendra Smith, Skagit County

*Scott Swanson, WSAC, Chair

Industrial Timber Landowner Caucus

Doug Hooks, WFPA

*Karen Terwilleger, WFPA, Chair

Small Forest Landowner Caucus

*Steve Barnowe-Meyer, WFFA

*Ken Miller, WFFA

State Caucus – DNR

*Marc Engel, DNR

Joe Shramek, DNR

State Caucus – Ecology & WDFW

*Rich Doenges, Ecology

Mark Hicks, Ecology

Don Nauer, WDFW

*Terra Rentz, WDFW

Chris Conklin, WDFW

Tribal Caucus – Westside

*Jim Peters, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission

Ash Roorbach, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission

Curt Veldhuisen, Skagit River System Cooperative

Tribal Caucus – Eastside

*Ray Entz, Kalispel/UCUT

*caucus representative

Others

Hans Berge, Adaptive Management Program Administrator

Angela Johnson, Adaptive Management Program (DNR)

Michael Maudlin, UPSAG Co-Chair

Mark Mobbs, CMER Tribal Member

Connie Lewis, Meridian Institute

Rachel Aronson, Triangle Associates

