

Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee  
November 13, 2014 Meeting Summary

Decisions and Actions from Meeting

Decision	Notes
1. Accepted October 2 and 10, 2014 meeting summaries with edits.	
2. Further discuss data analysis needs from the BTO final report, through a subgroup.	
3. Agreed that the work RSAG has been doing to prepare information on extensive monitoring is going in the right direction.	RSAG will likely bring the draft matrix of options to Policy at the January 2015 meeting.
4. Agreed to put dates on the calendar for Type F electrofishing workshop and off-channel habitat field trips.	Dates can be chosen at the December 2014 meeting.

Action	Assignment
1. Send Marc Ratcliff your caucus representative for Board Manual Section 16 development and stakeholder process (if participating).	Each caucus lead
2. Confirm that every caucus has a copy of DNR's budget request and AMP funding package.	Chris Hanlon-Meyer
3. Compile comments from CMER and Policy on the Lean process, report back in December.	Amy Kurtenbach
4. Convene a small group to discuss next steps for BTO (Terry Jackson, Marc Engel, Marc Gauthier, Karen Terwilleger, Dick Miller, EPA, & Mary Scurlock).	Stephen Bernath
5. Write a memo to Policy on how DNR anticipates completing the unstable slopes recommendations.	Chris Hanlon-Meyer
6. Coordinate how to provide information from electrofishing field practitioners at the electrofishing workshop.	Karen Terwilleger, Chris Mendoza, Smith Root, Tribes, and state caucuses
7. Confirm with WDFW's scientific collection permits expert that s/he is ready to present at the electrofishing workshop, and dates that would work.	Terry Jackson
8. Meet to discuss Type N issue, where we left off.	State, industrial landowner, and conservation caucuses
9. Come to December meeting with new date for when realistically Policy could discuss Fish Passage Effectiveness Monitoring.	Terry Jackson

**Welcome and Introductions** – Stephen Bernath, Co-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.

### *October Meeting Summaries*

Policy reviewed the October 2, 2014 draft meeting summary. Policy discussed how much anti-degradation can increase water temperature, which pertained to a section of that meeting summary. It was clarified that the 2.8°C increase can happen as long as the anti-degradation test is met, which is triggered by an increase of 0.3°C, and so long as the threshold criteria (e.g. 9, 12, 13,16, 17.5C depending on the assigned aquatic life uses to the specific water body) would not be exceeded. Additionally, in order to allowing warming in excess of the 0.3C antidegradation trigger, it must be demonstrated that that warming is in the overall public interest. With a few edits to the meeting summary, Policy accepted that version as final.

Policy also reviewed the October 10, 2014 draft meeting summary, which was from a special Policy meeting on unstable slopes. With a few edits, Policy accepted that version as final.

### *AMPA Update*

The new Adaptive Management Program Administrator (AMPA) is Hans Berge from King County, WA. He is the County's senior ecologist and has been working on fish habitat restoration and monitoring fish habitat in streams and lakes around the County. He has experience in and around streams, running research teams, writing reports, and communicating those results to a wide variety of municipalities in King County. He also has experience in budgeting. He does not have direct experience in forest practices and the rules, but is eager to learn. DNR is still negotiating with him on his start date, and is making sure he has the relevant documents now to start reviewing as background information.

**Debrief Forest Practices Board Meeting** – Marc Engel updated Policy on the relevant decisions and discussions by the Forest Practices Board (Board) the day before:

- Board Manual Section 16 was adopted as an interim manual, with the expectation that Phase 2 (dealing with run-out and delivery) and any additional editing to the manual, will be done by next August's Board meeting.
  - DNR will soon implement the stakeholder process to begin Phase 2 of the manual revisions, with the first meeting likely in December. This is a very technical manual and DNR prefers to have geologists or field foresters from caucuses if possible. Every Policy caucus has the opportunity to have a representative in this process, so if a caucus is interested in participating they should send their representative's information to Marc Ratcliff, who will be convening the stakeholder process.
  - The stakeholder process will be modeled after the work to create the FPHP Board Manual, which took ten months with two meetings a month. For this process, there is a large amount of work to do so the group will be moving quickly.
  - Notes from every meeting will be in the form of the updated draft Manual, which will be sent out for caucuses to review. Every person attending the meetings is expected to communicate with their caucus between meetings.
  - This process will also rely on the capacity of DNR staff to do this work in addition to other work. It was also noted that the workload for some people doing both this stakeholder process and the regular Policy meetings will increase dramatically. But since DNR encourages technical geologists/field foresters to be a part of the stakeholder process, it could help reduce the burden on any one person.

- Policy discussed the nature of these stakeholder processes, and whether or not the special stakeholder meetings qualify as Policy Committee input. It was agreed that it is not input from the Policy Committee, but input from the stakeholders. DNR will make sure to check in with the full Policy Committee as the stakeholder group makes progress.
- The Board accepted Policy's recommendations on unstable slopes. Now the only piece that remains is for Policy to complete the recommendations that are outlined to be Policy's work. This was addressed later in the meeting.
- Unstable Slopes Rule
  - The Board enacted CR-102 for the draft rule. It will now go into the State Register which will begin a formal public comment period. DNR will respond to every comment received in the CR-102 process (not from the CR-101 process). There will be a public meeting and a stakeholder meeting on the draft rule, likely in January.
  - DNR will also do a cost-benefit analysis during the CR-102 process. This will be presented as final when the rule language will be presented as final. DNR will also accept comments on the cost-benefit analysis during the public comment period.
  - DNR will also do a small business EIS (SBEIS), which will be included in the cost-benefit analysis.
- Board's 2015 Workplan
  - The Board outlined when Policy should come back with more information on Type F and Type N. Policy discussed this further, later in the meeting.
  - The Board suggested dates in their workplan, now it is up to Policy to either confirm or change those dates based on what Policy perceives is a reasonable timeline.
- Adaptive Management Program (AMP) Budget
  - One of the main budget packages in this next legislative session concerns how to finance the AMP.
  - DNR put in a general state request for the AMP; DNR will make sure every caucus has a copy or link to that request.
  - Right now the Governor is putting his budget together, so now is a good time to advocate for the AMP budget so that it remains in the Governor's budget. Some caucuses heard from the Chair of the House Appropriations Committee that if the AMP budget is included in the Governor's budget, he will support it in the House.
  - There is a delicate balance between DNR needing to produce at 15% less budget while also trying to maintain funding levels outlined in the settlement agreement.
  - A caucus suggested that Policy consider a Lobby Day, when TFW caucuses go together to the legislature to talk to legislators about the AMP's importance.
  - All caucuses were encouraged to talk with other caucuses about strategy.

**LEAN Process** – Stephen Bernath reminded Policy of the history of the LEAN process in the AMP. About three years ago when there was a fund balance, caucuses considered how to use that money so they agreed to hire a consultant trained in the LEAN process, and started with CMER as a pilot. This is how the TWIG process was started so a smaller group could work on study designs without using the entire SAG to do that work.

Amy Kurtenbach is going through a certification course in LEAN. Once she has achieved that certification, she can administer LEAN and teach it to others. LEAN focuses on how to do more with less, so this could also be something that Policy mentions to legislators during the AMP funding discussions. The focus of the initial LEAN pilot process was how to get study designs, faster. There are now four TWIGs in various stages along the process. Part of LEAN is a continuous improvement, so the AMP can make course-corrections after this check-in through Amy's work. Amy's certificate course ends in December, and Aaron Everett agreed to be her project sponsor. She will provide recommendations to Aaron, which will likely be shared with CMER and Policy.

Amy led two exercises for Policy, duplicate of exercises she led for CMER. She asked everyone to note whether improving capacity or quality or speed is most important to achieving goals, and also asked for qualitative feedback about the challenges and opportunities that the new TWIG process has created. Some highlights from these anonymous comments:

- Speed was emphasized as more important by CMER than by Policy. It was also noted that capacity and quality affect speed.
- Discussion about the interaction between CMER and Policy, and who should have oversight or autonomy in the process.
- TWIGs are often a positive way to attract external scientists to the AMP. It was also noted that TWIGs increase communication between CMER and Policy.

Amy will take the feedback from Policy and combine it with the feedback from CMER, and report back to Policy at a future meeting.

**RMZ-Resample (Birds) Study** – Scott Pearson presented to Policy about the RMZ-Resample (Birds) Study. This was not a decision item at this meeting but it is likely that Policy will review and work to approve the 6 Questions on this study at a meeting in the near future. The discussion included:

- The desire for the re-sample was to consider long-term effects of buffers on birds.
- The study 10 years post-harvest had the same BACI study design as the original study design.
- A new part of the re-sample was to analyze the buffers as a continuous variable.
- Some results:
  - Species richness increased on both treatments.
  - There was no strong evidence of local extinction.
  - Species turnover was greater on the treatments.
  - Total bird abundance did not differ between treatments and controls.
  - No change in the abundance of riparian-associated species on treatments.
  - Species richness and abundance decreased on some very narrow buffers but not on others.
  - There was some evidence for the influence of buffer width on abundance and richness.
- One caution is that the study did not show if the birds within narrow buffers are successfully reproducing.

Policy thanked Scott and AJ for presenting their information, and Policy is ready to review the 6 Questions once it goes through CMER.

**Bull Trout Overlay Final Report** – Policy had a special meeting on November 3<sup>rd</sup> to further discuss this topic. That was not an official Policy meeting, however, so a decision needs to be made about next steps for the Bull Trout Overlay (BTO) final report.

- Policy discussed the options: formal action means that the Board is requested to take formal action. Policy could also agree to take action, but it is only at Policy's level that action is taken. Or Policy could agree to take no action on the final report.
- Since there are some uncertainties about the information from the final report, several caucuses were interested in having Policy take action to better understand those uncertainties so Policy can make better decisions later on. In the past, Policy has agreed to take action on a study but the action is only relevant to Policy, not requesting the Board to do anything.
- One caucus, while supportive of Policy doing more analysis if needed, expressed concern that this work could compete with other priorities on Policy's workload.

**Decision:** Policy agreed to take action to clarify and/or validate the information pertaining to the BTO Final Report from CMER. This includes considering the four actions proposed by the state caucuses and any other information or actions from other caucuses. Figuring out the action plan for next steps should be within 60 days (January 13, 2015). Six caucuses voted yes (state caucuses, large and small landowners, federal agencies, and counties). Three caucuses voted sideways (eastside and westside tribal caucuses, conservation caucus). The eastside tribal caucus agreed to proceed cautiously: their caveat is that if there is no progress by Policy to figure out how to answer these additional questions within 60 days (the timeline as laid out in the Board Manual), they may change their vote to not supporting any further action by Policy.

A subgroup of interested caucus representatives will get together within the 60 days to discuss how to move forward with analyzing the data from the study to answer additional questions. This includes Terry Jackson, Marc Engel, Marc Gauthier, Karen Terwilleger, Dick Miller, the federal caucus (representative to be determined), and Mary Scurlock.

**Extensive Monitoring** – Joe Murray, Chair of the Riparian Scientific Advisory Group (RSAG), updated Policy about the work RSAG has been doing to build a matrix of various outputs of remote sensing tools and the relative costs. Discussion points included:

- RSAG has been working independently of CMER so far, and has included a professor from the University of Washington.
- The group is working on identifying a range of options to show Policy, which they estimate would be at the January Policy meeting. They would be looking for Policy to give direction on how to plan the pilot study.
- The question for Policy at this meeting is whether or not they feel RSAG is still going in the right direction, given the guidance from Policy after the August 2014 meeting. After some discussion, Policy agreed that RSAG seems on the right path moving forward and they await RSAG's report back in January.

**Decision:** RSAG will continue to work on drafting the matrix of options, and will provide this back to Policy, likely at the January 2015 meeting. If there is a way to inform CMER of their work before it goes to Policy, RSAG will look for that opportunity as well.

**Next Steps to Address Policy's Priority Topics** – Policy considered the information from the Board's 2015 workplan, where Policy left off on Type F, and other priority topics to consider how to move forward. The discussion included:

- Following up on the unstable slopes recommendations, Policy is responsible for:
  - Looking at Board Manual Section 16, once the run-out issue has been addressed. That will come back to Policy in July or August 2015, so Policy can consider then whether they have adequately finished the FPA process review. It was noted that checking in about this topic earlier than July might be a good idea.
  - Prioritizing mapping needs will also need to be done at some point in the future.
  - UPSAG will start meeting again on November 19. Once that happens, Policy/CMER/UPSAG can consider how to spend the \$50,000 in this fiscal year for scoping the glacial deep-seated landslides program.
- Type F – discussion on where Policy left off on this issue in March 2014:
  - Electrofishing workshop
    - Various caucuses were preparing information/speakers for the electrofishing workshop. Some caucuses are ready to go now, and a few need some time to get that information ready to go and coordinate.
    - Karen Terwilleger, Chris Mendoza, Smith Root, tribal caucuses, and state caucuses will coordinate to figure out how to present information from field practitioners about electrofishing.
    - Policy will find a date for this electrofishing workshop, at the December meeting.
  - Field trips
    - Westside field trip is ready whenever Policy would like to do the tour. At the December meeting, DNR will suggest the optimal time to do this tour, and Policy can decide the date.
    - Eastside field trip will need to be scheduled, which could be combined with an eastside Policy meeting. This will be determined at the December meeting.
    - The video of eastside off-channel habitat, provided by the eastside tribal caucus, is available to view at any time.
  - A caucus asked if there is an interim way to reduce risk to fish while Policy is determining how to permanently reduce the risk. It was noted that as Policy continues to move forward, if there are interim or other changes to make along the road, Policy can consider those.
  - Another caucus asked if there is a way to talk about how to address other Type F issues beyond those that are in the Board's motions. This could be further discussed at the December meeting.
- Type N
  - The Board expects a recommendation from Policy by August 2015.
  - The state caucuses will meet with the large landowner and conservation caucuses to figure out how to move forward, given where the discussion last left off.
- Fish Passage Effectiveness Monitoring
  - Terry Jackson was asked to come to the December meeting with a date in mind for when Policy could reasonably re-consider this issue. She will talk with Steve Bernath further to

clarify what is expected.

- Other issues
  - In addition to all these priority issues, Policy recognized that they will also need to focus on the AMP budget process during the legislative session.
  - There may be a need for Policy to consider the HPA rules adopted by the Fish & Wildlife Commission.
  - The small landowners may bring their templates to Policy in 2015.
  - Following up on the BTO final report may also take some of Policy's time, depending upon how much time is needed to devote to further data analysis.

#### **Next Steps**

- All caucuses are encouraged to bring their legislative proposals relevant to TFW that they will be supporting in the legislative session. They are also encouraged to bring legislative liaisons to the December meeting.
- Several caucuses will be working in between meetings to sign onto the AMP funding legislation.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30pm.

Attachment 1 – Participants by Caucus at 11/13/14 Meeting

**Conservation Caucus**

Chris Mendoza  
\*Mary Scurlock

**County Caucus**

Laura Merrill, WSAC  
\*Kendra Smith, Skagit County

**Federal Caucus**

\*Marty Acker, USFWS

**Landowner Caucus – Industrial (large)**

Kevin Godbout, Weyerhaeuser  
Doug Hooks, WFPA  
\*Karen Terwilleger, WFPA

**Landowner Caucus – Non-industrial (small)**

\*Dick Miller, WFFA

\*Caucus leads

**Others**

Joe Murray, Merrill & Ring (phone)  
Scott Pearson, WDFW  
AJ Kroll, Weyerhaeuser  
Claire Turpel, Triangle Associates

**State Caucus – DNR**

Marc Engel, DNR  
\*Chris Hanlon-Meyer, DNR  
Marc Ratcliff, DNR

**State Caucus – Ecology & WDFW**

\*Stephen Bernath, Ecology (Co-Chair)  
Mark Hicks, Ecology  
\*Terry Jackson, WDFW

**Tribal Caucus – Eastside**

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

**Tribal Caucus – Westside**

Nancy Sturhan, NWIFC  
\*Curt Veldhuisen, SRSC



Attachment 2 – Ongoing Priorities Checklist

Priority	Assignment	Status & Notes
<b>Type N</b>	Type N policy subgroup	On hold until other workload lessens.
<b>Type F</b>	Policy	Electrofishing workshop and off-channel habitat field trips will be scheduled at the December Policy meeting.
<b>Unstable Slopes</b>	Policy	Board accepted Policy's recommendations; now DNR/UPSAG are working on implementing those recommendations.
<b>Bull Trout Overlay</b>	Policy	To be further discussed by a subgroup of Policy members.
<b>Adaptive Mgmt Program Reform Rule Changes</b>		Accepted by Board at August meeting, CR-103 process initiated. Implemented initial changes at November 2013 meeting, will tweak changes for subsequent meetings.
<b>Ongoing CMER reports reviewed by Policy</b>	Mark Hicks & 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, or Subgroup	Next Meeting Date	Notes
<b>TFW Policy Committee</b>	December 4, 2014	
<b>CMER</b>	November 25, 2014	
<b>Type N Policy Subgroup</b>	TBD	On hold due to workload constraints.
<b>Type F Subcommittee(s)</b>	TBD	Policy will put dates on the calendar at the December meeting.
<b>Forest Practices Board</b>	February 2015	