

2025-2027 BIENNIUM CMER WORK PLAN

Prepared by:
COOPERATIVE MONITORING, EVALUATION AND RESEARCH COMMITTEE
January 2025

Commented [AP1]: Per CMER 11/26/24, Add Schedule L-1 as an appendix to the CMER Workplan. Briefly address current effort to revise, maybe in Section 2? Theyrn best person to do this task?

Commented [AP2R1]: A related suggestion was made to, instead of writing out the rule group resource objectives and performance targets (as exists now, just link to the new appendix. I am not sure if we really want/need to do that at this time. Could be better for next update.



Comments or questions, contact:

Aimee McIntyre, CMER Co-Chair
(Aimee.Mcintyre@dfw.wa.gov)

Ash Roorbach, CMER Co-Chair
(aroorbach@nwifc.org)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2025-2027 Biennium Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER) Work Plan and associated budget have been approved by the Forest Practices Board (Board) based on recommendations from the Timber, Fish and Wildlife Policy Committee (Policy) and CMER. The CMER Work Plan presents an integrated strategy for conducting research and monitoring to provide scientific information to support the Forest Practices Adaptive Management Program (AMP). The overarching purpose of the Work Plan is to inform CMER participants, Policy constituents, the Board and interested members of the public about CMER research and monitoring activities. Revisions are completed biennially to update the research findings of CMER and the changes in policy priorities and funding.

One hundred and seventeen (117) projects are included in the Work Plan. Since the AMP began in 2001, 569 projects have been completed, 2046 projects are active, and 443 projects under consideration. The projects cover a range of topics related to the forest practices rules and are at various stages of development or completion. Projects originated as priority research topics in Schedule L-1 of the Forests and Fish Report (April 1999), which was later revised and adopted by the Board in February 2001 and incorporated into the Washington Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan (FP HCP).

The Work Plan is organized hierarchically into rule groups, programs, and projects. Section 2.0 describes the CMER research and monitoring strategy, and the approaches used to address critical questions relevant to the AMP. Section 3.0 describes CMER and Policy procedures for prioritization at the program and project level, and Section 4.0 presents the Board approved 2025-2027 biennium projects and budget allocations. Proposed budget allocations for 2025-2027 projects and activities can be found in Table 4. Section 5.0 describes the CMER research and monitoring program, with program and project descriptions organized by rule group. Appendix A contains a table titled “CMER Projects, Objectives, and Targets,” which links specific resource objectives and key riparian functions (e.g., in-stream temperature, large woody debris, litter, sediment) to CMER projects, organized by programs within rule groups.

For the 2025-2027 biennium, there are 23 projects in the Stream Typing Rule Group, 6 projects in the Type N Riparian Prescriptions Rule Group, 3 in the Type F Prescriptions Rule Group, 32 in the Unstable Slopes Rule Group, 1 in the Roads Rule Group, and 2 in the Wetlands Protection Rule Group. Of the 1620 active projects, 163 are ongoing and 43 are being scoped. Specific project descriptions can be found on the pages listed below; however, reading the entire subsection describing a rule group is recommended to both better understand the programs and projects in that rule group and comprehend how they are integrated to answer critical research and monitoring questions.

Commented [JM3]: A discussion of extensive monitoring should be included in this section. It applies to all rule groups.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Commented [TH4]: Update at end of editing

- 1.0 INTRODUCTION 1
- 2.0 CMER RESEARCH AND MONITORING STRATEGY 3
 - 2.1 FOREST PRACTICES RULE GROUPS..... 3
 - 2.2 RESEARCH AND MONITORING PROGRAMS..... 3
- 3.0 PRIORITIZATION OF CMER PROJECTS..... 6
 - 3.1 CMER PRIORITIZATION PROCESS 6
 - 3.2 POLICY PRIORITIZATION..... 8
- 4.0 2023-2025 BIENNIUM CMER WORK PLAN PROJECTS AND BUDGETS 9
- 5.0 RULE GROUP DESCRIPTIONS AND MONITORING STRATEGIES 11
 - 5.1 STREAM TYPING RULE GROUP 12
 - 5.1.1 Rule Overview and Intent 12
 - 5.1.2 Rule Group Resource Objectives and Performance Targets 12
 - 5.1.3 Rule Group Strategy..... 13
 - 5.1.4 Stream Typing Program (Rule Tool) 15
 - 5.1.4.1 Program Strategy 15
 - 5.1.4.2 Last Fish/Habitat Prediction Model Development Project 16
 - 5.1.4.3 Annual/Seasonal Variability Project..... 16
 - 5.1.4.4 Last Fish/Habitat Prediction Model Field Performance Project..... 18
 - 5.1.4.5 Default Physical Criteria Assessment Project..... 18
 - 5.1.4.6 Fish/Habitat Detection Using Environmental DNA (eDNA)..... 19
 - 5.1.4.7 Evaluation of physical features that define fish habitat in forested landscapes across Washington State (PHB)..... 20
 - 5.1.5 Stream Typing Program (Extensive Status and Trends Monitoring) 20
 - 5.1.5.1 Program Strategy 20
 - 5.1.5.2 Recoverable/Restorable Fish Habitat Project 21
 - 5.2 TYPE N RIPARIAN PRESCRIPTIONS RULE GROUP 22
 - 5.2.1 Rule Overview and Intent 22
 - 5.2.2 Rule Group Resource Objectives and Performance Targets 23
 - 5.2.3 Rule Group Strategy..... 23
 - 5.2.4 Type N Delineation Program (Rule Tool) 25
 - 5.2.4.1 Program Strategy 25
 - 5.2.4.2 Perennial Initiation Point Survey: Pilot Study 25
 - 5.2.5 Sensitive Site Program (Rule Tool) 26
 - 5.2.5.1 Program Strategy 26
 - 5.2.5.2 SAA Sensitive Sites Identification Methods Project 26
 - 5.2.5.3 SAA Sensitive Sites Characterization Project 26
 - 5.2.5.4 Sensitive Sites and Amphibians Project 27
 - 5.2.6 Type N Riparian Effectiveness Program 28

5.2.6.1	Program Strategy (Westside).....	28
5.2.6.2	Westside Type N Buffer Characteristics, Integrity, and Function (BCIF) Project 29	
5.2.6.3	Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project in Hard Rock Lithologies (Hard Rock Project)	30
5.2.6.4	Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project in Soft Rock Lithologies (Soft Rock Project)	31
5.2.6.5	Slash in Type N Streams Project.....	32
5.2.6.6	Windthrow Frequency, Distribution, and Effects Project	32
5.2.6.7	Program Strategy (Eastside).....	33
5.2.6.8	Eastside Type N Buffer Characteristics, Integrity, and Function (BCIF) Project 34	
5.2.6.9	Eastside Type N Forest Hydrology Project (FHS).....	34
5.2.6.10	Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness Project (ENREP)	34
5.2.6.11	Eastside Ns Effectiveness Project.....	35
5.2.6.12	Literature Review and Synthesis Related to the Salvage of Fire Damaged Timber	36
5.2.7	Type N Amphibian Response Program (Effectiveness)	37
5.2.7.1	Program Strategy	37
5.2.7.2	SAA Detection/Relative Abundance Methodology Project	40
5.2.7.3	Tailed Frog Literature Review Project	40
5.2.7.4	Tailed Frog Meta-Analysis Project.....	40
5.2.7.5	Tailed Frog and Parent Geology Project	41
5.2.7.6	Dunn’s Salamander Project.....	41
5.2.7.7	Buffer Integrity – Shade Effectiveness (Amphibians) Project	41
5.2.7.8	Amphibian Recovery Project.....	42
5.2.7.9	Water Temperature and Amphibian Use in Type Np Waters with Discontinuous Surface Flow Project (formerly Amphibians in Intermittent Streams Project).....	42
5.2.7.10	Van Dyke’s Salamander Project	43
5.2.7.11	Eastside Amphibian Evaluation Project	44
5.2.7.12	Coastal Tailed Frog Extensive Status Project	44
5.2.8	Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring Program	45
5.2.8.1	Program Strategy	45
5.2.8.2	Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring – Temperature, Type F/N Westside	46
5.2.8.3	Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring – Temperature, Type F/N Eastside	46
5.2.8.4	Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring – Vegetation, Type F/N Westside and Eastside Projects	47
5.2.8.5	Riparian Characteristics and Shade Response Study	48
5.2.8.6	Wood Recruitment Volume and Source Distances from Riparian Buffers Project.....	48
5.3	TYPE F RIPARIAN PRESCRIPTIONS RULE GROUP	50

- 5.3.1 Rule Overview and Intent 50
- 5.3.2 Rule Group Resource Objectives and Performance Targets 52
- 5.3.3 Rule Group Strategy 54
- 5.3.4 DFC Validation Program (Rule Tool)..... 57
 - 5.3.4.1 Program Strategy 57
 - 5.3.4.2 DFC Target Validation Project 58
 - 5.3.4.3 DFC Plot Width Standardization Project 58
 - 5.3.4.4 FPA Desktop Analysis Project..... 59
 - 5.3.4.5 DFC Site Class Map Validation Project 59
 - 5.3.4.6 DFC Trajectory Model Validation Project..... 59
 - 5.3.4.7 DFC Aquatic Habitat Project..... 60
 - 5.3.4.8 Pathways of Riparian Stand Development to Maturity Project..... 60
 - 5.3.4.9 Red Alder Growth and Yield Model Project 60
- 5.3.5 Eastside Type F Riparian Rule Tool Program..... 61
 - 5.3.5.1 Program Strategy 61
 - 5.3.5.2 Eastside Disturbance Regime Literature Review Project 62
 - 5.3.5.3 Eastside LWD Literature Review Project..... 62
 - 5.3.5.4 Eastside Temperature Nomograph Project (Rule Tool) 63
 - 5.3.5.5 Eastern Washington Riparian Assessment Project (EWRAP) 63
 - 5.3.5.6 Eastside Modeling Evaluation Project (EMEP)..... 64
 - 5.3.5.7 Eastside Timber Habitat Evaluation Project (ETHEP) (Rule Tool)..... 64
 - 5.3.5.8 Eastside Type F Channel Wood Characterization Study (ESICCS) 65
 - 5.3.5.9 Fire Effects on Eastside RMZ's (FEER) 65
- 5.3.6 Bull Trout Habitat Identification Program (Rule Tool) 66
 - 5.3.6.1 Program Strategy 66
 - 5.3.6.2 Bull Trout Presence/Absence Protocols..... 67
 - 5.3.6.3 Bull Trout Habitat Prediction Models 67
 - 5.3.6.4 Yakima River Radiotelemetry..... 68
- 5.3.7 Westside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Program 68
 - 5.3.7.1 Program Strategy 68
 - 5.3.7.2 Westside Type F Riparian Prescription Effectiveness Monitoring Projects 70
 - 5.3.7.3 Westside Type F Experimental Buffer Treatment Project 72
 - 5.3.7.4 Type F Performance Target Validation Project 72
- 5.3.8 Eastside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Program..... 72
 - 5.3.8.1 Program Strategy 72
 - 5.3.8.2 Bull Trout Overlay Temperature (Eastside Riparian Shade/Temperature) Project 73
 - 5.3.8.3 Solar Radiation/Effective Shade Project 74
 - 5.3.8.4 Eastside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Monitoring Project (BTO add-on)..... 74
 - 5.3.8.5 Groundwater Conceptual Model Project..... 74
- 5.3.9 Hardwood Conversion Program (Effectiveness) 75
 - 5.3.9.1 Program Strategy 75
 - 5.3.9.2 Riparian Hardwood Conversion Project..... 76

5.3.9.3	Riparian Hardwood Conversion Project – Temperature Component	77
5.3.9.4	Annotated Bibliography: Riparian Hardwood Conversion	77
5.3.9.5	Ecology Water Temperature Modeling Project	78
5.3.10	Intensive Monitoring/Cumulative Effects Program	78
5.3.10.1	Program Strategy	78
5.4	CHANNEL MIGRATION ZONE RULE GROUP	79
5.4.1	Rule Overview and Intent	79
5.4.2	Rule Group Resource Objectives and Performance Targets	79
5.4.3	Rule Group Strategy	79
5.4.4	CMZ Delineation Program	80
5.4.4.1	Program Strategy	80
5.4.4.2	CMZ Screen and Aerial Photograph Catalog Project and CMZ Boundary Identification Criteria Project	80
5.4.4.3	Consistency and Accuracy of CMZ Boundary Delineations	80
5.4.5	CMZ Validation Program (Intensive)	81
5.4.5.1	Program Strategy	81
5.5	UNSTABLE SLOPES RULE GROUP	82
5.5.1	Rule Overview and Intent	82
5.5.2	Rule Group Resource Objectives and Performance Targets	82
5.5.3	Rule Group Strategy	83
5.5.4	Unstable Landform Identification Program	84
5.5.4.1	Program Strategy	84
5.5.4.2	Shallow Rapid Landslide Screen for GIS Project	85
5.5.4.3	Technical Guidelines for Geotechnical Reports Project	85
5.5.4.4	Regional Unstable Landforms Identification Project (RLIP)	85
5.5.4.5	Landform Hazard Classification System and Mapping Protocols Project	85
5.5.4.6	Landslide Hazard Zonation Project	86
5.5.5	Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring Program	86
5.5.5.1	Program Strategy	86
5.5.5.2	Unstable Slope Criteria Project: An Evaluation of Hillslopes Regulated under Washington Forest Practices Rules	87
5.5.5.3	Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring Project	88
5.5.5.4	Mass Wasting Landscape-Scale Extensive Monitoring Project	88
5.5.5.5	Mass Wasting Buffer Integrity and Windthrow Assessment Project	89
5.5.6	Mass Wasting Validation Program (Intensive)	89
5.5.6.1	Program Strategy	89
5.5.7	Deep-Seated Landslides Program	90
5.5.7.1	Program Strategy	90
5.5.7.2	Deep-Seated Landslide Research Strategy	90
5.5.7.3	Model Evapo-Transpiration in Deep-Seated Landslide Recharge Areas Project 92	
5.5.7.4	Literature Synthesis of the Effects of Forest Practices on Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides and Groundwater Recharge	92

5.5.7.5	Literature Synthesis of the Effects of Forest Practices on Non-Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides and Groundwater Recharge	93
5.5.7.6	Board Manual Revision Project	93
5.5.7.7	Glacial Deep-Seated Landslide Mapping Project	93
5.5.7.8	Deep-Seated Landslide Classification Project	94
5.5.7.9	GIS-Based Landslide Stability and Sensitivity Toolkit	94
5.5.7.10	Groundwater Recharge Modeling Project	95
5.5.7.11	Physical Modeling of Deep-Seated Landslides.....	95
5.5.7.12	Landslide Monitoring Project.....	95
5.5.7.13	Evapo-Transpiration Model Refinement Project	96
5.6	ROADS RULE GROUP	97
5.6.1	Rule Overview and Intent	97
5.6.2	Rule Group Resource Objectives and Performance Targets	98
5.6.3	Rule Group Strategy.....	98
5.6.4	Road Sub-Basin-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Program	101
5.6.4.1	Program Strategy	101
5.6.4.2	Road Sub-Basin-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project	101
5.6.4.3	Road Surface Erosion Model Update Project.....	102
5.6.4.4	Road Surface Erosion Model Validation/Refinement Project.....	102
5.6.5	Road Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Program	103
5.6.5.1	Program Strategy	103
5.6.5.2	Effectiveness of RMAP Fixes Project.....	103
5.6.5.3	Road Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project.....	104
5.6.6	Roads Validation Program and Cumulative Sediment Effects	104
5.6.6.1	Program Strategy	104
5.6.6.2	Intensive Watershed-Scale Monitoring to Assess Cumulative Effects.....	105
5.7	FISH PASSAGE RULE GROUP	106
5.7.1	Rule Overview and Intent	106
5.7.2	Rule Group Resource Objectives and Performance Targets	106
5.7.3	Rule Group Strategy.....	106
5.7.4	Fish Passage Effectiveness/Validation Monitoring Program.....	107
5.7.4.1	Program Strategy	107
5.7.5	Extensive Fish Passage Monitoring Program	109
5.7.5.1	Program Strategy	109
5.7.5.2	Extensive Fish Passage Trend Monitoring Project	109
5.8	PESTICIDES RULE GROUP	111
5.8.1	Rule Overview and Intent	111
5.8.2	Rule Group Resource Objectives and Performance Targets	111
5.8.3	Rule Group Strategy.....	111
5.8.4	Forest Chemicals Program (Effectiveness and Validation).....	112
5.8.4.1	Program Strategy	112
5.9	WETLANDS PROTECTION RULE GROUP	113

5.9.1	Rule Overview and Intent	113
5.9.2	Rule Group Resource Objectives and Performance Targets	115
5.9.3	Rule Group Strategy	116
5.9.4	Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Program	120
5.9.4.1	Program Strategy	120
5.9.4.2	Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project	121
5.9.4.3	Forest Practices and Wetlands Systematic Literature Review	122
5.9.4.4	Forested Wetlands Literature Review and Workshop Project	123
5.9.4.5	Statewide Forested Wetlands Regeneration Pilot Project	123
5.9.5	Wetland Management Zone Effectiveness Monitoring Program	124
5.9.5.1	Program Strategy	124
5.9.5.2	Wetland Management Zone Effectiveness Monitoring Project	124
5.9.6	Forest Roads and Wetlands Program	125
5.9.6.1	Program Strategy	125
5.9.6.2	Roads Effects on Wetlands	126
5.9.6.3	Wetlands Mitigation Effectiveness Project	126
5.9.7	Wetlands Intensive Monitoring Program	127
5.9.7.1	Program Strategy	127
5.9.7.2	Wetlands Intensive Monitoring Project	128
5.9.8	Wetland Mapping Program	128
5.9.8.1	Program Strategy	128
5.9.8.2	Wetland Intrinsic Potential Tool (WIP)	129
5.9.9	Silvicultural Chemicals and Wetlands Program	129
5.9.9.1	Program Strategy	129
5.10	WILDLIFE RULE GROUP	130
5.10.1	Rule Overview and Intent	130
5.10.2	Rule Group Resource Objectives and Performance Targets	131
5.10.3	Rule Group Strategy	131
5.10.4	Wildlife Program	131
5.10.4.1	Program Strategy	132
5.10.4.2	RMZ Resample Project	132
5.10.5	Other Wildlife Programs/Projects	133
5.11	INTENSIVE WATERSHED-SCALE MONITORING TO ASSESS CUMULATIVE EFFECTS	134
5.11.1	Resource Objectives and Performance Targets	134

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	Relationships among projects in the Westside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Program	70
-----------	--	----

Commented [TH5]: Update at end of editing

LIST OF TABLES

Commented [TH6]: Update at end of editing

Table 1.	CMER Scientific Advisory Group Structure.....	1
Table 2.	Description of the Rule Groups Used as a Framework for the CMER Work Plan	3
Table 3.	Rankings for Effectiveness Monitoring and Extensive Status and Trends Monitoring Programs (completed December 19, 2002).	7
Table 4.	2023-2025 Biennium CMER Projects and Budget	9
Table 5.	Stream Typing Rule Group Critical Questions and Programs.....	13
Table 6.	Stream Typing Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects	15
Table 7.	Stream Typing Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects	20
Table 8.	Type N Riparian Prescriptions Rule Group Critical Questions and Programs	24
Table 9.	Type N Delineation Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects.....	25
Table 10.	Sensitive Site Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects	26
Table 11.	Type N Riparian Effectiveness Program – Westside: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects	28
Table 12.	Type N Riparian Effectiveness Program – Eastside: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects	33
Table 13.	Type N Amphibian Response Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects.....	38
Table 14.	Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects	45
Table 15.	Type F Riparian Prescriptions Rule Group Critical Questions and Programs	55
Table 16.	DFC Validation Program: Rule Group Critical Questions and Associated Research Projects ...	57
Table 17.	Eastside Type F Riparian Rule Tool Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects.....	61
Table 18.	Bull Trout Habitat Identification Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects.....	66
Table 19.	Westside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects	69
Table 20.	Eastside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects.....	73
Table 21.	Hardwood Conversion Program: Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects	75
Table 22.	CMZ Rule Group Critical Questions and Programs.....	79
Table 23.	CMZ Delineation Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects	80
Table 24.	CMZ Validation Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects	81
Table 25.	Unstable Slopes Rule Group Critical Questions and Programs	83
Table 26.	Unstable Landform Identification Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects.....	84

Table 27. Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects 87

Table 28. Mass Wasting Validation Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects 89

Table 29. Summary of Deep-Seated Landslide Research Strategy projects and status 91

Table 30. Deep-Seated Landslides Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects 92

Table 31. Roads Rule Group Critical Questions and Programs 99

Table 32. Road Sub-Basin-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects 101

Table 33. Road Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects 103

Table 34. Roads Validation Program and Cumulative Sediment Effects: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects 104

Table 35. Fish Passage Rule Group Critical Questions and Programs 107

Table 36. Fish Passage Effectiveness/Validation Monitoring Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects 108

Table 37. Extensive Fish Passage Monitoring Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects 109

Table 38. Pesticides Rule Group Critical Questions and Programs 112

Table 39. Wetlands Rule Group Critical Questions and Programs 119

Table 40. Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects 120

Table 41. Wetland Management Zone Effectiveness Monitoring Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects 124

Table 42. Forest Roads and Wetlands Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects 125

Table 43. Wetlands Intensive Monitoring Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects 127

Table 44. Wetland Mapping Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects 128

Table 45. Silvicultural Chemicals and Wetlands Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects 130

Table 46. Wildlife Rule Group Critical Questions and Programs 131

Table 47. Wildlife Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects
132

Table 48. Wildlife Rule Group Critical Questions and Associated Programs (Developed as Part of TFW)
133

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AMP	Adaptive Management Program
AMPA	Adaptive Management Program Administrator
BACI	Before After / Control Impact study
bapa	basal area per acre
BCIF	Westside Type N Buffer Characteristics, Integrity, and Function Project
BMP	Best Management Practice
Board	Forest Practices Board
BTO	Bull Trout Habitat Overlay
BTSAG	Bull Trout Scientific Advisory Group
CMER	Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee
CMZ	Channel Migration Zone
CWA	Clean Water Act
DEM	Digital Elevation Model
DFC	Desired Future Condition (riparian)
DNR	Department of Natural Resources
Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology (also WDOE)
eDNA	environmental DNA
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
ELZ	Equipment Limitation Zone
EMEP	Eastside Modeling Evaluation Project
ENREP	Eastside Type N Riparian Evaluation Project
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESA	Endangered Species Act – Federal law
ESICCS	Eastside Type F Channel Wood Characterization Study
ETHEP	Eastside Timber Habitat Evaluation Project
EW RAP	Eastern Washington Riparian Assessment Project
FEMAT	Forest Ecosystem Management Assessment Team
FFR	Forests & Fish Report
FHS	Eastside Type N Forest Hydrology Project
FPA	Forest Practices Application
FPARS	Forest Practices Application Review System (FPARS)
FP HCP	Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan
GIS	Geographic Information System
HCP	Habitat Conservation Plan
hgm	hydrogeomorphic
HPA	Hydraulics Permit Approval – WDFW Permits
ISAG	In-Stream Scientific Advisory Group
ISPR	Independent Scientific Peer Review
IWT	Initial Writing Team
LCBAPA	Mean live conifer basal area per acre
LHZ	Landslide Hazard Zone
LWAG	Landscape and Wildlife Scientific Advisory Group
LWD	Large Woody Debris – logs in streams-sometimes called LOD (Large Organic Debris)
MDT	Monitoring Design Team

2025-2027 Biennium CMER Work Plan

NCASI	National Council for Air and Stream Improvement (timber industry research group)
NWIFC	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
OSU	Oregon State University
PIP	Perennial Initiation Point (Survey)
Policy	Timber, Fish and Wildlife Policy Committee
QA/QC	Quality Assurance / Quality Control
RCW	Revised Code of Washington – Statute, Laws
RFQQ	Request for Qualifications and Quotations
RIL	Rule-Identified Landforms
RLIP	Regional Unstable Landforms Identification Project
RMAP(s)	Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plans
RMZ	Riparian Management Zone
RSAG	Riparian Scientific Advisory Group
SAA	Stream-Associated Amphibians
SAG	Scientific Advisory Group, a sub-group of CMER
SAGE	Scientific Advisory Group- Eastside
SEPA	State Environmental Policy Act
TFW PC	Timber/Fish/Wildlife Policy Committee
TFW	Timber, Fish and Wildlife
THT	Timber Habitat Types
tpa	trees per acre
TWIG	Technical Writing Implementation Group
UMA	Upland Management Area
UPSAG	Upslope Scientific Advisory Group
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
WAC	Washington Administrative Code – Rule
WARSEM	Washington State Road Surface Erosion Model
WAU	Watershed Administrative Unit
WDFW	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
WetSAG	Wetlands Scientific Advisory Group
WMZ	Wetland Management Zone

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Washington State Forest Practices Board (Board) adopted an adaptive management program (Washington State Forest Practices Rules, WAC 222-12-045) in concurrence with the 1999 Forests and Fish Report (FFR) legislation (RCW 76.09.370). This legislation, guided primarily by the Washington Forests and Fish Report, formed the basis for the federally approved Washington Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan (FP HCP) in 2006. The purpose of the Forest Practices Adaptive Management Program (AMP) is to:

“provide science-based recommendations and technical information to assist the Board in determining if and when it is necessary or advisable to adjust rules and guidance for aquatic resources to achieve resource goals and objectives.”

To provide the science needed to support adaptive management, the Board established the Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER). The Board appoints core CMER members and empowers CMER to implement research per guidelines established by the FFR and implemented under the FP HCP.

Currently, CMER is supported by six active scientific advisory groups (SAGs). One former SAG (the Bull Trout Scientific Advisory Group, or BTSAG) has been merged with another SAG (the Riparian Scientific Advisory Group [RSAG]). The SAGs consist of both core voting CMER members and additional scientific participants representing the various stakeholders of the forest practices rules. The purpose of the SAGs is to design and implement the research and monitoring prioritized by CMER. Each SAG focuses on specific aspects of the forest practices rules, according to their areas of scientific expertise. Table 1 provides a brief description of the SAGs.

Table 1. CMER Scientific Advisory Group Structure

Active Scientific Advisory Group	Acronym	Develops and Oversees Projects Related To:
In-Stream Scientific Advisory Group	ISAG	In-stream issues, including stream typing and fish passage.
Landscape-Wildlife Advisory Group	LWAG	Wildlife, including stream-associated amphibians
Riparian Scientific Advisory Group	RSAG	FP HCP riparian strategy
Scientific Advisory Group – Eastside	SAGE	Issues specific to eastside of the Cascade Mountains
Upland Processes Scientific Advisory Group	UPSAG	Roads, mass wasting, and channel processes
Wetlands Scientific Advisory Group	WetSAG	Wetland issues, including identification and protection
Inactive Scientific Advisory Group	Acronym	Develops and Oversees Projects Related To:
Bull Trout Scientific Advisory Group	BTSAG	Bull trout biology and the forest practices rules designed to maintain bull trout habitat. In 2008, this SAG was merged with RSAG.

In 2012, the Forest Practices Board directed CMER to conduct a pilot process to test if the application of a Lean approach would result in increasing the efficiency and reducing the time of developing the scoping and study design phases of CMER projects. The pilot process replaced the

role of the SAGs in study design with smaller Initial Writing Teams (IWTs) and Technical Writing and Implementation Groups (TWIGs). The premise was that smaller groups of scientists and technical experts along with fewer review steps would be more efficient in developing research study designs. The pilot program included five projects. By late 2018, four of the five projects had approved study designs; the Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness Project, the Roads Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project, Westside Type F Riparian Prescription Monitoring Project, and the Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project. The study design of the remaining project (Unstable Slopes Criteria) is currently in process. Following completion of scoping and study design, project implementation will transition back into CMER's process outlined in the PSM. The revised PSM incorporates many parts of the Lean process.

The goal of the CMER Work Plan is to present an integrated strategy for conducting research and monitoring that will provide credible scientific information to support the Forest Practices Adaptive Management Program. The purpose of the Work Plan is to inform CMER participants, TFW Policy Committee (Policy) constituents, the Board, and interested public about CMER activities. The plan is now revised each biennium in response to research findings of CMER or the scientific community, changing technology, changes in policy objectives, and funding. This version supersedes the Biennial 2023-2025 CMER Work Plan.

The remainder of the document describes the CMER research and monitoring program as well as CMER recommendations for the Work Plan. Section 2.0 describes the organization of the CMER research and monitoring strategy, and the approaches used to address research and monitoring questions relevant to Forest Practices Adaptive Management. Section 3.0 describes CMER procedures for prioritizing programs (topic areas) and projects. Section 4.0 presents the Board-approved CMER Work Plan, including project prioritization, scheduling, and budget allocations. Section 5.0 describes the CMER research and monitoring program, with program and project descriptions organized by rule group. Appendix A contains the table titled "CMER Projects, Objectives, and Targets," which links specific resource objectives and key riparian functions (e.g., in-stream temperature, large woody debris, litter, sediment) to CMER projects, organized by programs within rule groups.

2.0 CMER RESEARCH AND MONITORING STRATEGY

The CMER Work Plan consists of 117 projects (including multiple phases of a given project) covering a range of topics related to the forest practices rules. These projects are at various stages of development or completion. Since the AMP began in 2001, 596 projects have been completed, 2046 projects are ongoing, and 1344 under consideration. The Work Plan is organized hierarchically into rule groups, programs, and projects, as described below.

2.1 FOREST PRACTICES RULE GROUPS

At the highest level, the CMER Work Plan is organized by forest practices “rule groups.” A rule group is a set of forest practices rules relating either to a particular resource, such as wetlands or fish-bearing streams, or to a particular type of forest practice, such as road construction and maintenance. The ten rule groups are shown in Table 2. Although the rule group divisions are somewhat arbitrary, they provide a useful framework for developing a research and monitoring strategy.

Table 2. Description of the Rule Groups Used as a Framework for the CMER Work Plan

Rule Group	Description	Rule Context
Stream Typing	Prescriptions for identifying fish-bearing and non-fish-bearing streams	WAC 222-16
Type N Riparian Prescriptions	Prescriptions for identifying non-fish-bearing streams and management of adjacent riparian areas	WAC 222-30
Type F Riparian Prescriptions	Prescriptions for managing fish-bearing streams and adjacent riparian areas	WAC 222-30
Channel Migration Zone	Prescriptions for delineating channel migration zones	WAC 222-30
Unstable Slopes	Prescriptions for identifying and managing areas potentially susceptible to mass wasting/erosion processes	WAC 222-24, -30
Roads	Prescriptions for identifying and managing erosion and runoff from forest roads	WAC 222-24
Fish Passage	Prescriptions for identifying and preventing fish passage barriers	WAC 222-24
Pesticides	Prescriptions for application of forest chemicals	WAC 222-38
Wetlands Protection	Prescriptions for identifying and managing wetlands	WAC 222-30
Wildlife	Prescriptions for protecting wildlife	WAC 222-10, -30

2.2 RESEARCH AND MONITORING PROGRAMS

Critical research and monitoring questions are identified at the rule group level to address information gaps related to scientific uncertainty and resource risk associated with the rules. Once these research and monitoring questions are identified, programs are developed to address them. Programs consist of one or more related projects designed to strategically address a set of related scientific questions. The CMER Work Plan lists 34 programs containing multiple projects at various stages of development.

CMER research and monitoring programs utilize a variety of approaches to address critical questions at different spatial and temporal scales. The Work Plan incorporates an integrated research and monitoring approach as recommended by the Monitoring Design Team (MDT) Report (MDT 2002). This includes **effectiveness monitoring** to evaluate prescription effectiveness at the site or landscape scale; **extensive status and trends monitoring** to evaluate status and trends of resource condition indicators across FP HCP lands; and **intensive/validation monitoring** to identify causal relationships and document cumulative effects at the watershed scale. CMER also conducts **rule implementation tool projects** to develop, refine, or validate science-based management tools necessary for implementing the rule(s) (e.g., predictive models, protocols, etc.) or for establishing performance standards. These four approaches are summarized below:

Effectiveness Monitoring:

Effectiveness monitoring programs are designed to evaluate the performance of the prescriptions in achieving resource goals and objectives. Effectiveness monitoring differs from the other approaches in that it is directed at prescription effectiveness, primarily at the site scale.

Extensive Status and Trends Monitoring:

Extensive monitoring programs evaluate the current status of key watershed resources and habitat condition indicators across FP HCP lands, and document trends in these indicators over time as the forest practices prescriptions are applied across the landscape. Extensive monitoring provides a statewide, landscape-scale assessment of the effectiveness of forest practices rules to attain specific performance targets on FP HCP lands. Extensive monitoring is designed to provide report-card-type measures of rule effectiveness (i.e., to what extent are FP HCP performance targets and resource condition objectives being achieved on a landscape scale over time). These measures can then be used to determine the degree to which progress is meeting expectations.

Intensive Monitoring (Cumulative Effects) and Validation Monitoring:

Intensive monitoring is designed to evaluate cumulative effects of multiple forest practices at the watershed scale. Analysis of these effects improves our understanding of the causal relationships and effects of forest practices rules on aquatic resources. Intensive monitoring integrates the effects of multiple management actions over space and through time within the watershed. Evaluation of monitoring data requires an understanding of the effects of individual actions on a site, and the interaction of those responses through the system. Evaluating biological responses is similarly complicated, requiring an understanding of (1) how various management actions and site conditions interact to affect habitat conditions, and (2) how aquatic resources respond to these habitat changes. Taken together, these evaluations will address the adaptive management program's objectives for validation monitoring. This sophisticated level of understanding of physical and biological systems can be achieved with an intensive, integrated monitoring effort.

Commented [JM7]: This should be in a section that covers multiple rule groups.

Rule Implementation Tool Development:

Rule implementation tool projects are designed to develop, refine or validate tools used to implement the forest practices rules.

1. Methodology Tool Development Projects develop, test, or refine protocols, models, and guidance that are designed to identify and locate management features specified in the forest practices rules, such as the Last Fish/Habitat Model, landslide screens, Np/Ns breaks and sensitive sites, or the achievement of specified stand conditions (e.g., the desired future condition [DFC] basal area target).
2. Target Verification Projects consist of studies designed to verify assumptions and targets developed during FFR negotiations that authors identified as having a weak scientific foundation (such as the DFC basal area targets for Type F streams), or that have been established in the Methodology Tool Development Projects.

Rule implementation tools differ from tools needed to implement a specific monitoring program or project. For example, the Road Surface Erosion Model is a tool necessary to implement several projects in the Roads Rule Group Effectiveness Monitoring Program. Monitoring implementation tools are typically included with the effectiveness monitoring programs.

2.3 Schedule L-1 Performance Targets Review and Revision

Schedule L-1, part of the original Forests and Fish Report and later adopted by the Forest Practices Board (Board) in February 2001 with minor revisions, outlines three overarching performance goals, Resource Objectives defined by Functional Objectives and Performance Targets, and three critical questions addressing compliance, effectiveness, and validation monitoring. Schedule L-1 serves as the foundation for the Adaptive Management Program (AMP), and more specifically guides the development of research and monitoring projects described in this Work Plan.

In response to the Board-approved State Auditor's Office (SAO) Response Plan, TFW Policy recognized the need to predefine decision criteria for actions based on project outcomes. Schedule L-1 contains Resource Objectives that are broken down into Functional Objectives and Performance Targets intended to be met as part of the Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). These Functional Objectives and Performance Targets serve as quantitative measures in a structured decision-making model. To ensure the measures are based on best available science in a structured decision-making model, TFW Policy identified the need to review and update, as appropriate, Schedule L-1, which has not been revised since 2001.

In 2023, a joint workgroup was formed with three representatives each from CMER and TFW Policy to develop a process for review and revising Schedule L-1 Performance Targets, incorporating the latest, best available science. The group completed its work in September 2023, setting the stage for a new workgroup of CMER voting members tasked with 1) Prioritizing Performance Targets that are in need of review and revision and 2) Developing a process for establishing Subject Matter Expert (SME) groups that would review the prioritized Performance Targets and develop recommendations, based on the best available science, for their revision.

Formatted: Heading 2, Left, Indent: Left: 0", Right: 0"

Prioritizing which Performance Targets should be reviewed and revised was based on (a) CMER studies that are closest to completion, (b) Performance Targets which have been recommended for review in completed CMER study reports, Stillwater Report, or planned CMER studies, and (c) Functional Objectives with no corresponding Performance Targets. Based on gathered background information, the Workgroup separated the existing Performance Targets into three groups: 1) High priority for review and revision, SME group should be formed; 2) High priority for review and revision, whereby active CMER studies currently being implemented will directly inform the performance target, no SME group needed; and 3) Performance Target is not a priority for review. Based on these criteria, the workgroup recommended nine Performance Targets for review, split into three SME groups as such:

- a. Shade, Riparian Condition, Litterfall, In-Stream LWD
- b. Pool Frequency, Pool Depth, Peak Flows, Fines in Gravel
- c. Wetlands

This prioritization was approved by CMER and TFW Policy in March of 2024.

The workgroup then moved on to its second task of developing a process to form SME groups. To maintain the credibility of the recommendations produced by the SME groups, the workgroup thought it would be imperative that these groups remain independent, both in perception and reality. To that end, SME groups exclude scientists affiliated with caucuses. Using the Independent Scientific Peer Review (ISPR) contract with the University of Washington, scientists meeting specific expertise criteria were identified to participate. Each SME group includes a CMER staff scientist for subject-matter alignment and a DNR Project Manager for process continuity. This approach, approved by CMER and TFW Policy in September 2024, ensures objectivity and timely completion.

SME groups are reviewing relevant background materials, CMER studies, peer-reviewed literature, and other scientific sources to evaluate and update the prioritized Performance Targets. The review will assess whether existing targets:

1. Align with current scientific state of knowledge.
2. if not, if there is enough new information to warrant revising, replacing, or adding to them,
and
3. if so, provide recommendations for new Performance Targets.

Each group will provide detailed, science-based justifications for its recommendations. Proposed updates will be forwarded to CMER for review using Structured Decision Making, followed by TFW Policy evaluation and recommendation to the Forest Practices Board. The SME groups aim to complete their work by June 30, 2025, with subsequent reviews and approvals extending beyond this date.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Tab stops: 1.06", List tab + Not at 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", No bullets or numbering

3.0 PRIORITIZATION OF CMER PROJECTS

3.1 CMER INITIAL PROJECT PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

CMER's long-term goal is to address the full range of critical questions identified in the CMER Work Plan, while recognizing that availability of funding, time, and human resources will limit the number of projects that can be developed and implemented each year. To focus effort and resources on the most critical issues for Forest Practices Adaptive Management, CMER prioritizes proposals for research and monitoring at both the program and project levels. Establishing priorities allows CMER to pursue the most pressing issues in an orderly manner.

The first step in CMER's prioritization process was to rank the relative importance of proposed programs in meeting FP HCP goals and objectives. CMER projects have since gone through several rankings in response to budget priorities and changes in workload allocation. The program prioritization strategy was to:

1. Rank effectiveness/validation monitoring and extensive status and trend monitoring programs on the basis of scientific uncertainty and risk to aquatic resources.
2. Evaluate the importance of rule implementation tool programs by consulting with DNR and then establish priorities on a project basis.
3. Defer integration of the intensive monitoring program into the CMER Work Plan until further scoping and coordination with other efforts occurs.

CMER members attending the December 19, 2002, CMER meeting provided an initial ranking of programs for effectiveness monitoring and extensive status and trend monitoring. The group evaluated each program by asking two questions:

1. How certain are we of the science and/or assumptions underlying the rule?
2. How much risk is there to aquatic resources if the science or assumptions underlying the rule are incorrect?

These questions were selected as the criteria to rank programs, because the need for scientific information to inform adaptive management is most critical when there is a high level of scientific uncertainty concerning the interaction between forest practices, watershed processes, and aquatic resources; and where the sensitivity of the processes and aquatic resources to potential disturbance creates the greatest risk of resource impacts.

Uncertainty is a measure of confidence in the science underlying a rule, including the causal relationships providing the conceptual foundation for the prescriptions and assumptions about prescription effectiveness and resource response when the prescription is applied on the ground. High uncertainty indicates that at the time of FFR negotiations, little was known about the underlying science and the rule is likely based on assumptions that have not been validated. It may also indicate that the prescription is untested and performance under field conditions is unknown. Low uncertainty indicates that at the time of FFR negotiations, the science underlying the rule was well known and accepted or that the prescription (or similar treatment) has been evaluated under similar conditions. Risk is a measure of the potential for detrimental impacts to aquatic resources, including fish, stream-

Commented [JM8]: Why do we need to know cause?

associated amphibians, and water quality. High risk indicates the activity covered by the prescription has a greater potential to affect aquatic resources due to its magnitude, frequency, or direct linkage to the resource. Low risk indicates the rule has less potential to affect resources.

CMER averaged individual scores to obtain mean risk and uncertainty scores for each program. These were multiplied to get a combined score that was used to rank the programs (Table 3). Policy accepted the rankings and instructed CMER to use them to prioritize projects on effectiveness/validation and extensive status and trend monitoring.

Table 3. Rankings for Effectiveness Monitoring and Extensive Status and Trends Monitoring Programs (completed December 19, 2002).

Program Title	Overall Ranking	Uncertainty		Risk	
		Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
Effectiveness/Validation Programs					
Type N Buffer Characteristics, Integrity Function	1	4.4	1	3.9	1
Eastside Type F Desired Future Range and Target	2	4.2	2	3.8	2
Type N Amphibian Response	3	4.2	2	3.7	3
Road Sub-Basin-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring	4	3.4	5	3.4	4
Type F Statewide Prescription Monitoring	5	3.2	7	3.1	6
Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring	6	3.2	6	2.9	8
Eastside (BTO) Temperature	7	3.0	9	3.2	5
Wetlands Revegetation Effectiveness	8	3.5	4	2.7	11
Road Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring	9	2.6	14	3.1	6
Hardwood Conversion	10	3.0	8	2.6	12
Wetlands Mitigation	11	2.8	11	2.7	10
Fish Passage Effectiveness Monitoring	12	2.6	14	2.9	9
Wildlife Program	13	2.9	10	2.4	14
Wetland Management Zone Effectiveness Monitoring	14	2.8	12	2.5	13
CMZ Effectiveness Monitoring	15	2.7	13	2.1	15
Forest Chemicals	16	2.0	16	2.1	16
Extensive Status and Trends Monitoring Programs					
Extensive Riparian Monitoring	1	3.5	2	3.5	1
Extensive Mass Wasting Monitoring	2	3.7	1	2.9	3
Extensive Fish Passage Monitoring	3	3.1	3	3.1	2

Commented [JM9]: Is this 4.4 out of a possible 5? Explain in table. What is it based on?

CMER used program rankings shown in Table 3, as well as information from DNR consultations on the relative importance of rule implementation tool programs, to provide guidance to the SAGs on where to focus time and energy in scoping and developing programs and projects. Since 2002, when Table 3 was developed, some program titles within the Work Plan have been changed to clarify research strategies within the rule group and program structure. However, the basic prioritization has not changed. Additional prioritization of CMER projects occurred with Ecology's CWA milestones, the Stillwater Report, and the Settlement Agreement between WFPA, Conservation and DNR.

Commented [HB10]: Is this true? This table should be updated via a cross walk with the current MPS and dropping the completed programs/projects.

The second stage of prioritization occurs at the project level in order for CMER to make recommendations to Policy concerning scheduling and allocation of funding among the projects developed by the SAGs. Projects are prioritized based on (1) the extent to which they are deemed essential to inform the Forest Practices Adaptive Management Program, (2) input from DNR on their importance in improving implementation of forest practices rules, (3) status of projects relative to Policy decisions on adaptive management, and (4) the need to follow through and complete work already underway. CMER and the Adaptive Management Program Administrator (AMPA) develop each fiscal year's proposed projects based on those criteria.

As a part of the 2025-2027 Work Plan update process, CMER approved the SAG-recommended projects that may be removed from the CMER project list based on studies that have been completed or other relevant studies. These projects are noted as "withdrawn" in Appendix A and are included in Appendix x. In addition, the SAGs made recommendations on the sequencing of current rule group.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

3.2 POLICY PRIORITIZATION

Policy is responsible for reviewing and approving each CMER Work Plan before submitting it to the Board for approval. Policy is also responsible for providing guidance to CMER on project prioritization, consistent with directions outlined in WAC 222-12-045 and in Section 22, "Guidelines for Adaptive Management Program," in the Forest Practices Board Manual.

Policy's process for prioritizing projects may not always be consistent with CMER's process regarding scientific uncertainty and potential risk to aquatic resources. While Policy has in past years approved CMER's Work Plan priorities, Policy must also consider annual/biennial state budget fluctuations and other factors associated with meeting milestones in accordance with the FP HCP and/or Clean Water Act (CWA) assurances.

In 2009, due to delays in meeting deadlines for determining if forest practices rules met CWA assurances, Policy decided to prioritize CMER projects according to whether they were answering critical questions associated with the CWA assurances. Due to substantial budget shortfalls expected in 2010 and beyond, Policy directed CMER to implement only ongoing projects in FY 2010 and delay new projects until adequate funding was available. Active projects in the current CMER Work Plan reflect these priorities, based on Policy's input concerning CMER's annual budget and the CWA.

The Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) is charged with overseeing the CWA assurances milestones. Ecology has developed a document outlining specific CMER projects targeted at answering critical questions associated with the CWA. Ecology's document also lists

timelines and anticipated completion dates for those CMER projects.

In 2012, in response to a threat of a lawsuit, a settlement was reached that further affected CMER's project priorities. This settlement agreement included a project work schedule (CMER Master Project Schedule) that can be changed with consensus by the full Policy committee and is approved annually by the Board. In general, the settlement work schedule maintained CMER's prior priorities, with emphasis on CWA projects.

4.0 2025-2027 BIENNIUM CMER WORK PLAN PROJECTS AND BUDGETS

Table 4 presents information on ongoing and new CMER projects for the 2025-2027 biennium, organized by rule group. ~~Project budgets are categorized as either Tier 1 or Tier 2 projects. Tier 1 projects are those projects CMER is certain to implement in 2025-2027. Tier 2 projects are those projects that CMER may initiate in 2025-2027, but that have not yet been approved by CMER and/or Policy and may still require additional work on study design, review, and/or accurate costs.~~

Table 4. 2025-2027 Biennium CMER Projects and Budget

	FY26	FY27
Stream Typing Rule Group		
Water Typing Strategy (PHB Validation, Physicals, LiDAR Model Map)	\$1,158,900	\$1,153,400
Type N Rule Group		
Temperature and Amphibians in discontinuously flowing Np reaches	\$250,000	\$360,000
Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness Project (ENREP)	\$620,662	\$535,688
Extensive Monitoring: Type F/N Stream Temperature	\$50,000	\$50,000
Riparian Characteristics and Shade Response Study	\$142,238	\$178,914
Type F Rule Group		
Westside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Prescription Monitoring Project	\$200,000	\$421,200
Unstable Slopes Rule Group		
Unstable Slope Criteria Project	\$75,000	\$75,000
Deep-Seated Landslide Research Strategy Project	\$200,000	\$100,000
Roads Rule Group		
Road Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project	\$715,256	\$421,200
Wetlands Rule Group		
Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project	\$85,000	\$35,000
Wetland Management Zone Effectiveness Monitoring	0	\$50,000
Subtotal Projects	\$3,497,056	\$3,409,226
Total Project	\$6,906,282	
Project Staffing		
4 CMER Principal Investigator Staff (4 at NWIFC, 1 at DNR)	\$1,852,315	
Project Support		
Contingency Fund for Active Projects	\$100,000	

2025-2027 Biennium CMER Work Plan

CMER Project Managers (4)	\$1,282,188
Dispute Resolution Mediation Contingency Funds (Policy mediation/facilitation and CMER Technical Arbitration Panel on-call contracts)	\$100,000
Program Administration	
Onboarding and training for new members (CMER, Policy and Board)	\$70,000
Technical Editor and CMER Statistical support (on-call contract)	\$100,000
Science review of the program every five years	\$300,000
Biennial fiscal and performance audits of the AMP	\$200,000
AMP Administrator and Contract Specialist / CMER Coordinator	\$907,750
Independent Science Review Panel	\$221,277
CMER Conference	\$5,000
Integrated online workspace for AMP and public facing dashboard (SAO Recommendation)	\$24,000
Subtotal Staffing, Support, and Administration	\$4,294,771
Total 2023-2025 Biennium Expenditures for Projects, Staffing, Support, and Administration	\$11,925,053

5.0 RULE GROUP DESCRIPTIONS AND MONITORING STRATEGIES

This portion of the Work Plan includes research and monitoring strategies for each forest practices rule group. Information on each rule group is presented separately, in a similar format. The “Rule Overview and Intent” briefly describes the rule; the “Rule Group Resource Objectives and Performance Targets” lists the objectives and targets from Schedule L-1, adopted by the Board in 2001; and the “Rule Group Strategy” describes the programs within a given rule group and how they work together to answer the rule group critical questions.

Commented [AT11]: RSAG suggestion: mention that Schedule L-1 is being updated.

The programs for each rule group are organized by approach (i.e., rule implementation tools, effectiveness monitoring, extensive monitoring, and intensive monitoring). The “Program Strategy” section describes how the specific research and monitoring projects work together to answer the rule group’s specific critical questions. Some programs include additional sub- questions to the rule group critical questions. These questions are identified in tables under each program strategy. The description, goals and status of each project are also described under each program.

Because of the complexity of the riparian strategy, it is divided into four rule groups: Stream Typing Rule Group (Type F/N delineation), Type N Rule Group (non-fish-bearing streams), Type F Rule Group (fish-bearing streams and associated wetlands), and Channel Migration Zone Rule Group. The remaining rule groups are Unstable Slopes, Roads, Fish Passage, Pesticides, Wetlands Protection, and Wildlife. The last section in this chapter describes the intensive monitoring/cumulative effects program, which addresses cumulative effects and validation of performance targets/resource objectives.

5.1 STREAM TYPING RULE GROUP

5.1.1 Rule Overview and Intent

The Forest Practices Board adopted rules delineating waters of the state into three categories, Type S waters (shorelines of the state), Type F waters (fish-bearing), and Type N waters (non- fish-bearing). Distinguishing the upstream limits of Type F (or S) waters is particularly important, because fish use and lack thereof in streams creates differences in the aquatic resources of concern, the forest management strategies, and the prescriptions applied.

Prior to the rules associated with the Forests and Fish Report (1999), stream typing was based on a set of physical and beneficial-use criteria. Due to questions about the accuracy of this system, the forest practices rules require development of a statewide stream map using a multiparameter, field-verified, GIS logistic regression model to identify the upper extent of Type F streams.

The intent of the Stream Typing Rule Group is to develop a statewide stream typing map, described as follows in the forest practices rules:

“The department will prepare water type maps showing the location of Type S, F, and N (Np and Ns) Waters within the forested areas of the state. The maps will be based on a multiparameter, field-verified geographic information system (GIS) logistic regression model. The multiparameter model will be designed to identify fish habitat by using geomorphic parameters such as basin size, gradient, elevation and other indicators. The modeling process shall be designed to achieve a level of statistical accuracy of 95% in separating fish habitat streams and nonfish habitat streams. Furthermore, the demarcation of fish and nonfish habitat waters shall be equally likely to over and underestimate the presence of fish habitat. These maps shall be referred to as ‘fish habitat water typing maps’ and shall, when completed, be available for public inspection at region offices of the department. Fish habitat water type maps will be updated every five years where necessary to better reflect observed, in-field conditions.”

Until the fish habitat water type maps described above are adopted by the Board, WAC 222-16- 031—the Interim Water Typing System—will continue to be used.

5.1.2 Rule Group Resource Objectives and Performance Targets

Resource Objectives:

- Streams and their associated wetlands should be typed to include fish habitat. Fish habitat is defined in the forest practices rules to mean “habitat, which is used by fish at any life stage at any time of the year, including potential habitat likely to be used by fish, which could be recovered by restoration or management, and including off-channel habitat.”

The rules also direct that DNR will prepare water typing maps, which will be based on a multiparameter, field-verified, peer-reviewed, geographic information system (GIS) logistic regression model. The multiparameter model will be designed to identify fish habitat by using geomorphic parameters such as basin size, gradient, elevation, and other indicators.

Performance Target:

- The predictive fish habitat model should have a statistical accuracy of +/- 5% with the line of demarcation between fish and non-fish-habitat waters equally likely to be over- and under inclusive.

5.1.3 Rule Group Strategy

The Forests and Fish Report (FFR) provided rationale and guidance for a strategy related to the stream typing system. The FFR indicated that the current approach to stream typing was not adequately precise, defined a modeling approach for developing a new map, and set specifications for the accuracy of the model. It also called for development of a field protocol for inclusion in the Forest Practices Board Manual.

The In-Stream Scientific Advisory Group (ISAG) was tasked in 2003 with developing and validating a GIS-based model to predict the upstream extent of fish habitat (Table 5). This task fell under the Stream Typing Program, which is categorized as a rule tool.

Table 5. Stream Typing Rule Group Critical Questions and Programs

Rule Group Critical Questions	Program Name	Task Type	SAG
How can the line demarcating fish- and non-fish-habitat waters be accurately identified?	Stream Typing Program	Rule Tool	ISAG
To what extent do current default physical criteria for Type-F waters, considering potential geographic differences, accurately identify the upstream extent of (detected) fish use (all species) and/or fish habitat?	Stream Typing Program	Rule Tool	ISAG
Can alternative (to current) default physical criteria for Type-F waters, considering potential geographic differences, be identified that would more accurately and consistently identify the upstream extent of (detected) fish use (all species) and/or fish habitat?	Stream Typing Program	Rule Tool	ISAG
Are there sustained gradient or stream size thresholds alone that serve as default physical criteria?	Stream Typing Program	Rule Tool	ISAG
How well and under what conditions does eDNA sampling accurately and consistently identify the upstream extent of fish use, abundance, and/or fish habitat?	Stream Typing Program	Rule Tool	ISAG

Commented [HT(12): Update table, program name not needed since all the same.

Rule Group Critical Questions	Program Name	Task Type	SAG
To what extent can LiDAR be used with the current fish habitat model to develop a new model for predicting the upstream extent of fish habitat sufficient to meet the requirements of the Forest and Fish Agreement?	Stream Typing Program	Rule Tool	ISAG
What constitutes a ‘permanent natural barrier’ (PNB) to different species of fish at different life stages?	Stream Typing Program	Rule Tool	ISAG
To what extent does the current water typing survey window account for seasonal and annual variability in fish distribution considering potential geographic differences?	Stream Typing Program	Rule Tool	ISAG
How do different fish species use seasonal habitats (timing, frequency, duration)?	Stream Typing Program	Rule Tool	ISAG
How does the upstream extent of fish use at individual sites vary seasonally and annually?	Stream Typing Program	Rule Tool	ISAG
How does the delineation of the upstream extent of fish habitat change seasonally?	Stream Typing Program	Rule Tool	ISAG
What are the most appropriate/effective methods (include electrofishing) for documenting fish presence/absence in lotic habitats?	Stream Typing Program	Rule Tool	ISAG
How do species interactions influence the upper extent of fish habitat?	Stream Typing Program	Rule Tool	ISAG
What, if any, biological indicators can be effectively used to help identify fish presence and/or fish habitat?	Stream Typing Program	Rule Tool	ISAG
Has the upstream extent of fish distribution been affected in managed forests?	Stream Typing Program	Extensive Status and Trends Monitoring	ISAG
To what extent do anthropogenic blockages downstream affect fish occupancy in habitats at/near the upstream extent of fish distribution?	Stream Typing Program	Extensive Status and Trends Monitoring	ISAG
To what extent do depressed fish stocks influence electrofishing detections, fish distribution, and habitat identification?	Stream Typing Program	Extensive Status and Trends Monitoring	ISAG
What are the rates of fish recolonization and habitat recovery in systems impacted by natural disturbance (debris flow, mass wasting, fire, etc.), and what are the variables that influence those rates?	Stream Typing Program	Extensive Status and Trends Monitoring	ISAG
To what extent could altered flow regimes, caused by climate change, effect fish distributions, fish populations and/or fish habitat?	Stream Typing Program	Extensive Status and Trends Monitoring	ISAG

5.1.4 Stream Typing Program (Rule Tool)

5.1.4.1 Program Strategy

The purpose of the Stream Typing (Rule Tool) Program is to identify projects that will refine and/or validate the water typing process, specifically as the process relates to identifying the regulatory Type-F/N break.

Commented [AT13]: ISAG: Review Water Typing Strategy document and AFF technical memo to CMER/Policy and consider what elements to include into this subsection.

At the November 5, 2019 Washington Forest Practices Board (Board) meeting the following motion was passed:

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

“Recommend the Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER) to develop study designs for the PHB validation, physical characteristics, and map-based Lidar model studies. Design the studies for cost savings, including the phasing of the studies with eastern Washington to be initiated first, and the possibility and advisability of combining the PHB validation, physical characteristics and map-based Lidar model studies, and then to report on the study designs to the Board by their May, 2020 meeting.”

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.11", First line: 0"

In December 2019, CMER voted that the Instream Scientific Advisory Group (ISAG) should have the lead in drafting a response to the Board motion (above) by developing a Water Typing Strategy for CMER approval that addresses the Board’s request. Consistent with the Board’s motion, that strategy should include (but not be limited to) recommendations for how to proceed with the ‘PHB Validation’ (PHB), ‘Default Physical Criteria (DPC)’ and ‘Map-based Lidar Model’ (LiDAR Model) studies.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

The strategy includes, in part, the following recommendations (see approved Water Typing Strategy for details):

- Coordinate implementation of the DPC and PHB studies to take advantage of their shared elements (e.g. sample sites, upstream extent of fish distribution information), but maintain separate study-specific elements (e.g. focused analysis) that are designed to accomplish study objectives and answer project related critical questions in the CMER work plan (2019 - 2020).
- Postpone implementation of the LiDAR Model study until after completion of the DPC and PHB studies and the development of a statewide LiDAR derived stream network.
- There is potential for eDNA (Environmental DNA) to be included as an added element to the PHB and/or DPC studies, however, continued investigation of eDNA as a prospective water typing tool should not necessarily be limited to work within these other studies.
- Structure the studies so that the eastside and westside portions of each study may function independently if needed.

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

ISAG’s recommendation was that the AFF study, along with PHBs and DPC, would best fit early in the Water Typing Strategy project sequence, ahead of the modeling and mapping. At their May 9, 2024 meeting, the Board approved including the Anadromous Fish Floor (AFF) Validation Study on the Master Project Schedule.

Formatted: List Paragraph, Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering




Figure X. Conceptual Diagram of Water Typing Strategy

Table 6. Stream Typing Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
How can the line demarcating fish- and non-fish-habitat waters be accurately identified?	Last Fish/Habitat Prediction Model Development Project
	Annual/Seasonal Variability Project
	Last Fish/Habitat Prediction Model Field Performance Project
	Potential Habitat Breaks
To what extent do current default physical criteria for Type-F waters, considering potential geographic differences, accurately identify the upstream extent of (detected) fish presence (all species) and/or fish habitat?	Default Physical Criteria Assessment Project
Can alternative (to current) default physical criteria for Type-F waters, considering potential geographic differences, be identified that would more accurately and consistently identify the upstream extent of (detected) fish presence (all species) and/or fish habitat?	

Commented [AT15]: Formatting note: Ensure figure is numbered appropriately

Formatted: Font: 10.5 pt

Formatted: Normal, Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering

Commented [AT16]: Work with ISAG to identify which CQs pertain to AFF

Commented [H(17R16)]: I would say numbers 1; 3 and 4 if we can identify suitable "AFF DPC"; 7 for anadromous fish PNBs; 8, 9, 10, and 11 to account for the variable life histories of anadromous fishes; possibly 12 and 13.

Commented [AT18R16]: Not necessary for this round. Will add CQs (once developed) in next Work Plan update

Commented [HT(19)]: Reformat table

Are there sustained gradient or stream size thresholds alone that serve as default physical criteria?	
How well and under what conditions does eDNA sampling accurately and consistently identify the upstream extent of fish presence, abundance, and/or fish habitat?	Fish/Habitat Detection Using eDNA Project
To what extent can LiDAR be used with the current fish habitat model to develop a new model for predicting the upstream extent of fish habitat sufficient to meet the requirements of the Forest and Fish Agreement?	No projects developed at this time.
What constitutes a 'permanent natural barrier' (PNB) to different species of fish at different life stages?	No projects developed at this time.
To what extent does the current water typing survey window capture-account for seasonal and annual variability in fish distribution considering potential geographic differences?	Potential Habitat Breaks

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
How do different fish species use seasonal habitats (timing, frequency, duration)?	Potential Habitat Breaks
How does the upstream extent of fish use at individual sites vary seasonally and annually?	Potential Habitat Breaks
How does the delineation of the upstream extent of fish habitat change seasonally?	Potential Habitat Breaks
What are the most appropriate/effective methods (include electrofishing) for documenting fish presence/absence in lotic habitats?	No projects developed at this time.
How do species interactions influence the upper extent of fish habitat?	No projects developed at this time.
What, if any, biological indicators can be effectively used to help identify fish presence and/or fish habitat?	No projects developed at this time.

5.1.4.2 Completed Projects (See Appendix X for details)

- Last Fish/Habitat Prediction Model Development Project
- Annual/Seasonal Variability Project
- Last Fish/Habitat Prediction Model Field Performance Project
- Fish/Habitat Detection Using Environmental DNA (eDNA)

5.1.4.3 Potential Habitat Breaks (PHB) Validation Study

Description:

The purpose of this study is to develop criteria for accurately identifying PHBs and to evaluate the utility of PHB criteria for use in the Fish Habitat Assessment Methodology (FHAM) as part of a water typing rule. The study is designed to assess which combinations of gradient, channel width, barriers to migration, and other physical habitat and geomorphic conditions are associated with uppermost detected fish locations and upstream extent of fish habitat. This will 1) inform which Board-identified PHB criteria most accurately identify the upstream extent of fish habitat in an objective and repeatable manner as applied in the FHAM and 2) evaluate whether an alternative set or combination of empirically derived criteria more accurately achieves this goal (CMER 2020). Additionally, this study is intended to provide insight into how uppermost detected fish points, upstream extent of fish habitat based on FHAM, and PHBs proposed by the Washington Forest Practice Board may vary across geography, seasons, and years. The Board is expected to use the study findings to inform which PHB criteria to use in FHAM.

Status:

An initial study design was developed by a Board-designated science panel and subsequently approved by ISPR in 2018. It was also reviewed by members of CMER and ISAG in 2019. An updated version of the study design was presented to the Board. The Board then created a Water Typing Subcommittee to provide recommendations on next steps. Per recommendation of the Water Typing Subcommittee, in November 2019 the Board recommended that CMER develop a “Potential Habitat Breaks” study design. CMER then voted that ISAG should have the lead in responding to this Board motion. ISAG presented

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Body Text, Space Before: 0.25 pt, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Formatted: Body Text, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", Tab stops: Not at 0.74" +

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Commented [AT20]: From study design (also in charter and CY23 project summary sheet)

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Right: 0"

Commented [H(21): "...and upstream extent of fish habitat."

Commented [AT22R21]: Added

Commented [H(23): Not really. The Board currently seems to be intent on selecting a PHBs alternative before this study even begins.

Commented [em24R23]: Could we add "Three board-approved PHB options will be included in the draft rule proposal and accompanying analyses." to this paragraph?

Commented [AT25R23]: Resolved by deletion of last sentence. Added last paragraph to Status section.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

[the Board with a strategy to develop water typing study designs in May 2020, and initiated the work thereafter. ISAG developed a study design, revised from the 2019 study design. This study design received ISPR and CMER approval in May 2023. The Prospective 6 Questions document was approved by CMER in October 2023 and delivered to TFW Policy in November 2023. The project team has initiated site selection, with field implementation expected to begin in spring 2025.](#)

[The Board is currently \(as of 2024\) in the process of adopting a permanent water typing rule. The Board is poised to adopt a PHB alternative in November 2024. The results of this study will inform the AMP participants regarding the PHBs to be adopted by the Board.](#)

[The Board is expected to use the study findings to inform which PHB criteria to use in FHAM.](#)

5.1.4.35.1.4.4 Default Physical Criteria (DPC) Assessment Project

Description:

The accuracy of the current default physical criteria has not been validated, and research describing the physical characteristic at the upstream extent of fish distribution is limited. Also, protocol survey practitioners have frequently observed differences between the upstream extent of (detected) fish presence and the default physical criteria. The magnitude of difference between the last fish and the default physicals has not been assessed. Therefore, research is needed to (1) compare and quantify how the current default physical criteria correspond to the uppermost point of fish presence and potential fish habitat; (2) determine the physical characteristics of habitat likely to be used by fish, and (3) determine if sustained gradient or stream size thresholds alone [could](#) serve as default physical criteria.

Status:

In 2016, a Board-designated science panel-initiated work on the study design, with the consideration of combining it with the Potential Habitat Breaks (PHB) study. ISAG reviewed and provided comments on the draft, however, no final/approved study design was produced. The Board then created a special Water Typing Subcommittee to provide recommendations on next steps. Per recommendation of the Water Typing Subcommittee, in November 2019 the Board recommended that CMER develop a “Default Physicals Criteria” study design. CMER then voted that ISAG should have the lead in responding to this Board motion. ISAG presented the Board with a strategy outline to develop water typing study designs in May 2020, and initiated work on revising the ~~Potential Habitat Breaks~~PHB study design. Following CMER ~~and ISPR~~ approval of the ~~Potential Habitat Breaks~~PHB study design in ~~September 2022~~May 2023, ISAG initiated work on the Default Physical Criteria (DPC) study design. [The DPC study design is expected to be sent to CMER to initiate concurrent CMER/ISAG review in fall 2024. ISAG anticipates that the PHB and DPC studies will use data from the same field sites but use different analyses to answer the questions specific to each.](#)

5.1.4.5 Anadromous Fish Floor (AFF) Validation Study

[As described in the March 13, 2024 memo from ISAG AFF validation study will be implemented separately as a companion study that will be integrated in the AMP Water Typing Strategy. While the AFF is intended to be used in conjunction with the Fish Habitat Assessment Methodology \(FHAM\), AFF points would play a different role in the water typing process than PHB](#)

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.13", Outline numbered + Level: 4 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: -0.51" + Indent at: 0.11"

Commented [H(26): I realize this is a quote, but this should be "fish". It's the AFF, not the "ASH".

Commented [AT27R26]: Added fish in brackets

Formatted: Body Text, Justified, Right: 0.27", Space Before: 0.05 pt

and DPC points. Conceptually, the AFF and DPC function as bookends, between which implementation of FHAM begins, and the AFF:

- Would likely require a separate sampling framework to capture data representative of anadromous fish use. The presence of substantial anadromous barriers, spatial coverage, and specific data needs for PHBs and DPC taken together suggest little overlap between AFF and other water typing studies.
- Must account for the variability in abundance of anadromous species as it relates to extent/distribution.
- Should reflect recoverable habitat historically occupied by anadromous species.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

ISAG suggests that this study, along with PHBs and DPC, would best fit early in the Water Typing Strategy project sequence, ahead of the modeling and mapping.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Status:

A Proposal Initiation (PI) was received in May 2023 from Washington Department of Natural Resources for the Anadromous Fish Floor (AFF) Validation Study. The PI requests the development of a study design "to determine the physical stream features of an anadromous stream fish floor and compare to the criteria used in the Board accepted AFF alternatives."

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Commented [H(28)]: I realize this is a quote, but this should be "fish". It's the AFF, not the "ASH".

Commented [AT29R28]: Added fish in brackets

In August 2023, TFW Policy approved the AFF PI with a recommendation that the Forest Practices Board add the AFF Validation Study to the CMER Work Plan and Master Project Schedule. CMER assigned the AFF Validation Study to ISAG in August. In March 2024, the project team developed a memo with recommendations for the AFF Validation Study, which was approved by CMER and accepted by TFW Policy in April 2024. At their May 9, 2024 meeting, the Board approved including the Anadromous Fish Floor (AFF) Validation Study on the Master Project Schedule.

Formatted: No underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, No underline

The project team is conducting an after-action review of the previous AFF effort, conducted by the Board's technical AFF work group (Anadromous Fish Floor (AFF) Policy Memo, 2021 and Addendum, 2022; Anadromous Fish Floor Spatial Analysis Findings Report, 2021 and Addendum, 2022; Anadromous Fish Floor Addendum Report, 2022; 4-5 citations), to identify what worked well and what did not, what data and analytical gaps remain, and other lessons learned.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Italic, No underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Commented [AT30]: Add citations (see AFF background folder)

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Commented [AT32R31]: Resolved by adding language from memo

The Board is currently (as of 2024) in the process of adopting a permanent water typing rule. The Board is poised to adopt an AFF alternative in November 2024. The results of this study will inform the AMP participants regarding the AFF to be adopted by the Board.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Italic, No underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Normal, Left, Space After: 8 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style, Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li

Formatted: Normal, Left, Indent: Left: 0", Right: 0", Space Before: 0 pt, After: 8 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style, Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li

5.1.5 Stream Typing Program (Extensive Status and Trends Monitoring)

5.1.5.1 Program Strategy

The purpose of the Stream Typing (Extensive Status and Trends Monitoring) Program is to identify projects for evaluating the current status of key watershed processes and/or habitat conditions that relate to the water typing at the landscape scale.

Table 7. Stream Typing Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
Has the upstream extent of fish distribution been affected in managed forests?	Recoverable/Restorable Fish Habitat Project
What type, and how much, fish habitat has been restored and recovered through forest management practices and to what degree has it affected fish distribution and abundance?	Recoverable/Restorable Fish Habitat Project
To what extent do anthropogenic blockages downstream affect fish occupancy in habitats at/near the upstream extent of fish distribution?	No projects developed at this time.
To what extent do depressed fish stocks influence electrofishing detections, fish distribution, and habitat identification?	No projects developed at this time.
What are the rates of fish recolonization and habitat recovery in systems impacted by natural disturbance (debris flow, mass wasting, fire, etc.), and what are the variables that influence those rates?	No projects developed at this time.
To what extent could altered flow regimes, caused by climate change, affect fish distributions, fish populations, and/or fish habitat?	No projects developed at this time.

Commented [H33]: The first two questions are probably not answerable due to lack of meaningful baseline data against which to compare. Answers to the last question would be highly speculative and no doubt debatable.

Commented [AT34R33]: No changes needed now. For further discussion within ISAG. For first question, consider adding an additional question: "If so, how?"

5.1.5.2 Recoverable/Restorable Fish Habitat Project

Description:

"Fish habitat" means habitat which is used by fish at any life stage at any time of the year including potential habitat likely to be used by fish which could be recovered by restoration or management and includes off-channel habitat (WAC 222-16-010). The primary intent of this project will be to assess potential landscape-scale differences in fish distribution patterns within managed and unmanaged forestlands. In addition, the project will identify and quantify different types of fish habitat that have been recovered and/or restored through forest management practices (e.g., riparian buffer prescriptions, RMAPs) since the FP HCP was implemented. Where possible, the project will also investigate the degree to which fish distribution and abundance has changed from pre- to post-restoration and recovery.

Status:

This project was proposed for inclusion by ISAG (2016) in the CMER Master Project Schedule for the 2017–2019 biennium. Due to a shift in the FP Board priorities this project has been put on hold and will be re-evaluated and new priorities will be determined by ISAG.

5.2 TYPE N RIPARIAN PRESCRIPTIONS RULE GROUP

5.2.1 Rule Overview and Intent

Type N streams are protected under forest practices rules for several reasons. First, they provide habitat for stream-associated amphibians (SAA) covered by the agreement. Second, water quality standards pertaining to these streams need to be met. Finally, Type N streams contribute water, nutrients, woody debris, and sediment that affect downstream fish habitat and water quality.

Two buffering strategies are prescribed for Type Np streams: the clear-cut and the partial-cut strategies. The clear-cut strategy is prescribed for the westside, whereas landowners on the eastside have the flexibility to use either clear-cut or partial-cut strategies. The clear-cut strategy on the westside involves a patch buffering system where portions of the riparian stand can be clear-cut to the stream, but remaining areas are protected with a 50-foot (ft.) wide no-cut patch buffer. The patch buffer includes fixed and flexible components. Fixed components include 50-56 ft. buffers around most sensitive sites (e.g., connected springs and seeps, Np initiation points, and stream junctions) and on both sides of the stream 300-500 ft. upstream from the Type F/Type Np junction. The flexible component allows the landowner to choose where to place the remaining buffer to bring the total buffer length to a minimum of 50% of the Type Np length. Eastside landowners have the second option of using the partial-cut strategy, a continuous 50-ft. buffer along the length of the Type Np stream. The partial-cut buffer can be thinned, provided that the appropriate basal area and leave tree requirements are met. A 30-ft.-wide equipment limitation zone (ELZ) is established on all Type N streams (Np and Ns) statewide to minimize sediment input from bank and soil disturbance. Operations within the ELZ are designed to avoid soil disturbance, and sediment delivery must be mitigated.

The Type N rules are based on the assumption that riparian buffering strategies will result in aquatic conditions that meet resource objectives and consequently achieve the three Forests and Fish Report performance goals. However, a high level of uncertainty exists in the science underlying these assumptions because the functional relationships between riparian management practices, riparian functions, and aquatic resource response are not well studied or understood.

Several major areas of uncertainty include the following:

1. How to identify the upper boundary of perennial flow in Type N streams.
2. How riparian stands and the inputs and functions they provide respond to management practices and the level of protection provided by the prescriptions.
3. The habitat utilization patterns of SAAs and their response to riparian management practices.
4. The effects of Type N riparian management practices on sediment, large woody debris (LWD), temperature, and nutrient regimes in downstream fish-bearing streams.

5.2.2 Rule Group Resource Objectives and Performance Targets

Resource Objectives:

The Type N riparian prescriptions are designed to accomplish the following FP HCP resource objectives:

- Provide cool water by maintaining shade, groundwater temperature, flow, and other watershed processes controlling stream temperature.
- Provide complex in- and near-stream habitat by recruiting LWD and litter.
- Prevent delivery of excessive sediment to streams by protecting stream-bank integrity, providing vegetative filtering, protecting unstable slopes, and preventing routing of sediment to streams.
- Provide conditions that sustain SAA population viability within occupied sub-basins.

Performance Targets:

- Stream Temperature: To be developed
- Water quality standards: To be developed
- Sediment: Target related to harvest and activities in the ELZ has yet to be developed.
- Groundwater Temperature: To be developed.

5.2.3 Rule Group Strategy

As mentioned above, the forest practices Type N riparian prescriptions were based on assumptions that contain scientific uncertainties. The Type N riparian strategy is designed to address those areas of scientific uncertainties by focusing on critical questions related to delineation of Np/Ns streams, characterization of Np streams, identification and characterization of sensitive sites, and the effectiveness of the rules in achieving FP HCP goals and resource objectives. The critical questions, programs, task types, and responsible scientific advisory groups (SAGs) are listed in Table 8. The first step in the strategy involves rule tool programs that address how to delineate and characterize Type N streams and sensitive sites. The Type N Delineation Program addresses how to characterize and delineate the uppermost boundaries of Type N streams, including perennial and seasonal streams. The purpose of the Sensitive Site Program is to refine the descriptions of SAA sensitive sites in the forest practices rules and to estimate their importance to SAAs.

After rule tools have been developed to characterize and/or delineate Type N streams, the next step in the strategy is to assess the effectiveness of the riparian prescriptions in meeting resource goals and performance targets. The Type N Riparian Effectiveness Program assesses how the forest practices riparian prescriptions, as well as alternative buffer prescriptions, address the FP HCP resource objectives (i.e., riparian processes and functions) within Type N streams, as well as their contribution to downstream Type F streams. The Type N Amphibian Response Program addresses how SAA population viability is maintained by the Type N prescriptions on the westside. The Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring Program is then designed to provide an initial and series of subsequent snapshots of temperature and riparian vegetation conditions in Type N streams across the FP HCP landscape and to document how those conditions change over time.

Table 8. Type N Riparian Prescriptions Rule Group Critical Questions and Programs

Rule Group Critical Questions	Program Names	Task Type	SAG
How should the initiation point of Type Np streams be identified for management purposes?	Type N Delineation Program	Rule Tool	UPSAG

Commented [JM35]: It seems odd that we have been working on protecting streams for 50 years and targets have not been developed. Perhaps we need to look at a different approach because one size does not fit all.

Commented [TA(36R35)]: RSAG suggestion for CMER consideration:
 1.Refer to Schedule L-1, make note that L-1 is being updated. (Welles will paste in relevant performance targets)
 2.Ensure Resource Objectives and Performance Targets are included for each rule group.

Commented [AP37R35]: 11/26/24. CMER suggestion. Front load reference to schedule L-1 appendix and performance targets and description of current revisions in Work Plan. List of performance targets could be referenced in rule group descriptions such as here, deleting existing text. **GLOBAL CHANGE NEEDED. AMP staff to complete.

Commented [JM38]: initial snapshot

Can the methods used to identify and characterize sensitive sites be improved?	Sensitive Site Program	Rule Tool	LWAG
Are rule-identified sites valuable for amphibians?	Sensitive Site Program	Rule Tool	LWAG
Are sites important to amphibians correctly identified by rule?	Sensitive Site Program	Rule Tool	LWAG
How do survival and growth rates of riparian leave trees change following Type Np buffer treatments? Are riparian processes and functions provided by Type Np buffers maintained at levels that meet FP HCP resource objectives and performance targets for shade, stream temperature, LWD recruitment, litterfall, and amphibians?			
How do other buffers compare with the forest practices Type N prescriptions in meeting resource objectives? How do the Type N riparian prescriptions affect water quality delivered to downstream Type F/S waters? Are the Type N performance targets valid and meaningful measures of success in meeting resource objectives?	Type N Riparian Effectiveness Program ¹	Effectiveness	RSAG SAGE
What is the frequency and distribution of windthrow in forest practices buffers on Type N and F streams? What site and habitat conditions are associated with sites with significant blowdown? What is the effect of buffering or not buffering spatially intermittent stream reaches in Type Np streams?			
Is stream-associated amphibian (SAA) population viability maintained by the Type N prescriptions?	Type N Amphibian Response Program	Effectiveness	LWAG
What is the current status of riparian conditions and functions in Type N and F streams on a statewide scale, and how are conditions changing over time?	Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring Program	Extensive	RSAG
Are forest practices riparian prescriptions effective at protecting groundwater flow and temperature?	Groundwater Conceptual Model Project Type N Riparian Effectiveness Program	Effectiveness	UPSAG RSAG SAGE WetSAG

Commented [JM39]: Above you said that performance targets have yet to be defined, so how can you determine if they have been met?

Commented [TA(40R39)]: Footnote added

Commented [JM41]: If performance targets have yet to be developed, how can you test their validity?

Commented [TA(42R41)]: Footnote added

Commented [TA(43)]: For RSAG parking lot: From Jenelle: This warrants a separate validation program.

Commented [H(44)]: Perhaps windthrow studies should also be moved to a new section for projects that cover both F and N RMZs?

Commented [TA(45R44)]: From RSAG for CMER discussion

Commented [AP46R44]: *Move to RSAG internal parking lot.

Commented [JM47]: We need to look at landscape populations not just treatment reaches.

Commented [TA(48R47)]: Note from RSAG: There has been some discussion of landscape scale amphibian presence/absence as part of Extensive Monitoring

Commented [AP49R47]: **in RSAG internal parking lot.

Commented [JM50]: This should be F and N. See above.

¹ [The ongoing Schedule L-1 update-of performance targets is also relevant to some of these questions.](#)

5.2.4 Type N Delineation Program (Rule Tool)

5.2.4.1 Program Strategy

Because the Type N protections differ between perennial and seasonal stream reaches, it is important that perennial and seasonal reaches can be identified before management activities occur. This is difficult because determining a flow regime requires walking extensive stream lengths during the summer dry season. The need for a simpler year-round determination method led to the basin area default method contained in the FFR. [The Forest Practices Board eliminated the default basin option in 2006, in response to the Type N Stream Demarcation Study](#)~~Default Basin Area Study~~. The Type N Delineation Program was designed to determine whether regulatory delineation methods were sufficiently accurate and whether there were preferable alternatives.

Commented [JM51]: The Board eliminated this in or about 2006.
Commented [AT52R51]: For CMER from RSAG: Find official name of study that eliminated the default basin size

The Type N Delineation Program evaluated existing and alternative delineation methods using observational field studies. In 2001, a pilot study (administered by UPSAG) was conducted to validate existing methods for defining perennial and seasonal streams for both western and eastern Washington, as described below. Based on the results of the study, in November 2006 the Forest Practices Board adopted the rule that eliminated the option to use a default basin size. Though the Board Manual was to be relied upon to provide guidance for determining the uppermost point of perennial flow, the proposed Board Manual language for providing this guidance was not approved at that time. Currently, no further action is being taken by CMER on this issue.

Table 9. Type N Delineation Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names	SAG
How should the initiation point of Type Np streams be identified for management purposes?	Perennial Initiation Point Survey: Pilot Study	UPSAG

5.2.4.2 Completed Projects (See Appendix X for details)

- Perennial Initiation Point Survey: Pilot Study

Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

5.2.5 Sensitive Site Program (Rule Tool)

5.2.5.1 Program Strategy

The Sensitive Site Program, which began in 1999, consists of two rule-tool implementation projects. The purpose of this program is to refine the descriptions of stream-associated amphibian (SAA) sensitive sites in the forest practices rules and to estimate their importance to SAAs. The strategy is to first develop a field methodology to assist forest managers in identifying sensitive sites, and then characterize sensitive sites that are the most important to the SAAs addressed in the FP HCP. See Table 10 for critical questions and associated projects.

Table 10. Sensitive Site Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
Are sites important to amphibians correctly identified by rule?	SAA Sensitive Sites Characterization Project
Are rule-identified sites valuable for amphibians?	Sensitive Sites and Amphibians Project
Can the methods used to identify and characterize sensitive sites be improved?	SAA Sensitive Sites Identification Methods Project Sensitive Sites and Amphibians Project

5.2.5.2 Completed Projects (See Appendix X for details)

- SAA Sensitive Sites Identification Methods Project
- SAA Sensitive Sites Characterization Project

5.2.5.3 Sensitive Sites and Amphibians Project

Description:

This project proposes to use existing data from a combination of the Hard Rock project, SAA Sensitive Sites Identification Methods Project, and SAA Sensitive Sites Characterization Project to synthesize information on characteristics of FP Sensitive Sites and riparian sites important to amphibians. If desired, a second field phase of this project would focus on remaining uncertainties associated with seeps, including identification, characterization and amphibian use on the Type N landscape.

Project Critical Questions:

- Are rule-identified sites valuable for amphibians?
- Are sites important to amphibians correctly identified by rule?
- Can the methods used to identify and characterize sensitive sites be improved?

Status:

This project has not been initiated or scoped.

5.2.6 Type N Riparian Effectiveness Program

The effectiveness of the prescription package for Type N riparian management is uncertain because there are many gaps in the scientific understanding of headwater streams, their aquatic resources, and the response of riparian stands, amphibians, water quality, and downstream fish populations to different riparian management strategies. Consequently, prescriptions are based on assumptions that have been neither thoroughly studied nor validated. This program ~~is~~ ranked first among the 16 CMER programs (see Section 3.0). This program has been divided into two sections, one for the westside and one for the eastside, due to differences in the prescriptions and critical questions, which lead to unique program strategies.

5.2.6.1 Program Strategy (Westside)

The purpose of this program is to evaluate the westside Type N riparian management prescriptions, including response of riparian vegetation, growth and mortality of buffer trees, level of riparian functions

Formatted: No Spacing, No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Formatted: List Paragraph, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Formatted: List Paragraph, Indent: Left: 0.5", No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Commented [JM53]: This is important. We need to focus on the landscape.

Commented [JM54]: Who did the ranking? I would delete this sentence.

Commented [TA(55R54)]: From RSAG for CMER discussion

provided, biotic and water quality responses to prescriptions (both within the Type N system and in downstream fish-bearing waters), and the prescriptions’ effectiveness in achieving performance targets and meeting water quality standards. Critical questions for this program, along with the projects designed to answer them, are shown in Table 11.

Three CMER projects evaluated the effectiveness of the westside Type N riparian prescriptions. These projects used different but complementary approaches to inform adaptive management. The Westside Type N Buffer Characteristics, Integrity, and Function (BCIF) Project examined a random sample of westside Type N forest practices applications (FPAs) after harvest to evaluate the performance of Type N prescriptions as they are applied operationally over the range of conditions occurring in the FP HCP landscape. The Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project in Hard Rock Lithologies (Hard Rock project) and Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project in Soft Rock Lithologies (Soft Rock project) focused on aquatic resource response to Type N prescriptions in streams with competent (i.e., less erodible, or hard rock) and relatively incompetent lithologies in western Washington. Both studies used a manipulative experimental design that compared the effectiveness of the riparian buffers left in harvested watersheds to unharvested control sites. The Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project in Soft Rock Lithologies served as a companion study to the Hard Rock project. The Soft Rock project provided important confirmation of the effect of forest practices prescriptions on the more erodible substrates that were not included in the Hard Rock project.

Table 11. Type N Riparian Effectiveness Program – Westside: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
How do survival and growth rates of riparian leave trees change following Type Np buffer treatments?	Westside Type N Buffer Characteristics, Integrity, and Function (BCIF) Project Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Projects (Hard Rock and Soft Rock projects)

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
Are riparian processes and functions provided by Type Np buffers maintained at levels that meet FP HCP resource objectives and performance targets for shade, stream temperature, LWD recruitment, litterfall, and amphibians?	Westside Type N Buffer Characteristics, Integrity, and Function (BCIF) Project Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Projects (Hard Rock and Soft Rock projects); the Soft Rock project did not include amphibians or litterfall
How do other buffers compare with the forest practices Type N prescriptions in meeting resource objectives?	Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project in Hard Rock Lithologies (the Soft Rock project tested only the forest practices rule buffer, no alternative buffers)
How do the Type N riparian prescriptions affect water quality delivered to downstream Type F/S waters?	Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Projects (Hard Rock and Soft Rock projects); the Soft Rock project did not include fish)

Commented [HT(56)]: Combine into one table

What is the frequency and distribution of windthrow in forest practices buffers?	Westside Type N Buffer Characteristics, Integrity, and Function (BCIF) Project
What site and habitat conditions are associated with sites with significant blowdown?	Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Projects (Hard Rock and Soft Rock projects) Windthrow Frequency, Distribution, and Effects Project
Are forest practices riparian prescriptions effective at protecting groundwater flow and temperature?	No project identified
Are the Type N performance targets valid and meaningful measures of success in meeting resource objectives	No project identified
What is the effect of buffering or not buffering spatially intermittent stream reaches in Type Np streams?	Discontinuous Np Project
What are the physical characteristics and functions of accumulations of instream slash through time?	Slash in Type N Streams Project
How does amphibian use of reaches with accumulations of instream slash vary through time?	

5.2.6.2 Completed Projects (See Appendix X for details)

- Westside Type N Buffer Characteristics, Integrity, and Function (BCIF) Project
- Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project in Soft Rock Lithologies (Soft Rock Project)

5.2.6.2.5.2.6.3 Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project in Hard Rock Lithologies (Hard Rock Project)

Description:

This study is a field experiment that assessed the effects of clear-cut harvest of Type N basins with three riparian buffer strategies (compared to unharvested reference basins) during Phase 1 (2006–2011), extended monitoring in Phase 2 (2012–2017), and ~~a current monitoring in~~ additional monitoring in Phase 3 (2023-2024). Study responses included riparian stand structure, tree mortality, wood recruitment and loading, stream temperature and cover, discharge, nutrient export, suspended sediment export, stream channel characteristics, litterfall input and detritus export, biofilm and periphyton, macroinvertebrate export, and stream-associated amphibian density. Data on downstream effects on stream temperature and fish populations were also assessed, where possible. Study sites were limited to basins with basalt or other hard rock lithologies, where the target amphibian species are more likely to be found. The BACI (Before-After /Control-Impact) study design includes randomized blocks, with sites assigned to one of four treatments, including the reference.

Status:

This study consisted of three years of pre-harvest data collection 2006-2008 and multiple years of post-harvest data collection spanning from 2009–2017. The Phase 1 report is complete, and five findings reports (one covering findings of the entire study, with separate reports for stand structure and tree mortality, wood recruitment and loading, stream temperature and cover, and stream-associated amphibians) have been transmitted to Policy.

Formatted: No Spacing, Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Formatted: Justified, Right: 0.25"

Results of the detection probability method used in this study were published in the journal *Forest Ecology and Management* in 2012. Stream temperature and amphibian response results were presented at the American Fisheries Society conference in Portland, Oregon in August 2015 and at the National Council on Air and Stream Improvement meeting in September 2015, and at the CMER Science Conferences in October 2016 and May 2018. Results were presented to Policy in late 2017.

The extended monitoring, Phase 2 (2012 and later; through nine years post-harvest), included responses for riparian stand structure, tree mortality, wood recruitment and loading, stream temperature and cover, discharge, nutrient export, suspended sediment export, stream channel characteristics, stable isotopes, and stream-associated amphibian density. The timing of data collection varied among the many study variables depending upon ~~the expected response time~~ study variable-specific considerations and expense. The final report was approved by ISPR and was approved by CMER on July 27, 2021. Temperature data collected through fall 2019 were included in the Phase 2 report as an addendum.

Because of the long generation time of stream-associated amphibians, the genetic component of this study spans the interval of 2006–2017. The final genetic report was approved by ISPR and CMER in 2019. A Findings Report was developed and presented to TFW Policy and the Forest Practices Board.

Continued monitoring of the rule effectiveness through time is consistent with the study design. Monitoring for stream-associated amphibians (Phase 3) is currently in the final report writing phase implementation and will be ~~conducted~~ completed summer of 2025 ~~and 2024~~ (budget allocations in the current CMER MPS ~~span fiscal years 2022–for FY 2025~~). Results from Phase 2 ~~suggest~~ showed significant declines in Coastal Tailed Frog populations 7- and 8-years post-harvest (e.g., -65% to -93% decline in larval density depending on treatment) that were not apparent in the initial post-harvest period. ~~Future Phase 3~~ monitoring will ~~allow identification~~ identify of potential longer-term effects of harvest on Coastal Tailed Frog populations and other stream-associated amphibians, including torrent and giant salamanders.

Opportunity exists to evaluate within-basin (study site) amphibian genetic diversity and genetic neighborhood gene flow between study sites and adjacent drainages (repeat of pre-harvest genetic work to look for potential response/change over time). The genetic tissues samples to support this work were collected in conjunction with Phase 3 amphibian demographic sampling in 2023 and 2024.

Another opportunity exists to compare basin-wide amphibian abundance estimates from the Phase 3 effort to eDNA samples for headwater amphibians to inform the potential value of eDNA as a tool for landscape status and trends monitoring for amphibians as well as a potential sampling option for the proposed Coastal Tailed Frog Extensive Status Project. The eDNA samples to support this work were collected in conjunction with Phase 3 amphibian demographic sampling in 2023 and 2024.

Formatted: Justified, Tab stops: 6.44", Left + 6.56", Left

5.2.6.3.5.2.6.4 *Slash in Type N Streams Project*

Description:

The purpose of this project is to evaluate the functional role of slash in Type N streams. In the Hard Rock project, PIs observed high loads of harvest-related slash in unbuffered stream reaches, along with what appeared to be higher densities of torrent salamander utilizing these reaches. However, preliminary results

suggest that these increased densities in slash reaches did not extend through years 7 and 8 post-harvest. The function and physical characteristics of instream slash have not been studied extensively and has not been systematically studied from an amphibian use perspective. This project intends to evaluate the biotic and abiotic variables associated with instream slash in Type N streams. To evaluate how slash changes through time, we propose identifying study sites representing various stand ages and time since harvest that could be used in a chronosequence study of slash characteristics. To evaluate how amphibian use of slash changes through time, we propose the additional inclusion of study sites where baseline data for amphibian densities already exists (i.e., Type N Study sites).

Project Critical Questions:

- What are the physical characteristics and functions of accumulations of instream slash through time?
- How does amphibian use of reaches with accumulations of instream slash vary through time?

Status:

This project has not been initiated or scoped.

5.2.6.45.2.6.5 **Windthrow Frequency, Distribution, and Effects Project**

Description:

Results of the Westside Type N BCIF Project indicate that windthrow mortality in westside Type N buffers may be common and highly variable. Many land managers have observed this as well. In response to this concern, RSAG included a windthrow assessment into the three major Type N riparian effectiveness projects (Hard Rock, Soft Rock, and ENREP), as well as the Westside Type F exploratory project.

Status:

~~The windthrow results from the two westside Type N studies are currently being considered by the TFW Policy Type N alternative prescription workgroup. Windthrow was also measured in the Westside Type F Riparian exploratory study, and will be further incorporated into the Effectiveness study, which is currently being designed. The 2005 DFC study recommended developing a study on windthrow. TFW Policy recommended integrating a windthrow element into other CMER projects rather than conducting a windthrow-specific study. RSAG proposed has begun scoping a project to build a metadatabase of existing windthrow data from previous and ongoing CMER and DNR projects. This project is queued to use any available unspent funds. This is anticipated to make use of data from BCIF, the two Type N Effectiveness studies, the FPA Field Check study, and the Type F Exploratory study.~~

5.2.6.55.2.6.6 **Program Strategy (Eastside)**

The purpose of the eastside program is to evaluate Type N riparian management prescriptions, including response of riparian vegetation, growth and mortality of buffer trees, level of riparian functions provided, biotic and water quality responses to prescriptions (both within the Type N system and in downstream fish-bearing waters), and the prescriptions' effectiveness in achieving performance targets and meeting water quality standards. Critical questions for this program, along with the projects designed to answer them, are shown in Table 12.

The Eastside Type N Forest Hydrology Project developed by SAGE ~~contains~~ led to a series of follow-up studies that will examine eastern Washington headwater streams with the final intent of effectiveness

Formatted: Justified, Indent: Left: 0", Right: 0"

Commented [JM57]: This has not been decided. RSAG is not currently designing an effectiveness study. I would delete the highlighted sentences.

Commented [AT58R57]: Edited

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Commented [H(59)]: As currently worded, this indicates that ENREP is part of the E WA Forest Hydrology Project, which in turn means that the Hydrology Project has not yet been completed (re: 1st bullet in 5.2.6.7 below).

Commented [TA(60R59)]: Todd clarified that ENREP is part of Eastside Type N Forest Hydrology Project

monitoring. Given the importance of flow as a transport mechanism between non- fish-bearing and fish-bearing streams and the unique functions these streams exhibit, SAGE, through the ENREP study, decided that determining the hydrology of Type N streams would be the first step in laying the groundwork for additional studies. By understanding forest hydrology, we will better understand spatially intermittent reaches and where they are likely to occur across eastern Washington, thus providing additional information to help correctly delineate the Type Np/Ns break.

The ENREP study will help determine if, and to what extent, the prescriptions found in the Type N Riparian Prescriptions Rule Group and/or a related commonly applied prescription affording more protection than the current rules require (i.e., full-length two-sided 50-foot no-cut RMZs) are effective in achieving performance targets and water quality standards, particularly as they apply to sediment and stream temperature in eastern Washington. ENREP moved forward into implementation, so the TWIG group has converted into an active project team.

Table 12. Type N Riparian Effectiveness Program – Eastside: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions		Project Names	SAG
How do survival and growth rates of riparian leave trees change following Type Np buffer treatments?		Eastside Type N Buffer Characteristics, Integrity and Function (BCIF) Project	RSAG
Are riparian processes and functions provided by Type Np buffers maintained at levels that meet FP HCP resource objectives and performance targets for shade, stream temperature, LWD recruitment, litterfall, and amphibians?		Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness Project (ENREP)	SAGE
Are riparian processes and functions provided by the Type Ns Equipment Limitation Zone maintained at levels that meet FP HCP resource objectives and performance targets for stream temperature and sediment delivery?		Eastside Type Ns Intermittent Streams Project (ENSP)	
Program Research Questions	<i>What are the characteristics of eastern Washington Type N stream channels and riparian areas and how do they vary across eastern Washington?</i>	Eastside Type N Forest Hydrology Project	SAGE
	<i>Do different types of Type N channels explain the variability in the response of Type N channels to forest practices?</i>	Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness Project	
What is the effect of buffering or not buffering spatially intermittent stream reaches in Type Np streams?		Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness Project	SAGE TWIG
How do the Type N riparian prescriptions affect water quality delivered to downstream Type F/S waters?		No projects yet scoped	SAGE
Are forest practices riparian prescriptions effective at protecting groundwater flow and temperature?		No projects yet scoped (see Groundwater Conceptual Model Project)	UPSAG RSAG SAGE WetSAG

Commented [JM61]: Performance targets should be included where they exist. Perhaps add a column to the critical questions tables.

Formatted: No Spacing, Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Commented [H(62): Not necessarily "completed", depending on one's reading of the eastside strategy at 5.2.6.6 abv.

Commented [TA(63R62): Todd confirmed it has been completed, but led to ENREP (currently active). Clarified language above.

5.2.6.7 Completed Projects (See Appendix X for details)

- [Eastside Type N Forest Hydrology Project \(FHS\)](#)

• [Literature Review and Synthesis Related to the Salvage of Fire Damaged Timber](#)

5.2.6.6.5.2.6.8 Eastside Type N Buffer Characteristics, Integrity, and Function (BCIF) Project

Description:

The Eastside Type N Buffer Characteristics, Integrity, and Function (BCIF) Project, managed by RSAG, is designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the eastside Type N riparian prescriptions, including survival of buffer leave trees, stand condition and trajectory over time, and changes in riparian functions, including shade, LWD recruitment, and stream-bank protection. RSAG proposes to examine a random sample of eastside Type N riparian FPAs to evaluate the performance of Type N prescriptions as they are applied operationally over the range of eastside Type N streams.

Status:

RSAG attempted to implement this project in 2004 and again in 2006, but was unable to find an adequate number of study sites because there were very few FPAs where landowners proposed to apply the eastside Type N prescriptions. Most landowners opted to simply stay out of the 50-ft Type N management zone rather than implement the thinning or patch-cut prescription. RSAG documented these findings in a series of memos. Due to the lack of suitable study sites, this study has been placed on hold, [however some of these prescriptions are being included in the current ENREP study under SAGE.](#)

5.2.6.7.5.2.6.9 Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness Project (ENREP)

Description:

The ENREP study will determine if, and to what extent, the prescriptions found in the Type N Riparian Prescriptions Rule Group and/or a related commonly applied prescription affording more protection than the current rules require (i.e., full-length two-sided 50-foot no-cut RMZs) are effective in achieving performance targets and water quality standards, particularly as they apply to stream temperature and discharge in eastern Washington.

[In 2021, TFW Policy and CMER requested the Forest Practices Board establish a pilot rule to allow the study to more effectively test the effect of buffering and not buffering sections of Type Np \(non-fish bearing perennial\) streams that seasonally go dry. One section of one of the available study sites \(Blue Grouse\) was found suitable for testing the effect of clearcutting along a seasonally dry stream segment. This segment of stream, however, extends into the final 500 feet of the Np stream upstream of a Type F \(Fish Bearing\) stream where the rules require a continuous buffer be retained. The Board approved the pilot rule request.](#)

The [original](#) objectives of the ENREP study are: (1) quantify the magnitude of change in stream flow, canopy closure, water temperature, suspended sediment transport and wood loading within eastern Washington riparian management zones (RMZ) following harvesting within current rule constraints; and (2) evaluate the effects of these changes on downstream waters where possible. [The scope was expanded beyond current rule constraints with the addition of the pilot rule site described above.](#)

This study uses a blocked Multiple Before-After/Control Impact (MBACI) design with reaches nested within Type Np basins. Each treatment basin is paired with a reference basin. Data will be collected two-years pre-treatment and at least two-years post-treatment.

Status:

Formatted: No Spacing, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", Tab stops: Not at 0.74"

Formatted: No Spacing, Indent: Left: 0.5", Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Commented [H(64): Ensure this is on RSAG's list even if not currently active.

Commented [JM65]: Why not delete the study?

Commented [AT66R65]: Harry and John to bring to SAGE for discussion at 8/20 SAGE meeting

Commented [AT67R65]: SAGE thinks it should be kept in because some aspects of the BCIF project are not being looked at as part of ENREP.

Commented [H(68): Only std rule Rx and the de facto most common Rx are covered here, with no mention of (or authorization for) Alt' Plans and/or Pilot Rule Rx.

Commented [TA(69R68): Anna to check. Add info on pilot rule (from approved document)

Commented [TA(70R68): See added paragraph, taken from pilot rule request.

Formatted: Justified, Indent: Left: 0", Right: 0"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Right: 0"

Commented [AT71]: This language matches the scoping doc and charter but the exact wording is different from what's in the study design. Review with SAGE to confirm what wording to use.

Commented [H(72R71): They have clearly expanded beyond "within current rule constraints", which appears to have been the approved scope.

Commented [AT73R71]: See above comment - add info on how/why pilot rule was added

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

The ENREP study design was approved by CMER to go to ISPR in November 2016. While the study design was at ISPR, CMER staff evaluated potential sites during the summer of 2017. The design was modified to incorporate site specific information as requested by ISPR and ISPR approved the study design on January 24, 2018. The study design, prospective findings reports, and implementation plan were approved by CMER on March 27, 2018 and project implementation began late summer 2018.

The initial GIS office screening identified 121 Type N basins that appeared to meet study criteria. Of these, landowners identified 26 for possible inclusion in the study. Field reconnaissance of the 26 basins revealed three suitable basin pairs for inclusion in the study, Springdale, Blue Grouse, and Tripps. After these initial basin pairs were identified, two additional basin pairs were located, Coxit and Fish Creek.

At the Springdale and Tripps basins, harvest treatments were completed in 2021. Two years of pre-harvest data (starting spring 2019), harvest year data, and two years of post-harvest data have been collected, have been collected at the Springdale and Tripps basins. Harvest treatments were completed in 2021, and harvest year data has been collected at these basins. Two years of post-harvest data collection are planned for 2022 and 2023. At Blue Grouse, pre-harvest data collection began in 2019. Due to labor shortages and an extremely active fire season in the summer of 2021, harvest was delayed at Blue Grouse, and completed in February 2022. Given this delay, the data collection has captured three years of pre-harvest data. Monitoring was extended at the Blue Grouse basin through 2023 and 2024 to capture two years of post-harvest data.

Due to the two-year delay in locating the Coxit and Fish Creek sites, first year pre-harvest data collection began spring 2021. At Coxit, the harvest treatment was completed in 2023. One Two years of pre-harvest data, harvest year data, and one year of post-harvest data have been collected at this ese sites. At Fish Creek, harvest was delayed due to logistical complications and was completed in 2024. Three years of pre-harvest data and harvest year data have been collected at this site. Harvest treatments are anticipated summer 2023.

In 2024, after assessing some of the data from the two sites that hadve two years post-harvest completed, the Project Team proposed an extension for five additional years of post-harvest data collection (for seven years total) at all sites to gain more understanding of harvest impacts and recovery time on a number of parameters. The extension request prompted extensive discussion at both CMER and TFW Policy. It was decided to extend the monitoring through FY 25 and further extension will be discussed during budget conversations for the next Biennium with a final decision made in Spring 2025.

Commented [H(74): While one site is not necessarily very powerful or very representative, this might give us some idea of whether 2 years of pre-harvest data adequately captures background variability sufficiently for our use in BACI studies.

Commented [TA(75R74): No change needed.

Commented [H(76): Re: previous comment, these 3-yr pre-harvest data sets from two different sites and covering different (though overlapping) time periods is likely more powerful and more representative.

Commented [TA(77R76): No change needed.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Right: 0"

Formatted: Justified, Indent: Left: 0", Right: 0"

Commented [H(78): Suggest replacing this with "achieves", because (a) it is only one rule (ELZ) and (b) we have no idea until the study is done whether this Rx maintains anything other than status quo.

5.2.6.85.2.6.10 *Eastside Type Ns Effectiveness Project (ENSP)*

Description:

The Eastside Ns Effectiveness Project will determine if and to what extent the prescription found in the Type N Riparian Prescription Rule Group for Ns streams in Eastern Washington achieves and/or maintains performance targets and water quality with a particular focus on effects in downstream typed waters. A substantial number of stream channels in the forested areas of Eastern Washington are managed as Ns streams (non-fish-bearing seasonally dry). Some of these channels flow directly into Type F waters (fish-bearing), while others occur directly above the point in the channel defined as the uppermost point of

perennial flow. These channels are not protected by leaving treed buffers, and the effect teon downstream channel stability and riparian functions remains largely untested.

Commented [H(79)]: Replace with "on".

This project's objective is to develop a literature review. The review will inform a field study to examine the effect of applying the Ns rules on the Type Np and Type F waters lying downstream.

Project Critical Questions:

The literature review seeks to answer the following critical questions:

- To what extent does applying the Eastern Washington Type Ns riparian prescriptions affect the water quality, quantity, and stream channel stability of downstream Typed waters?
- To what extent if any does not buffering Ns stream channels decrease the base-flow or increase magnitude or frequency of scouring flows in downstream Typed waters?
- To what extent if any does not buffering Ns stream channels increase water temperature, turbidity, or sediment in downstream Typed waters?
- To what extent, if any, does not buffering Ns streams affect the amount of channel stabilizing wood, and is there evidence this leads to changes in channel stability or sediment production and routing to downstream typed waters?

Status:

Not currently being scoped. Study design development is planned following the ENREP study.

5.2.7 Type N Amphibian Response Program (Effectiveness)

5.2.7.1 Program Strategy

The restricted distribution of stream-associated amphibians (SAAs) and the lack of information about them required development of an amphibian response strategy that differs from that of many other rule groups or programs. The Type N Amphibian Response Program began with development of tools needed to implement the Type N buffer rule for sensitive sites (i.e., methods for identifying and characterizing SAA sensitive sites) and procedures to detect and determine the relative abundance of SAAs for monitoring purposes. During this time, other projects were undertaken that were designed to determine critical monitoring questions for some species (i.e., tailed frog literature review and meta-analysis) or to answer species-specific L-1 questions (i.e., related to Dunn's and Van Dyke's salamanders). This program is administered by LWAG. This program is ranked third among the 16 CMER programs.

The uneven abundance and distribution of SAAs limit study options for the amphibian response program. LWAG determined that an extensive monitoring project for SAAs would not provide useful information for the AMP, and the uneven distribution of SAAs prevented effective integration with other monitoring projects. LWAG concluded that any monitoring program must focus on those physical factors (e.g., geology) that appear to affect SAA distribution, abundance, and response to timber harvest (i.e., the Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project in Hard Rock Lithologies).

The purpose of this program is to address critical questions about the response of SAAs to forest practices, particularly the Type N riparian prescriptions. Many uncertainties exist about SAAs' distribution, life history, habitat-utilization patterns, and population dynamics. Uncertainties also exist on the effects of forest practices on SAA habitats and the response of SAA populations to these changes. Consequently,

the Type N riparian rule assumes that buffering of perennial Type N streams around “sensitive” sites (sites thought to provide high-quality SAA habitat) will contribute to maintaining the viability of SAA populations. These assumptions and uncertainties have been examined and used to develop a series of sub-questions under the main critical question (Table 13).

Table 13. Type N Amphibian Response Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions		Project Names
Is stream-associated amphibian (SAA) population viability maintained by the Type N prescriptions?		
Program Research Questions	<i>Do SAAs continue to occupy and reproduce in the patch buffers?</i>	SAA Detection/Relative Abundance Methodology Project
	<i>Do SAAs continue to occupy and reproduce in the equipment limitation zone (ELZ)—only reaches?</i>	Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project in Hard Rock Lithologies
	<i>If SAAs do not continue to occupy the ELZ-only reaches, do they re-occupy those reaches before the next harvest?</i>	Van Dyke’s Salamander Project
	<i>How does SAA habitat respond to the sensitive site buffers?</i>	Coastal Tailed Frog Extensive Project
	<i>How does SAA habitat respond to variation in inputs; e.g., sediment, litterfall, wood?</i>	Tailed Frog Literature Review Project
	<i>How do SAA populations respond to the Type N prescriptions over time?</i>	
<i>What are the common findings and inconsistencies in published studies on the effects of timber harvest on tailed frogs?</i>		

Rule Group Critical Questions		Project Names
	<i>What can be learned from a meta-analysis of published data and unpublished data on tailed frogs in managed forests?</i>	Tailed Frog Meta-Analysis Project
	<i>Are published generalizations on the relationship between parent geology and tailed frog abundance correct and consistent?</i>	Tailed Frog and Parent Geology Project
	<i>What are the common findings and inconsistencies in published studies on the habitat associations of Dunn’s and Van Dyke’s salamanders?</i>	
	<i>Does territoriality confound interpretation of SAA relative abundance in relation to specified habitats?</i>	Dunn’s Salamander Project
	<i>How does large wood and decay class affect the distribution and abundance of Van Dyke’s salamander?</i>	Van Dyke’s Salamander Project
	<i>How common are the riparian microhabitats that support Van Dyke’s salamanders and how does harvest under current FP rules effect the persistence of those microhabitats and the species?</i>	
	<i>What are the effects of various levels of shade retention on the stream-breeding SAAs?</i>	Buffer Integrity – Shade Effectiveness Project
<i>Is there an optimum level of shade retention?</i>		

What are the effects of three buffer treatments on SAAs two years post-harvest?	Amphibian Recovery Project Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project in Hard Rock Lithologies
How do SAAs utilize intermittent stream reaches at or near the origins of headwater streams? How do site-specific factors (e.g., streams dominated by ground water) affect abundance and condition of amphibian populations? What is the frequency of occurrence of discontinuous surface flow in streams across the landscape?	Discontinuous Np Project
What is the effect of road-generated sediment on in-stream amphibians?	No current project
What is the effect of fertilizer and herbicides applied as a silvicultural treatment on amphibians? What are the exposure risks of herbicides applied as a silvicultural treatment to amphibians?	No current project
Does the distribution of FP HCP-designated amphibians on FP-managed lands across Eastern Washington warrant inclusion in CMER research?	Eastside Amphibian Evaluation Project
How should changes in detection across soil and air temperature ranges affect use of previously completed studies?	No current project
How do Coastal Tailed Frog populations respond to the Type N prescriptions over time?	Coastal Tailed Frog Extensive Status Project

5.2.7.2 Completed Projects (See Appendix X for details)

- [SAA Detection/Relative Abundance Methodology Project](#)
- [Tailed Frog Literature Review Project](#)
- [Tailed Frog Meta-Analysis Project](#)
- [Dunn’s Salamander Project](#)
- [Buffer Integrity – Shade Effectiveness \(Amphibians\) Project](#)
- [Amphibian Recovery Project](#)

5.2.7.15.2.7.3 Tailed Frog and Parent Geology Project

Description:

Recent studies in managed forests have emphasized the relationship between parent geology, stream substrate composition, and tailed frog abundance. A general hypothesis has emerged that tailed frogs are most abundant in streams on lithologies that produce hard or competent rock (e.g., volcanic basalt) versus those that do not (e.g., marine sandstones). However, a study in Olympic National Park found that tailed frogs were abundant on both marine and volcanic parent material, and a broader regional study, performed in 2008, did not find a clear pattern linked to lithologies. These studies were largely observational and the distinction between geologies was extrapolated from the results. The Tailed Frog and Parent Geology project would test the parent geology hypothesis throughout Washington.

Status:

This project has not been scoped.

Formatted: Indent: Hanging: 0.17", Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: Bullet + Aligned at: 0.11" + Indent at: 0.61"

Formatted: No Spacing, Indent: Hanging: 0.17", Space Before: 0 pt, Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: Bullet + Aligned at: 0.11" + Indent at: 0.61", Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Formatted: No Spacing, Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.13", Space Before: 0 pt, Outline numbered + Level: 4 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: -0.51" + Indent at: 0.11", Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

5.2.7.2 5.2.7.4 Water Temperature and Amphibian Use in Type Np Waters with Discontinuous Surface Flow Project (formerly Amphibians in Intermittent Streams Project)

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.11", Hanging: 0.63", Right: 0", Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Description:

The Water Temperature and Amphibian Use in Type Np Waters with Discontinuous Surface Flow project (i.e., Discontinuous Np project) seeks to evaluate the influence of discontinuous surface flow in Type Np Waters on stream temperature and amphibian use. This project will inform the effectiveness of FP rules for riparian buffer placement on Type Np Waters, including insights on buffer placement to maximize resource protection to support the Overall Performance Goals of meeting water quality standards and the long-term viability of covered species. The scoping of this project will incorporate a synthesis of existing CMER data and relevant published literature. Determining the influence of intermittent reaches on water temperatures and FP- designated amphibian use would provide important information for evaluating the relative benefits of riparian buffers on intermittent reaches, ultimately informing the riparian buffer rule for Type N streams.

Project Critical Questions:

- What is the effect of buffering or not buffering spatially intermittent stream reaches in Type Np streams?
- How do stream-associated amphibians (SAAs) utilize intermittent stream reaches near the origins of Type N (headwater) streams?
- How do site-specific factors (e.g., streams dominated by ground water) affect abundance and condition of amphibian populations?
- What is the frequency of occurrence of discontinuous surface flow in streams across the landscape?

Commented [S(80): Needs updating post scoping

Status:

Scoping **completed in calendar year 2024. LWAG is currently developing a timeline for Study Design development. is currently underway and anticipated to be completed in FY22.**

5.2.7.3 5.4.7.5 Van Dyke's Salamander Project

Commented [H(81): "2"

Commented [JM82]: Is this correct?

Description:

The Van Dyke's salamander, found only in Washington State, is the least studied of the seven Forests and Fish FP-covered amphibian species; it is not adequately addressed by any previous or current study. Conflicting information exists regarding the population viability of Van Dyke's salamander on managed landscapes. This species has a cool-adapted life history, which may make it vulnerable to Forest Practices activities, especially under future probable climate change scenarios for the Pacific Northwest.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.11", Hanging: 0.63", Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: Not at 0.74"

LWAG completed a literature review and assembled occurrence information to inform study design development. Additional effort to address duplicity and poor accuracy in the occurrence database is recommended to support a more comprehensive understanding of the historic distribution. Future work should be considered and a more accurate database of known occurrence information will inform alternative study design frameworks. **Opportunity exists to inform landscape geneflow with existing tissue samples from private, state, and federal partners.**

Project Critical Questions:

- How do SAA populations respond to the Type N prescriptions over time?

- How common are the riparian microhabitats that support Van Dyke’s salamanders and how does harvest under current FP rules effect the persistence of those microhabitats and the species?
- What are the common findings and inconsistencies in published studies on the habitat associations of Dunn’s and Van Dyke’s salamanders?
- How does large wood and decay class affect the distribution and abundance of Van Dyke’s salamander?

Status:

A literature review that also addressed known distribution, was completed in FY 2019. This project has not been scoped.

5.2.7.45.2.7.6 **Eastside Amphibian Evaluation Project**

Description:

Previous CMER-supported research informing the effectiveness of Forest Practices in meeting the Overall Performance Goal of maintaining long-term viability of other covered species focused entirely on managed landscapes in western Washington. The Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Project in Hard Rock Lithologies focused entirely on managed landscapes in western Washington. The reason for this focus is because most FFR-designated FP-covered amphibians have westside distributions, and those with eastside distributions are believed to have little overlap with eastside managed FP landscapes. However, this latter assumption is based on limited coarse-level data available from Washington GAP Analysis modeling. A focused inventory would be required to determine the actual distribution overlap in managed landscapes.

LWAG proposes to conduct a literature review and develop a distribution map overlaying the occurrences of FP HCP -designated amphibians with FP-managed lands in eastern Washington. Two FP-designated amphibians, Coastal Tailed Frog and Rocky Mountain Tailed Frog, are known to occur East of the crest of the Cascades. These products will help inform FP-designated amphibian distribution on eastside managed landscapes as well as priorities for future CMER work. The Eastside Amphibian Evaluation Project is a relatively simple occupancy study being considered to address the distribution of FFR-designated amphibians, to determine if their distribution on eastside managed landscapes deserves larger study attention. The study would incorporate the probability of detection to ensure accurate occupancy descriptions across the eastside FFR landscape. Note: This project is listed under Type N Amphibian Response Program, but its assessment may encompass at least some of the Type F landscape.

Project Critical Questions:

- Does the distribution of FP-designated amphibians on FP-managed lands across Eastern Washington warrant inclusion in CMER research?

Status:

This project is under consideration and has not yet been scoped.

5.2.7.55.2.7.7 **Coastal Tailed Frog Extensive Status Project**

Description:

The proposed Coastal Tailed Frog Extensive Status project is motivated by the negative response to harvest of Coastal Tailed Frog observed in the Type N Hard Rock project at the headwater sub-basin

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.13", Outline numbered + Level: 4 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 6 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: -0.51" + Indent at: 0.11"

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0", Outline numbered + Level: 4 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 6 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: -0.51" + Indent at: 0.11"

(harvest unit) scale 7- and 8- years post-harvest. A broader, landscape-scale assessment of Coastal Tailed Frog occupancy across the landscape will provide insight into the current status of this FP-designated species. This project would build on previous CMER work including a literature review on the species completed in 2015, baseline genetic neighborhood effort to explore population bottlenecking conducted in 2006-2008 as a part of the Type N Hard Rock project, and the stream-associated amphibian response data from the Type N Hard Rock project. Improved genetic analysis tools are available to evaluate Coastal Tailed Frog status for both long-term Type N Hard Rock Study sites and at broader spatial scales greater than individual Type N basins.

Project Critical Question

- How do Coastal Tailed Frog populations respond to the Type N prescriptions over time?

Status:

This project has not been initiated or scoped.

5.2.8 Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring Program

5.2.8.1 Program Strategy

The purpose of the Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring Program is to provide data needed to evaluate landscape-scale effects of implementing forest practices riparian prescriptions. This information will inform State and Federal regulatory agencies whether the forest practices rules can meet Clean Water Act requirements and riparian resource objectives at the landscape level. Knowing what is on the landscape is also important to help CMER prioritize, plan, conduct, and interpret other CMER studies and monitoring work. It would aid in making decisions about where best to focus CMER research efforts and answer questions about the scope of inference and importance of study findings. Critical questions for this program are shown in Table 14.

An extensive temperature and riparian conditions effort was initiated in 2007-8. The projects of that program were designed to obtain an unbiased estimate of the distribution of stream temperature and shade and of riparian stand characteristics on streams across FP HCP lands and, with resampling, the projects were intended to identify trends in these indicators. Those projects were stratified by the east and west portions of the state and by F and N stream types. That effort was discontinued after the first sampling event when CMER recommended to Policy to pursue remote sensing techniques as an alternative to field-based data collection.

After discussions evaluating the results from the initial effort, “Policy directed RSAG to consider high-level options for how to move forward on extensive monitoring as well as options for other extensive studies. This should include perspectives considering the past and future as well as existing technologies. RSAG should also consider other monitoring approaches to landscape-level performance.” (July 11, 2013 Policy meeting notes). RSAG was asked by CMER and the TFW Policy Committee to provide a “high level” assessment of using remote sensing and other tools to implement projects within this program. In response to the Policy request, RSAG moved forward with projects that would investigate the utility and cost- effectiveness of using remote sensing technology (i.e., LiDAR, aerial, and satellite imagery) for assessing the status and trends of riparian stand conditions and functions across all HCP lands. The RSAG investigations to date have provided a good understanding of the availability, feasibility, limitations and relative cost for using some of the newer remote sensing technologies to conduct

Commented [H(83): (RSAG item.) Gen'l format and logical note: This item does not belong in 5.2 or 5.3, and should be moved to a newly designated (major - 5.x) section for projects that include both F and N waters/RMZs (and I suggest making 5.4 into such a section).

Commented [T(84R83): For CMER from RSAG: Please consider this suggestion.

extensive (status and trends) monitoring. Policy [communicated their extensive monitoring priorities to CMER, and CMER is furthering the development of the program, including are currently working together to develop specific research questions that will address Policy's priorities,](#)² [that will provide RSAG direction on how to proceed with future projects in this program.](#)

Table 14. Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions*		Project Names
What is the current status of riparian conditions and the HCP-specified functions in and along Type F/N streams on a statewide scale, and how are conditions changing over time?		
Program Research Questions*	<i>What is the distribution of maximum summer stream temperature and 7-day mean maximum daily water temperature on FP HCP lands, and how is the distribution changing over time as the forest practices prescriptions are implemented?</i>	
	<i>What proportion of stream length, at the landscape scale, on FP HCP lands meets specific benchmarks for water temperature, and is this proportion changing over time as the forest practices prescriptions are implemented?</i>	Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring – Temperature, Type F/N Westside
	<i>What are current riparian stand attributes on FP HCP lands, and how are stand conditions changing over time as the forest practices prescriptions are implemented?</i>	Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring – Temperature, Type F/N Eastside
	<i>* The Program Research Questions are currently being reviewed as part of the development of the Scoping and BAS Documents, which are scheduled for review and approval through RSAG, CMER, and Policy by early 2025.</i>	Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring – Vegetation, Type F/N West/Eastside Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring Program – Riparian Vegetation and Stream Temperature
How does stream shading change with buffer width and intensity of management across a range of stand types and characteristics in Washington?		
Program Research Question	<i>How does stream shading change with buffer width, stand conditions, and treatments (e.g., basal area, density, age, height, and thinning)?</i>	Riparian Characteristics and Shade Response Study

* Currently being developed as a joint Policy/CMER effort.

5.2.8.2 Completed Projects (See Appendix X for details)

- [Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring – Temperature, Type F/N Westside \(Initial Status Effort\)](#)
- [Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring – Temperature, Type F/N Eastside \(Initial Status Effort\)](#)

5.2.8.2.2

² Memo to CMER from Saboor Jawad (AMPA), April 19, 2022.

Commented [AT85]: Anna/Alexander: add footnote referencing memo from Saboor to CMER April 2022

Commented [JM86]: Currently RSAG is working on the BAS and scoping document. This should be discussed in the work plan.

Commented [AT87R86]: Include in status section

Commented [JM88]: RSAG was asked to discuss 5.5.7.1 by UPSAG.

Commented [AT89R88]: Discussed at RSAG 9/11. No clear nexus to RSAG's current work.

Commented [JM90]: Should section 5.5.7.1 be included here?

Commented [TA(91R90)]: See comment above.

Formatted Table

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Not Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.07", Right: 0.1", Space Before: 7.95 pt

Commented [JM92]: We should look at the landscape not just where prescriptions are implemented.

Commented [TA(93R92)]: Can be addressed at a later time and/or in project research questions.

Formatted: Right: 0.1", Space Before: 7.95 pt

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.07", Right: 0.1"

Commented [P(94)]: New questions developed in Scoping and reviewed by RSAG

Commented [T(95R94)]: Pending RSAG, CMER, and Policy approval. RSAG not in consensus with including these questions in the workplan at this time, until they are approved by RSAG.

Commented [P(96R94)]: RSAG intends to review and approve these critical questions in their October meeting. If approved, they will provide to CMER for CMER approval. If CMER approved include in work plan.

Commented [T(97R94)]: Draft questions not included. See added comment about questions being in review/approval process.

Commented [JM98]: Why is this repeated three times?

Commented [TA(99R98)]: These are three different projects (Temp Westside, Temp Eastside, Vegetation)

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Commented [TA(100)]: RSAG parking lot: For RSAG

Commented [TA(101)]: For CMER: RSAG suggests R

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Italic

Formatted

Formatted

5.2.8.3 Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring – Vegetation, Type F/N Westside and Eastside Projects

Description:

This effort is currently undergoing further development. The Type F/N eastside and westside studies are expected to be performed concurrently. These projects will assess riparian conditions in Type N, F, and S stream reaches across FP HCP lands in the state in order to estimate conditions statewide. The method(s) of sampling has yet to be determined. The vegetation assessment component will consider the recommendations from the Extensive Riparian Vegetation Monitoring – Remote Sensing Pilot Study that was completed in the Mashel River Watershed by the Precision Forestry Cooperative (PFC) at the University of Washington. The feasibility of using the same sites used in the Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring temperature study will be investigated.

Status:

In 2006 a pilot study evaluated the accuracy of deriving riparian stand metrics from different scales of aerial photos compared to stand data from ground surveys. The contractor concluded that large-scale aerial custom photography could meet riparian assessment needs if combined with other remote sensing (e.g., Lidar) to accurately locate streams. Further study to evaluate the utility and cost effectiveness of using other remote sensing technology including satellite imagery was recommended, but no new work was planned in 2006.

A literature synthesis was completed by the PFC at the University of Washington in June of 2015. PFC reviewed articles on the use of remote sensing to evaluate the cost and value of various remote sensing tools to quantify 13 riparian forest metrics. This literature review was specifically requested by Policy in March of 2015 to inform decision-makers on what remote sensing methods they may want to test in a pilot project.

The purpose of that first pilot project was to determine if remote sensing can be used in conjunction with traditional field work to accomplish the purposes established in the CMER Work Plan and the Monitoring Design Team report (MDT 2002) for extensive status and trend vegetation analysis. This project looked at riparian vegetation on all stream types—S, F, Np and Ns—and all ownerships in the Mashel watershed under the "Extensive Riparian Vegetation Monitoring - Remote Sensing Pilot Study Agreement No. IAA 16-205". CMER and Policy approved this pilot project for riparian extensive vegetation monitoring, which began in November of 2015 and was completed in July of 2017. Scoping for a second pilot, the Extensive Riparian Vegetation Monitoring Implementation Pilot Study, was completed by PFC in June of 2018. This study was intended to explore the feasibility of applying the methodology and model to other regions of the state and provide a better understanding of remote sensing data availability, cost, and recommendations for how to implement an inventory of riparian vegetation conditions across FP HCP lands in Washington State. The scoping document and prospective findings report were delivered to Policy in 2019.

The key component of this study was to test the transferability of forest inventory models developed in the Mashel watershed to other watersheds. Although the original intent was to implement this pilot in eastern Washington and then the northwest coast, an opportunity arose to test it using existing field data from the Olympic Experimental Study Forest. The transferability of Mashel models to predict DBH, basal area, and stand density were tested using forest inventory plot data that was collected by DNR in the

Commented [JM102]: This should be a landscape scale not a reach scale study.

Commented [TA(103R102): Addressed in active ExMo project (5.2.8.4)

Olympic Experimental State Forest (OESF). The final report was approved by CMER in January of 2020 and was presented to Policy in May of 2020.

Based on this previous work, RSAG and CMER developed and approved a Status and Trends Strategy and presented it to Policy in October of 2019. CMER has requested that Policy provide direction on the priority questions that need to be addressed prior to beginning any additional Extensive Status and Trends projects. A joint CMER/Policy workshop was held on extensive monitoring methods and efforts in use by other entities to help inform how to advance the FP Adaptive Management Program efforts. Further action on implementation depends on the outcome of ongoing CMER and Policy deliberations (see 5.2.8.4).

5.2.8.4 Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring Program – Riparian Vegetation and Stream Temperature Study

Description:

The purpose of the Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring Program is to provide data needed to evaluate landscape-scale effects and changes over time of implementing forest practices riparian prescriptions. This information will inform State and Federal regulatory agencies if the Forest Practices Rules meet resource objectives of the FP HCP for key aquatic conditions and processes affected by forest practices and Clean Water Act requirements. This program will also help CMER prioritize, plan, conduct, interpret, and assess scope of inference of other CMER studies and monitoring work. The Timber Fish and Wildlife (TFW) Policy committee directed CMER to “develop options for a monitoring program to help determine how stream temperature and riparian functions have changed or are changing in association with the application of the forest practice rules.” (TFW Policy Committee Minutes, March 2, 2023). The objective is to build and maintain a status and trends monitoring program that will evaluate how aquatic conditions, riparian forest structure and functions, and the desired habitat conditions they support, change on a landscape scale.

Status:

A Project Charter was developed by RSAG and the Project Team and was approved by CMER in October 2023. The Project Team is developing a Scoping Document, including a Best Available Science (BAS) Report, with expected completion and delivery to CMER in early 2025.

5.2.8.4.5.2.8.5 Riparian Characteristics and Shade Response Study

Description:

The purpose of this study is to estimate/evaluate how stream shade responds to a range of riparian harvest treatments within and among environments (ecoregions) common to commercial forestlands covered under the Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan (FPHCP). This study will use a before/after empirical research approach based on a two-factor experimental design to estimate stream shade response to different riparian buffer configurations. The two factors to be examined are: 1) stream-adjacent no-harvest zone width and 2) adjacent-stand harvest intensity.

Results from this study will help the Adaptive Management Program interpret and respond to ongoing and future monitoring studies that directly test both shade and temperature, and will provide information about how well alternative riparian buffer prescriptions meet shade targets. Four study alternatives were identified in the approved scoping document and presented to the TFW Policy Committee. In November 2018 Policy directed CMER to develop a study design based on CMER’s preferred alternative.

Commented [AP104]: Below materials from Charter and Scoping

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Italic, Underline

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Formatted: Font: Not Italic, No underline

Formatted: Font: Not Italic, No underline

Formatted: Font: Not Italic, No underline

Formatted: Font: Not Italic, No underline

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, No underline

Formatted: Normal, Justified, Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: No Spacing, No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Commented [AT105]: This language was updated in CY23 PSS

Commented [JM106]: I would recommend just using ecoregions.

Commented [TA(107R106)]: Change made

Commented [AT108]: Does not seem to be a relevant part of the description. Delete or move to "Status"

Commented [TA(109R108)]: Moved to status

Status:

Four study alternatives were identified in the approved scoping document and presented to the TFW Policy Committee. In November 2018 Policy directed CMER to develop a study design based on CMER's preferred alternative. A project ~~Scoping Document~~ charter was approved by Policy in November 2019. The Study Design was approved by ISPR January 2022, and approved by CMER on March 22, 2022. A field trial was conducted summer 2022 to validate the field methods, logistics, analytical work flow, and to enable refinement of the study cost estimates. Two project sites in the Northwest Coast ecoregion were implemented in summer 2024. Additional sites will be identified for implementation in summer 2025. It is anticipated that two sites per year can be completed until achieving the specified sample size of 20 sites (10 eastside, 10 westside).

Commented [TA(110)]: Anna to check on history/timeline.

Commented [TA(111R110)]: See clarification: Project charter (not scoping doc) was approved by Policy in Nov 2019

~~5.2.8-5.2.8.6~~ **Wood Recruitment Volume and Source Distances from Riparian Buffers Project**

Description:

Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan (FPHCP) uses riparian buffers to meet the functional resource objective for large wood recruitment/ habitat complexity. Source-distance curves and volume estimates developed with data from unmanaged forests in western Oregon (McDade et al. 1990) and various wood recruitment models (i.e. FEMAT) were used to design the FPHCP riparian buffers. It seems reasonable to expect that wood recruitment volumes and source distances in riparian buffers consisting of younger stands characteristic of managed forest lands would differ from unmanaged stands or modeled outputs, due to factors such as tree height, species composition, and disturbance in buffers exposed to wind and other disturbances when one or more of many harvest alternatives is implemented in the adjacent stands is harvested. The buffer widths in the FPHCP were based on wood recruitment source distances from a study on mature stands. The stands currently being managed under the FPHCP are predominantly younger riparian stands and there is uncertainty whether the results of McDade et al. 1990 are applicable to younger riparian stands with adjacent harvest over the course of their development. There has been a wealth of wood recruitment work since the 1990s that has improved our knowledge of wood source distances in conditions that tend to be present across HCP lands.

Commented [JM112]: harvested or clear-cut.

Commented [TA(113R112)]: Edits made

Status:

A draft charter of this project was written by RSAG. Similar wood source and wood recruitment work is already incorporated into several other effectiveness projects which include windthrow and wood recruitment elements. ~~RSAG is writing a charter for this project. The charter includes problem statement, objectives, and questions of interest.~~ The degree to which this topic can be answered within or in conjunction with other studies such as the Westside Type F Prescription Effectiveness Monitoring Project and how this work relates to any windthrow investigation (5.2.6.5) are part of the charter and scoping discussions.

Commented [JM114]: This section needs to be updated.

Commented [TA(115R114)]: Updated

5.3 TYPE F RIPARIAN PRESCRIPTIONS RULE GROUP

5.3.1 Rule Overview and Intent

The FP HCP recognizes differences in riparian systems and processes between eastern (eastside) and western (westside) Washington. However, though the Type F riparian rules prescribe different protection strategies for eastern and western Washington riparian management zones (RMZs), they also share some basic characteristics. The common characteristics are RMZs equal in width to a site-potential tree height and divided into three zones: core, inner, and outer. All zones are intended to provide key riparian functions, including bank stability, shade, wood recruitment, litterfall, and preventing sediment delivery to streams caused by surface erosion.

The core zone is adjacent to the stream and is a no-harvest zone. The core zone is intended to provide most key riparian functions. The inner zone extends outward from the core zone and is primarily intended to provide additional shade and large woody debris (LWD) recruitment. The outer zone extends the RMZ out to one site-potential tree height.

During development of the Forests and Fish Rules, the protection of bull trout was determined to be an area of special concern because the species was listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) as threatened throughout its geographical distribution in Washington. A main factor contributing to bull trout's threatened status is the degradation of habitat, especially increasing stream temperatures. Bull trout require cooler stream temperatures than other salmonids. The water quality standards in place at the time of forest practices rule development were assumed to be too warm for bull trout. The proposed rule protection strategies for shade and stream temperature were assumed to be more at risk in eastern Washington than in western Washington because of the potential for more shade removal from within eastside RMZs, combined with warmer eastside air temperatures. Therefore, an additional shade rule to be applied within the bull trout habitat overlay (BTO) was prescribed for eastern Washington riparian rules in order to provide adequate stream temperature protection for bull trout (see section below on eastside Type F rules for further details). The additional shade rule does not apply to western Washington.

The specific rule protection strategies for western and eastern Washington are described separately in the sections below.

Westside Type F Rules:

The FFR described the goal of the riparian strategies for westside Type F (fish-bearing) streams as follows:

“Riparian silvicultural treatments and conservation measures that are designed to result in riparian conditions on growth and yield trajectories towards what are called ‘desired future conditions.’ As used in this report, desired future conditions are the stand conditions of a mature riparian forest, agreed to be 140 years of age (the midpoint between 80 and 200 years) and the attainment of resource objectives.... These desired future conditions are a reference point on the pathway to restoration of riparian functions, not an endpoint of riparian stand development.”

The western Washington Type F riparian rules are based upon the following assumptions:

- The desired future condition (DFC) basal area targets adequately describe mature riparian forest conditions (140 years old).

- Stands meeting the DFC targets will provide the aquatic habitat conditions needed to achieve functions and to meet the overall performance goals and resource objectives.
- The growth model used for DFC adequately projects riparian growth and mortality.
- Some hardwood-dominated riparian stands need to be converted to conifer in order to achieve DFC.

Commented [JM116]: Is may a better word in this sentence?

Commented [PA(117R116)]: RSAG 9/12/24, CMER please check if this is already approved language from another AMP document.

Western Washington RMZs consist of three zones, including the following:

1. A 50-ft.-wide no-harvest core zone.
2. An inner zone extending from 10 to 100 ft. beyond the core zone (depending on the site class and stream size) where the timber harvest management objective is to place the combined core and inner zone on a trajectory to grow into the DFC.
3. An outer zone extending beyond the inner zone to the edge of the RMZ where timber harvest is managed to protect special sites and wildlife habitat, and to provide for one site-potential tree height, required by the Federal Services under the FP HCP.

Eastside Type F Rules:

The goals for the eastern Washington Type F riparian rules are to provide for stand conditions that (1) vary over time within the range of historical disturbance regimes; (2) provide riparian functions needed to meet resource goals for fish, amphibians, and water quality; and (3) maintain forest health by minimizing risk of catastrophic damage from insects, disease, or fire.

The eastern Washington Type F riparian rules are based upon the following assumptions:

- The management strategies in the Type F rules will put stands in the RMZ on a trajectory that is within the range of natural variability.
- The defined elevation bands are reasonably accurate reflections of the spatial distribution of historical disturbance regimes and species compositions.
- The management strategies will minimize risk of catastrophic events within the RMZs.
- The management strategies will put stands on a trajectory that will provide the riparian functions needed to support harvestable populations of fish.
- The shade/temperature overlays are necessary to provide stream temperatures that meet the state water quality standards and the needs of bull trout.

Commented [H(118)]: This seems so squishy and vague as to be m/l meaningless. It might have been poorly paraphrased from elsewhere during some previous round of workplan revisions. It also does not seem to be worded logically: A state would be within or outside of a range, and a trajectory could be moving that state toward, within, or away from that range.

Commented [TA(119R118)]: Suggest deleting "that is"

Commented [PA(120R118)]: CMER Please Consider

Commented [H(121)]: Dave S-H called this out specifically in his findings and discussion of EWRAP Phase 2, but others since might have failed to catch this during their reading of the final report.

Commented [TA(122R121)]: No change needed here. For discussion/consideration.

Commented [H(123)]: This is stated here as an assumption. Is it also stated elsewhere as an objective, a goal, or a performance target?

Commented [TA(124R123)]: No change needed.

Commented [JM125]: This implies that there is no riparian function now. What about saying "will maintain and improve riparian function"?

Commented [AT126R125]: Not within RSAG purview

Eastern Washington Type F rules consist of three riparian zones, including the following:

1. A 30-ft.-wide no-harvest core zone.
2. An inner zone that is 45 to 70 ft. wide (depending on site class and stream size).
3. An outer zone between 0 and 55 ft. wide.

The sum of the core, inner, and outer zones approximates the height of a site-potential tree, which varies with site class. Allowable harvest within the inner and outer zones is different for each of three elevation bands, referred to as timber habitat types in the rules. These elevation bands were intended to emulate variations in natural disturbance regimes, variations in species distributions, and other riparian

characteristics. Guidance for selecting RMZ leave trees based on size and species are intended to move riparian stand conditions toward larger trees of fire- and disease-resistant species.

Two shade rules exist for the eastside Type F riparian rule package. The first is the Standard Shade Rule, which defines the amount of shade needed to meet state water quality standards (in place at the time of rule development) using the nomograph in Section 1 of the Forest Practices Board Manual. The second is the all-available shade rule, which applies to areas within the BTO. The BTO is an area defined on a map that depicts the distribution of known and potentially suitable bull trout habitat in eastern Washington. When a timber harvest unit is located within the BTO, all available shade (as determined by a densiometer) must be retained within 75 ft. of the bankfull channel width or channel migration zone (CMZ), whichever is greater. Outside of the BTO, prescriptions fall under the Standard Shade Rule, which can allow for harvest of a portion of shade trees within the 75 ft., depending on elevation and the amount of canopy cover prior to harvest.

The FP HCP assumes that riparian forests managed in accordance with western and eastern Washington riparian rule strategies will provide adequate levels of key riparian functions (providing LWD, bank stability, shade, and nutrients and preventing sediment input to streams) necessary to meet the resource objectives and performance targets outlined in the FP HCP.

5.3.2 **Rule Group Resource Objectives and Performance Targets**

Resource Objectives:

- Heat/Water Temperature: Provide cool water by maintaining shade, groundwater temperature, flow, and other watershed processes controlling stream temperature.
- LWD/Organic Inputs: Develop riparian conditions that provide complex habitats for recruiting LWD and litter.
- Sediment: Provide clean water and substrate and maintain channel-forming processes by minimizing to the maximum extent practicable the delivery of management-induced coarse and fine sediment to streams (including timing and quantity) by protecting stream- bank integrity, providing vegetative filtering, protecting unstable slopes, and preventing the routing of sediment to streams.
- Hydrology: Maintain surface and groundwater hydrologic regimes (magnitude, frequency, timing, and routing of stream flows) by disconnecting road drainage from the stream network, preventing increases in peak flows causing scour, and maintaining the hydrologic continuity of wetlands.

Performance Targets:

- Stream Temperature: Meet water quality standards.
- Shade:
 - In type F and S streams, except eastside bull trout habitat, meet targets produced by the shade model or, if this model isn't used, reach 85–90% of all effective shade.
 - Eastside target is all available shade within 75 ft. of designated bull trout habitat per predictive model.
- Riparian Condition:

Commented [H(127): Those driving the current direction of ETHEP would apparently like us all to forget about the first and second of these three things the THTs are intended to emulate - and to assume (or pretend) instead that the middle one of the three is the only one, or the only one that matters.

Commented [TA(128R127): No change needed

Commented [HB129]: We need a place holder for possible target changes per the HCP L1 review for the HCP protected species. We need agreement on targets or desired future conditions for the public resources that are addressed under the forest practices act but not in the FPHCP. An example of the latter is wetland general health.

Commented [AT130R129]: These will be updated following approval of Schedule L1 changes.

- In westside and high-elevation eastside habitats, riparian stands are on pathways to meet DFC targets (species, basal area, trees per acre, growth, and mortality).
- On the eastside, outside of the high elevation THT the desired future conditions targets are qualitative rather than quantitative~~only the high elevation zone has a desired future condition (DFC)~~; and current stands on pathways to achieve eastside condition ranges for each habitat series.
- Pool Frequency: Meet target of less than 2 channel widths per pool.
- Sediment:
 - Mass wasting – target is virtually none triggered by new roads, and a favorable trend on old roads.
 - Timber harvesting-related—target is no increase over natural background rates from harvest on a landscape scale on high-risk sites.
 - Old roads are not to exceed 0.15-0.25 (ratio of road length delivering to streams/total stream length in miles) in the coast (spruce) zone and west of the crest; 0.08-0.12 east of the crest. Old roads are not to exceed 6-10 T/yr (ratio of road sediment production delivered to streams/total stream length in tons/year/mile) in coast (spruce) zone; 2-6 T/yr west of the crest; and 1-3 T/yr east of the crest.
 - Targets include no stream-bank disturbance outside road crossings on S/F streams; less than or equal to 10% of the equipment limitation zone (ELZ)~~and less than 12% embedded fines (< 0.85 millimeters)~~.
- In-stream LWD:
 - Westside – 5% of recruitment potential for stands on the trajectory toward DFC, with additional recruitment from trees in the outer zone. See Schedule L-1 for details on numbers of pieces³.
 - Eastside – To be developed, based on eastside disturbance regimes.
- Residual Pool Depth: See Schedule L-1 for details⁴.
- Stream/ELZ disturbance: No stream-bank disturbance outside road crossings.
- Peak Flows: Westside – target is not to cause a significant increase in peak flow recurrence intervals resulting in scour that disturbs stream-channel substrates that provide actual or potential habitat for salmonids, attributable to forest management activities⁵. Increases in two-year peak flows related to forest management (roads and harvest) are less than 20%⁶.
- Groundwater Temperature: To be developed.

5.3.3 Rule Group Strategy

Uncertainties exist about the validity of the above-mentioned assumptions and effectiveness of the rules to achieve resource objectives and performance targets; this uncertainty leads to a series of critical

³ Details for the number of in-stream LWD pieces are found in the Schedule L-1 version adopted by the Forest Practices Board on 02-14-01.

⁴ Details for residual pool depths are found in the Schedule L-1 version adopted by the Forest Practices Board on 02-14-01.

⁵ From Schedule L-1, Appendix H to Forests and Fish Report

⁶ From Schedule L-1, version adopted by Forest Practices Board on 01-14-01.

Commented [H(131)]: This is not entirely true. In E WA, the (CAPITAL) DFC harvest option is afforded under rule only for RMZs in the High Elevation THT but getting and keeping RMZs within the RNV while avoiding catastrophic loss, etc. is a (lower case) desired future condition, as stated explicitly using this term in the intro paragraph of WAC 222-30-022. It is not as prescriptive, idealized, or specific as is the W WA/High Elevation E WA DFC options.

Commented [TA(132R131)]: For CMER from SAGE: Is there a way to capture the distinction between formal modeled basal area DFC targets mentioned here and the informal “desired future conditions” as described in the intro paragraph of WAC 222-30-022?

Commented [JM133]: Please explain.

Commented [AT134R133]: Language is directly from L-1. RSAG requests clarity in this statement.

Commented [HB135]: It is likely that natural background rates cannot be characterize through time and location and climate changes. Also, rates greater than natural back ground may be desirable for fish. This is a target that needs to be reconsidered and that should be addressed here.

Commented [AT136R135]: RSAG requests this be addressed during Schedule L1 update

Commented [H(137)]: This is not applicable to S/F RMZs in rule (even if it is an official Schedule L-1 Performance Target).

Commented [TA(138R137)]: For CMER: SAGE suggests deleting. The equivalent 30’ is accomplished with a core zone in E WA.

Commented [HB139]: There is good research supporting this rule but we are monitoring embedded fines.

Commented [AT140R139]: RSAG requests this be addressed during Schedule L1 update.

questions and programs to address them (Table 15). The programs include the following:

1. The DFC Validation Program, a rule tool program that addresses the validity of the westside DFC performance targets and the accuracy of the DFC model that is used to project stand trajectory to age 140. The purpose of this program is to validate the DFC approach for management of western Washington, conifer-dominated riparian stands on fish-bearing streams.
2. The Eastside Riparian Type F Rule Tool Program, which assesses current riparian stand and stream conditions on Type F streams across the eastside to provide a baseline for effectiveness monitoring and for establishing eastern Washington targets.
3. The Eastside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Program, which addresses the effectiveness of eastside Type F prescriptions in meeting riparian functions and resources conditions.
4. The Westside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Program, which addresses effectiveness of the Type F riparian rules in meeting performance targets and achieving resource objectives.
5. The Bull Trout Habitat Identification Program, which is a rule tool program. The primary goal of this program was to develop protocols and/or predictive models for determining sampling efficiency, presence/absence of bull trout, and habitat suitable to support bull trout. Site-specific data on bull trout presence/absence above barriers or habitat suitability would help to identify areas that might be added or removed from the bull trout habitat overlay, as defined in the rule. The work for this program has been completed and no further work is planned at this time.
6. The Hardwood Conversion Program, which addresses uncertainty regarding strategies and prescriptions for managing hardwood-dominated riparian stands by harvesting the hardwood and reforesting the area with conifer.
7. The Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring Program, which documents status and trends of riparian conditions on Type F, S, and N streams on a landscape scale.
8. The Intensive Monitoring/Cumulative Effects Program, which is designed to evaluate the cumulative effects of multiple forest practices on a watershed-scale, and to improve our understanding of causal relationships and the biological effects of forest practices rules on aquatic resources.

Table 15. Type F Riparian Prescriptions Rule Group Critical Questions and Programs

Rule Group Critical Questions	Program Name	Task Type	SAG
Does the DFC model adequately project stand basal area growth to age 140? Do the basal area targets adequately describe mature riparian forest conditions?	DFC Validation Program	Rule Tool	RSAG

- Commented [JM141]:** What about Types S and N?
- Commented [AT142R141]:** Added. See earlier comment that RSAG recommends a separate section for projects that cross multiple rule groups.
- Commented [JM143]:** Why do we need to know the cause?
- Commented [HT(144)]:** Fix break once all edits are done.
- Commented [JM145]:** This table should include performance targets.
- Commented [PA(146R145)]:** RSAG 9/12/24, Should we add a column adding performance targets? This would apply to all similar tables of this type. CMER's thoughts? Alternative, add in a table of performance targets for each rule group on their own for ease of future updating. This table could be hyperlinked to individual targets.
- Commented [PA(147)]:** RSAG 9/12, CMER to consider global change from 'task type' to 'project type'.
- Commented [HB148]:** A single BA target does not characterize "mature stand" diversity that is likely very important for fish. A place holder should for new targets and a study to identify them is needed here
- Commented [AT149R148]:** No change needed; opinions vary on how well the question has been answered.
- Commented [JM150]:** Do we want mature riparian forest conditions every place?
- Commented [PA(151R150)]:** RSAG Parking Lot comment, consider for RSAG science discussion.
- Commented [PA(152R150)]:** Resolve comment when moved to parking lot doc.

<p>What is the current range of conditions for eastside riparian stands and streams?</p> <p>What are appropriate LWD performance targets?</p> <p>Can the shade/temperature relationships in the eastside temperature nomograph be refined?</p> <p>How does stream shading change with buffer width and intensity of management across a range of stand types and characteristics in Washington?⁷</p> <p>Will application of the prescriptions result in stands that achieve eastside FP HCP objectives (forest health, riparian function, and <u>mimic</u> historical disturbance regimes)?</p>	<p>Eastside Type F Riparian Rule Tool Program/<u>Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring Program</u></p>	<p>Rule Tool</p>	<p>RSAG/ SAGE</p>
<p>How can habitat suitable for bull trout be identified?</p>	<p>Bull Trout Habitat Identification Program</p>	<p>Rule Tool</p>	<p>Former BTSAG</p>
<p>Are the Type F riparian rules effective in meeting the performance targets, resource objectives, and overall performance goals of the FP HCP?⁸</p> <p>Are current Type-F buffer prescriptions effective in providing/maintaining fish habitat necessary to support fish populations?</p>	<p>Westside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Program</p>	<p>Effectiveness /<u>Extensive</u></p>	<p>RSAG ISAG</p>

- Commented [H(153)]: Add RCSR to next (Program Name) column as it addresses this question directly.
- Commented [AT154R153]: From RSAG: RCS directly addresses the 4th question in this section. It's currently categorized under Extensive Monitoring Program, but should be included in next column (Program Name)
- Commented [PA(155R153)]: CMER to discuss.
- Commented [AP156R153]: 5.2.8
- Commented [AP157R153]: AP to make footnote indicating this CQ is addressed by RCS. **Change Needed.
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
- Commented [H(158)]: "and mimic historical disturbance regimes", per WAC 222-30-022.
- Commented [AT159R158]: RSAG recommends adding "mimic" per WAC
- Commented [PA(160R158)]: CMER to discuss.
- Commented [HB161]: Where in the HCP are these objectives?
- Commented [AT162R161]: No change needed.
- Commented [JM163]: State the performance targets.
- Commented [PA(164R163)]: See above comment.
- Commented [JM167]: What about extensive monitoring.
- Commented [PA(168R167)]: Made change
- Commented [AP169]: ** Change Needed. CMER has recommended to Policy that the WTF exploratory sites be monitored through ExMo project. *send to JB before completing. Pull from WTF F6Qs
- Commented [HB165]: Use the text from the HCP. This an ineffective open ended question?
- Commented [AP166R165]: RSAG 9/11, leave open for potential CMER discussion. Put in RSAG parking lot. Last question is a 'validation' or 'intensive cumulative' type question, not effectiveness nor extensive.

⁷ This critical question is also addressed by the Riparian Characteristics and Shade Response Study, under the Extensive Status and Trends Monitoring Program, 5.2.8.5

⁸ CMER has recommended to TFW Policy that the next phase of the Westside Type F Riparian Prescription Monitoring Project collaborate with the Extensive Status and Trends Monitoring Program Projects to continue evaluation of study sites long-term.

Rule Group Critical Questions	Program Name	Task Type	SAG
Are the Type F riparian rules effective in meeting the performance targets, resource objectives, and overall performance goals of the FP HCP?			
Will application of the prescriptions result in stands that achieve eastside FP HCP objectives (forest health, riparian function, and mimic historical disturbance regimes)?			
Are both the standard eastside prescriptions and the all-available shade rule effective in protecting shade and stream temperature and in meeting water quality standards?	Eastside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Program	Effectiveness	SAGE
Are there differences between the standard eastside rule and the BTO all available shade rule in the amount of shade provided and their effect on stream temperature?			RSAG
Is all available shade actually achieved with the densiometer methodology under the BTO shade rule?			ISAG
Are forest practices riparian prescriptions effective at protecting groundwater flow and temperature?			
Where and how should hardwood conversion projects be conducted, and what are the ecological outcomes?			Hardwood Conversion Program
What is the current status of riparian conditions and functions in Type F and S streams on a regional scale, and how are conditions changing over time?	Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring Program	Extensive	RSAG
How do aquatic organisms respond to changes in habitat and water quality associated with changes in riparian inputs and functions?			
What are the cumulative effects of forest practices on fish habitat and/or fish populations at the watershed scale?	Intensive Monitoring/Cumulative Effects Program	Intensive	RSAG
How do riparian buffer prescriptions for forest health affect fish habitat and fish populations?			ISAG
Will more frequent drought and flood events, associated with climate change, influence the effectiveness of current riparian buffers?			

Commented [AP170]: Is this still table 15? Double check when completing document review.

Commented [JM171]: State the performance targets.

Commented [PA(172R171)]: See above comment.

Commented [H(173)]: "...and mimic historical disturbance regimes", per WAC 222-30-022.

Commented [PA(174R173)]: See above

Commented [JM175]: Where does fishing and ocean conditions fit into this question?

Commented [PA(176R175)]: RSAG parking lot question.

Commented [PA(177R175)]: Resolve when moved to parking lot.

Commented [JM178]: It will be a challenge to answer this question.

Commented [PA(179R178)]: Move to RSAG parking lot. Resolve when moved.

5.3.4 ***DEC Validation Program (Rule Tool)***

5.3.4.5 ***Program Strategy***

To manage conifer and mixed riparian stands to achieve functions associated with mature stands, the DFC approach requires stand targets that reflect mature stand conditions and a model that can accurately predict the trajectory of young stands to maturity. The DFC Validation Program is administered by RSAG and is designed to address uncertainties about the DFC approach, including uncertainties about (1) how well the current targets reflect mature unmanaged riparian conditions for conifer and mixed stands; (2)

what sorts of habitat conditions will be provided by those mature riparian stands that meet the DFC targets; (3) the accuracy in riparian zones of site class maps used as the basis of the prescriptions and DFC modeling for a given location; (4) how accurately the DFC model predicts growth of riparian stands to age 140; (5) how the residual stands that result from the selected prescription options (and their associated leave tree requirements and constraints) affect future basal area ; and (6) how young stands of different composition, structure and silvicultural treatments and density develop in response to the prescriptions as they mature, and how this affects riparian function. The program consists of several projects designed to answer a series of critical questions to address these uncertainties (Table 16).

In addition to these projects, a component addressing some of these questions was included with the Westside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Exploratory project conducted in 2019 (5.3.7.2). Stand data from forty riparian buffers that included inner zone harvest (after the DFC model predicted excess basal area in the stands) were entered into the DFC model to learn how many remained on trajectory to the DFC targets after harvest and three years of post-harvest exposure. The Westside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Exploratory Final Report was completed and approved by ISPR in April 2024. The report from that investigation is currently in review.

Commented [JM180]: Does this include silvicultural treatments?

Commented [PA(181R180)]: Change made

Commented [JM182]: The report has been approved. We should show the completion date.

Table 16. DFC Validation Program: Rule Group Critical Questions and Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions		Project Names
Does the DFC model adequately project stand basal area growth to age 140?		
Do the basal area targets adequately describe mature riparian forest conditions?		
Program Research Questions	<i>Do the DFC targets accurately reflect stand conditions for mature, unmanaged conifer-dominated west-side riparian stands?</i>	DFC Target Validation Project DFC Plot Width Standardization Project
	<i>How are the westside Type F riparian prescriptions being applied by landowners? What is the effect of various prescription options and constraints on current harvest and projected future basal area?</i>	FPA Desktop Analysis Project
	<i>What is the accuracy of the DNR site class maps in riparian areas, and what factors influence map accuracy?</i>	DFC Site Class Map Validation Project
	<i>Does the DFC growth and mortality model accurately predict the trajectory of westside conifer-dominated riparian stands to age 140?</i>	DFC Trajectory Model Validation Project
	<i>What aquatic habitat conditions are associated with mature westside riparian stands?</i>	DFC Aquatic Habitat Project DFC Plot Width Standardization Projectphb
	<i>How do mature stand structures develop from younger stands in a variety of stand compositions and densities?</i>	Pathways of Riparian Stand Development to Maturity Project
	<i>What growth trajectories and successional pathways are characteristic of hardwood-dominated riparian stands?</i>	Red Alder Growth and Yield Model Project

Commented [JM183]: Should this be removed..

Commented [PA(184R183)]: On retired list.

Commented [JM185]: Should this be removed?

Commented [PA(186R185)]: On retired list.

Commented [JM187]: Should this be removed?

Commented [PA(188R187)]: On retired list.

5.3.4.5 Completed Projects (See Appendix X for details)

- [DFC Target Validation Project](#)
- [FPA Desktop Analysis Project](#)
- [Red Alder Growth and Yield Model Project](#)

5.3.4.3 Withdrawn Projects (See Appendix X for details)

- [DFC Plot Width Standardization Project](#)

5.3.4.4 DFC Site Class Map Validation Project

Description:

The third request from Policy was to prepare a scoping document that identifies and evaluates approaches for validating the accuracy of the DNR site class maps in riparian areas.

Status:

CMER staff prepared a scoping document that was approved by CMER and presented to Policy in the summer of 2006. Policy has not approved moving forward with this project.

5.3.4.5 DFC Trajectory Model Validation Project

Description:

This project will assess the accuracy of the desired future condition (DFC) model in predicting riparian stand growth and trajectory from harvest age to the DFC target (age 140). This project will be designed to validate the DFC model as a tool to predict trajectory to the DFC target for both conifer-dominated and mixed stands.

Status:

This study has neither been scoped nor designed. Development of this study was put on hold pending results from a proposed regional cooperative effort to study growth and mortality in riparian stands. RSAG does not plan to begin scoping on this project at this time.

5.3.4.6 DFC Aquatic Habitat Project

Description:

The purpose of this project is to determine the range of aquatic habitat conditions associated with the stated “desired future riparian stand conditions” at which this program is aiming.

Status:

This study has been neither scoped nor designed. The DFC Aquatic Habitat Project was ranked as a lower priority. Consequently, scoping on this project has not begun, although RSAG proposed conducting this study as part of the DFC Plot Width Standardization Project (Policy rejected this recommendation). RSAG does not plan to begin scoping on this project or implementing the DFC Plot Width Standardization Project unless directed by Policy.

5.3.4.7 Pathways of Riparian Stand Development to Maturity Project

Description:

The purpose of this project is to determine the development sequence of younger stands of various species

Formatted: No Spacing, Indent: Left: 0.13", Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: Bullet + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25", Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

compositions and densities to mature stands. The project is intended to inform management of uneven-aged stands and those of low density or mixed composition. The project is an outgrowth of the DFC Target Validation Project, based on the realization that many young, low-density stands of mixed composition may not achieve DFC on a timeline consistent with policy objectives without some form of intervention. Extensive monitoring could provide better understanding of the development of such stands to identify appropriate management approaches.

Status:

RSAG does not plan to begin scoping this project at this time.

5.3.5 Eastside Type F Riparian Rule Tool Program

5.3.5.1 Program Strategy

The Eastern Washington Riparian Assessment Project (EWRAP) consists of the following studies: Phase 1 and Phase 2 which also includes the Eastside Modeling and Evaluation Project, and the Eastside Type F Channel Wood Characterization Study. Both the Phase 1 and the channel wood characterization study are designed to sample the current condition of riparian and in-stream conditions (baseline conditions) on FP HCP lands. Phase 2 of EWRAP was designed to complete the analysis and answer the remaining critical questions from Phase 1. Included in Phase 2 was the EMEP which modeled the Phase 1 data addressing the rule group critical question, “Will application of the prescriptions result in stands that achieve eastside FP HCP objectives (forest health, riparian function, and historical disturbance regimes)?” By modeling the riparian data collected in Phase 1, SAGE can begin to explore what conditions are sustainable when the current forest practices rules are applied to various stand conditions in eastern Washington.

Uncertainties about the validity of assumptions and effectiveness of the rule led to the critical questions listed in Table 17.

Table 17. Eastside Type F Riparian Rule Tool Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
What is the current range of conditions for eastside riparian stands and streams?	Eastern Washington Riparian Assessment Project – Phase 1 Eastside Modeling Evaluation Project – Phase 2
What are appropriate LWD performance targets?	Eastside LWD Literature Review Project Eastside Type F Channel Wood Characterization Study
Can the shade/temperature relationships in the eastside temperature nomograph be refined?	Eastside Temperature Nomograph Project
Will application of the prescriptions result in stands that achieve eastside FP HCP objectives (forest health, riparian function, and historical disturbance regimes)?	Eastside Disturbance Regime Literature Review Project Eastside Timber Habitat Evaluation Project

5.3.5.2 Completed Projects (See Appendix X for details)

- [Eastside Disturbance Regime Literature Review Project](#)

Commented [H(189)]: Did EMEP truly model application of the prescriptions, or did it just project stand growth based on data as gathered c. 2007 using flawed assumptions about what is/is not allowed under the BTO shade rule?

Commented [AT190R189]: Both

- [Eastside LWD Literature Review Project](#)
- [Eastern Washington Riparian Assessment Project \(EWRAP\)](#)
- [Eastside Modeling Evaluation Project \(EMEP\)](#)

5.3.5.25.3.5.3 Eastside Temperature Nomograph Project (Rule Tool)

Description:

The Eastside Temperature Nomograph Project developed an eastern Washington-specific nomograph using existing data and identified gaps for future study. The study identified site characteristics necessary to produce a better predictive model of stream temperatures in eastern Washington.

Status:

The report was reviewed by SAGE and CMER and was not accepted as an approved project because technical shortcomings were identified. The document was [retired to the file completed](#) with comments noted. The data used in the analysis have been obtained and archived for potential future use and analysis.

5.3.5.35.3.5.4 Eastside Timber Habitat Evaluation Project (ETHEP) (Rule Tool)

Description:

Washington’s Forest Practices Rules for non-federal forestlands in eastern Washington use a Timber Habitat Type (THT) system to apply riparian rule prescriptions along fish-bearing (Type S and Type F) [and perennial non-fish-bearing \(Np\) streams](#) (WAC 222-30-022). This system defines THTs according to three elevation zones: Ponderosa Pine (<2500 feet), Mixed Conifer (2500-5000 feet), and High Elevation (>5000 feet). Riparian harvest rules vary by THT, with specific leave tree requirements intended to emulate natural disturbance regimes that promote forest health and provide riparian functions.

There is uncertainty about the scientific basis underlying the THT rules. Results from Phase I and II of the Eastern Washington Riparian Assessment Project (EWRAP) support the concern over the accuracy of the THT divisions and if they are the appropriate framework for applying riparian prescriptions. Further study is needed to determine the appropriate framework for applying riparian prescriptions to achieve [Washington Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan \(FPHCP 2005\)](#) objectives for riparian function.

The purpose of this project is to develop an ecologically meaningful and reliable framework for applying riparian harvest rules along Type S and Type F streams in eastern Washington.

Status:

[A Study Design was approved by CMER and Policy. The Project Team has since delivered a Field Data Collection Standard Operating Procedures manual and is collecting field data. Field data collection is scheduled to conclude at the end of the year. Draft Final Report to SageAGE is due June 30, 2025.](#)

~~A scoping document was approved in SAGE in October 2015, but was not reviewed by CMER for movement to Policy due to feedback from subject area experts. A project team was formed in August 2018 to work on an updated scoping document for this project based on feedback from subject experts. A revised scoping document was approved by SAGE September 8, 2020, by CMER in March 2021, and by Policy in June 2021. The Project Team initiated development of the Study Design in August 2021. Due to staffing issues, the Study Design is being finished under contract~~

Commented [H(191)]: Intro says this was part of EWRAP, so why listed separately? Intro also says the E WA Type F Channel Wood Characterization study (5.3.5.5, below) is part of EWRAP, and it is not completed - so is EWRAP really "completed"?

Commented [AT192R191]: Language already included in Completed Projects appendix

Formatted: No Spacing, Space Before: 0 pt, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Formatted: No Spacing, Indent Left: 0.5", Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Commented [H(193)]: Should this be moved out of the Workplan and into the appendix of retired projects?

Commented [AT194R193]: SAGE recommends retiring this project.

Commented [AT195R193]: CMER in agreement. Please move to completed projects list in final formatting.

Commented [S(196)]: This project is slated for completion in June 2025.

Commented [AT197R196]: Just a reminder, no edits needed.

Commented [H(198)]: Add, "and perennial non-fish-bearing (Np)" here before "streams". The THTs apply to both, even though the scope of the ETHEP study was interpreted by the project team as applying only to S/F RMZs.

Commented [AT199R198]: Language added

Commented [H(200)]: The ETHEP proponents and project team seem to have leapt from uncertainty about whether they are appropriate to an assumption that they are not, without ever addressing the uncertainty directly.

Commented [AT201R200]: No edits needed here. Address in report.

Commented [S(202)]: Update when timeline is more certain.

Commented [H(203R202)]: Document the approval of the new study design by SAGE, CMER, and ISPR. Phase 1 is well underway, and work on site selection for Phase 2 has already begun.

Commented [AT204R202]: Jenny to provide updated status language for approval at Oct SAGE meeting

Commented [AT205R202]: Update added

Formatted: Justified

~~with the University of Idaho. The completion date is expected to be in early 2023.~~

5.3.5.4 5.3.5.5 Eastside Type F Channel Wood Characterization Study (ESICCS)

Description:

Characterizing eastern Washington’s Type F streams is important, because information that describes the current status of channel wood and its influence on in-stream habitat conditions is scarce or simply does not exist. ~~information is scarce or simply does not exist that describes the current status of channel wood conditions and that condition’s influence on in stream habitat conditions~~. SAGE has identified three primary problems due to this lack of information. First, the scarcity of data limits the ability to make informed management decisions required of land managers and regulators. Second, a lack of information hinders the ability to address forest health risks (insects, disease, and fire) in upland and riparian forests. Finally, land managers and regulators have little guidance or context to evaluate alternate plans to meet necessary stream and riparian functions.

SAGE believes that better information is needed to determine the appropriate frequency and distribution of channel wood for meeting properly functioning aquatic habitat conditions. In addition, desired channel wood conditions need approximate the historical disturbance regimes.

Status:

Study design was approved by CMER in 2009 to accompany the EWRAP project, but the ESSICS project was removed as a priority due to budgetary constraints. It is unknown whether it will be completed.

5.3.5.6 Eastside Forest Health Strategy

Description:

The Eastside Forest Health Strategy workgroup recommends the development of a research and monitoring strategy investigating active RMZ management approaches that build on current RMZ prescriptions and are designed to balance disturbance resiliency and resource protection objectives outlined in the FP HCP (Schedule L-1 functional objectives and performance targets, Appendix N). Current riparian buffer prescriptions may be appropriate where RMZs are not fire dependent but may not be successful in achieving functional objectives and performance targets across the entire landscape subject to the Forest Practices Rules (FPRs). Determining the if, where, when, and how of additional management, is the responsibility of the Adaptive Management Program (AMP). Given diverse ownership, management objectives and limited AMP funding to test alternative prescriptions, the strategy will likely require a multi-scale approach (site, watershed, landscape) and close coordination with other landowners. Significant public and private funded efforts have been invested in forest health and fuels treatments in eastern Washington, but this emphasis has been primarily on upslope stands and not in regulatory RMZs.

It is generally agreed that the maximum extent of thinning allowed in current eastside RMZ rules are rarely implemented making it difficult to find enough examples to study their effectiveness related to fire and forest health. What we do know based on feedback from a non-random tally of stakeholders (Eastside Forest Health Strategy, Policy approved March 2023) and analysis of existing condition with the results of the Eastside Modeling Effectiveness Project (EMEP), is that overstocked, suppressed and stagnant riparian stands are likely to remain in this condition for several decades. Absent ~~of~~ active management,

Commented [H(206): Suggest changing this so it reads, "information that describes the current status of channel wood and its influence on in-stream habitat conditions is scarce or simply does not exist."

Commented [AT207R206]: Edit made (grammatical clarification)

Commented [S(208): This needs to be updated. Would like to include Rachel in the update of the status and timeline for this.

Commented [TH209R208]: Fix heading number

Commented [H(210R208): Update title to reflect the focus on riparian work. The AMP does not generally deal with upland harvest rules, and landowners already have a great deal of freedom and flexibility in choosing how to manage their uplands - not an AMP issue.

Commented [AT211R208]: SAGE not in consensus to add "Riparian" to title. Not added.

Commented [H(212): Current Rx might also be just fine for RMZs that are fire dependent. We have no idea because to date there has been no real effectiveness or validation work done on this.

Commented [AT213R212]: No edits needed here.

Commented [H(214): Where is this information reported?

Commented [AT215R214]: Citation added

Commented [H(216): Nothing in the rules has prevented landowners and managers from doing PCT work. Responsibility for decisions to forego proactive stand improvement work lies entirely on them.

Commented [AT217R216]: For discussion, no edits needed.

these stands may eventually suffer from insects/disease and fire, which could possibly lead to a catastrophic stand-replacing fire significantly impacting both ecological and monetary values of the RMZ.

The questions discussed by the subgroup fall into one or both of the following categories:

- Research to investigate alternative pre-fire riparian management strategies designed to reduce wildfire potential and improve forest health/fire resiliency and,
- post-fire actions that could help restore riparian function through active management.

The following questions should be considered by CMER/SAGE for guidance when scoping upcoming research:

1. To what degree do the current DNR water Types S/F and Np Rules, when applied to the RMZ, achieve functional objectives and performance targets (See Appendix A) related to forest health and fire resiliency?
2. What are the factors limiting implementation of RMZ prescriptions?
 - a. What percentage of the time are landowners applying current RMZ Rules?
 - b. What are the operational and forest stand limitations for applying current RMZ Rules?
 - c. Are the current RMZ Rules the limiting factor for whether the prescriptions are applied to the RMZ?
 - d. When and under what conditions are RMZs being managed under current Rules.
 - e. Is the primary consideration for entry based on revenue or enhanced riparian function?
3. What variable/variables contribute to wildfires entering the RMZ and how do these factors affect fire behavior within the RMZs?
 - a. Does post-harvest slash management impact the risk of wildfire entering an RMZ?
 - b. How do the fires behave once it enters the RMZ?
 - c. What percentage of landowners are applying PCT to the RMZ?
 - d. Does PCT application in RMZs vary by landowner class?
 - e. How does hydrology and geophysical characteristics (e.g., stream size, valley confinement, soil ~~wetness~~moisture, topographic position) influence susceptibility/risk to wildfire?
 - f. How do PCT, commercial thinning, hydrology and geophysical characteristics (e.g., stream size, valley confinement, soil ~~wetness~~moisture, topographic position) influence susceptibility/risk to wildfire?
4. Are Wetland Management Zone (WMZ) prescriptions applied more often than RMZ prescriptions?
 - a. If so, are there layout and/or operational benefits associated with the WMZ Rules?

If (a) is true, could these be used to modify the RMZ Rules to make them easier to apply on the ground while still maintaining similar stream functions/protections?

Status

In March 2019, CMER approved a proposal by SAGE titled “RMZ Response to Fire in Eastern Washington.” This document outlined a strategy that started with a GIS exercise that identified areas that have been affected by wildfire from 2014 to present and calculated the estimated number of miles of RMZ burned in those fires. The second step in the strategy was to produce an inventory of Alternate Plans that

Commented [H(218)]: "moisture"

Commented [T(219R218)]: For CMER from SAGE: suggested language edit

Commented [H(220)]: "moisture"

Commented [T(221R220)]: For CMER from SAGE: suggested language edit

Commented [H(222)]: Without this addition there is substantial overlap between this and the previous question.

Commented [AT223R222]: No suggested edit at this time. JH suggests addressing this in the Strategy by changing this sentence to: How do PCT, commercial thinning, hydrology and geophysical characteristics (e.g., stream size, valley confinement, soil moisture, topographic position) interact to influence susceptibility/risk to wildfire?

Formatted: Justified, Indent: Left: 0.13"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.69", No bullets or numbering

have occurred within RMZ's in these burned areas. The last step, Step 3, would be to develop a field study to assess the relative effects of pre-fire treatments and salvage or non-salvage activity in burned RMZs. Step 1, the GIS analysis of alternate plans that included salvage logging was exercise was completed in 2019, but no further work has been done to date. As of September/October 2024, CMER staff have been working on a GIS exercise that summarizes burn severity inside RMZ's and outside RMZ's across land ownership categories.

Project Critical Questions:

1. What are the structure and composition of burned RMZ stands in the core and inner zones of the immediately after and 5 years post fire?
2. What are the percent shade immediately after and 5 years post fire?
3. What is the rate of tree mortality, ingrowth, tree breakage/fall and wood recruitment?

Status:

The project has yet to be developed or scoped.

5.3.6 Bull Trout Habitat Identification Program (Rule Tool)

5.3.6.1 Program Strategy

The Bull Trout Habitat Identification Program is a rule tool program. This program was developed to address possible modifications of the bull trout habitat overlay, as defined in the rule. Because knowledge of the current and potential distribution of the species is imprecise, large areas of forestland in eastern Washington may be included in the bull trout habitat overlay (BTO). These areas may result in excessive restrictions and in riparian conditions that do not meet the intent of the eastside riparian strategy. Site-specific data on bull trout presence/absence or habitat conditions were thought to be helpful in identifying areas to add or remove from the BTO.

Two primary tasks have been identified for this program: (1) develop sampling efficiency models and protocols for detecting bull trout; and (2) developing habitat prediction models for helping to make determinations of habitats unsuitable to support bull trout.

This program was originally administered by the former BTSAG. The work for this program has been completed. Because of the difficulty in stakeholder agreement regarding removing areas from the BTO, efforts have moved to comparing and assessing the effectiveness of the two shade rules in protecting and maintaining shade and stream temperature. Results from this effort could lead to modifications of the BTO, in part or as a whole. No further work is planned for this program at this time.

Table 18. Bull Trout Habitat Identification Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
How can habitat suitable for bull trout be identified?	Bull Trout Presence/Absence Protocols
	Bull Trout Habitat Prediction Models
	Yakima River Radiotelemetry

Commented [H(224)]: This step failed to capture all of the relevant Alt' Plan FPAs in these burned areas - not sure why.

Commented [AT225R224]: No edits needed.

Commented [H(226)]: Unlike the previous (c. 2015) effort, the current endeavor is not limited to post-fire salvage issues and is intended to include assessment of how pre-fire Rx influence fire behavior and post-fire stand conditions within RMZs.

Commented [AT227R226]: Edit made

Commented [AT228]: Jenny to provide updated status update for approval at SAGE Oct meeting

Commented [AT229R228]: Update added

Commented [AT230]: For CMER: SAGE suggests deletion. From the earlier RMZ Response to Fire Strategy

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Commented [H(231)]: Add "outer".

Commented [AT232R231]: Consider only if text is not deleted.

Commented [H(233)]: Of the what? Something missing here.

Commented [AT234R233]: Consider only if text is not deleted.

Formatted: Justified, Indent: Left: 0.13", Right: 0.06", Tab stops: 0.38", Left + Not at 0.61"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.38", Tab stops: 0.38", Left

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.13", Tab stops: 0.38", Left + Not at 0.61"

Commented [H(235)]: Where? When?

Commented [AT236R235]: Consider only if text is not deleted.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Commented [H(237)]: AMP strategies are usually not projects or programs. They are approaches to prioritizing and sequencing projects. See section 2.2 for types of research and monitoring covered by the AMP and included in the Workplan. Strategies can be incorporated into the introductory subsections of the workplan, such as 5.3.5.1 above.

Commented [AT238R237]: Consider only if text is not deleted.

5.3.6.2 Completed Projects (See Appendix X for details)

- [Bull Trout Presence/Absence Protocols](#)
- [Bull Trout Habitat Prediction Models](#)
- [Yakima River Radiotelemetry](#)

5.3.7 Westside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Program

5.3.7.1 Program Strategy

The purpose of this program is to undertake research and monitoring to evaluate the effectiveness of westside Type F riparian prescriptions, to compare and evaluate alternative westside Type F buffer treatments, and to validate westside Type F performance targets. The program is designed to address scientific uncertainty about FFR/HCP prescriptions for westside Type F streams, including the following:

- Survival of buffer trees and rates of buffer tree mortality from competition, windthrow, disease, insects, and other factors.
- Post-harvest changes in conifer-dominated westside RMZs, and whether westside stands will remain on trajectory to achieve DFC performance targets.
- Uncertainty about the level of riparian functions provided by riparian stands produced by Type F prescriptions, and whether FP HCP resource objectives and performance targets will be achieved.
- Efficacy of alternative buffer designs in providing riparian functions and meeting resource objectives and performance targets.
- Validity of performance targets for Type F streams.

Table 19 lists the critical questions for the Westside Type F riparian effectiveness program, and identifies specific projects to address them.

Table 19. Westside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
Are the Type F riparian rules effective in meeting the performance targets, resource objectives, and overall performance goals of the FP HCP?	
<p><i>Riparian Stand Characteristics and Riparian Functions</i></p> <p><i>How do the RMZ and no-RMZ harvest prescriptions affect riparian stand characteristics and riparian functions?</i></p> <p><i>How do the characteristics of riparian forest stands and associated riparian functions in areas with RMZ and without RMZ harvest change over time?</i></p> <p><i>Do riparian forest stands in areas with RMZ and without RMZ harvest remain on trajectory to achieve DFC targets?</i></p>	Westside Type F Riparian Prescription Effectiveness Monitoring Project (Phase 1- Exploratory)

Formatted: No Spacing, Indent: Left: 0.5", No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"


Program Research Questions	Physical Stream Characteristics and Processes	
	<i>How do physical stream characteristics and processes respond to changes in riparian functions in areas with RMZ and without RMZ harvest?</i>	Westside Type F Riparian Prescription Effectiveness Monitoring Project (Phase 2- Experimental)
	<i>Do physical stream characteristics and processes meet performance targets?</i>	Pathways of Riparian Development to Maturity Project (DFC Validation)
	Aquatic Biological Response	
	<i>What is the aquatic biological response to changes in riparian functions in areas with RMZ and without RMZ harvest?</i>	
	<i>Would alternative approaches to the westside Type F prescriptions be more effective in meeting FP HCP resource objectives and performance targets, while reducing costs or increasing flexibility for landowners?</i>	Westside Type F Experimental Buffer Treatment Project
<i>Are Westside Type F performance targets valid and meaningful measures of success in meeting resource objectives?</i>	Westside Type F Performance Target Validation Project	
<i>Are forest practices riparian prescriptions effective at protecting groundwater flow and temperature?</i>	Groundwater Conceptual Model Project	

Commented [JM239]: State the performance targets.
 Commented [PA(240R239)]: See above related comment.

Implementation of these projects has begun in a sequence such that each project will help to inform the design and implementation of subsequent projects (Figure 1). The Westside Type F Riparian Prescription Exploratory Study is the first phase of the project in the sequence. This project began (Phase 1) by analyzing information from forest practice applications and GIS data to determine how frequently westside Type F FPAs occur in different management categories (e.g., RMZ inner zone harvest, no RMZ inner zone harvest, site class, stream width). This investigation (Phase 1a) informed the scoping and study design phases of the Exploratory study. The FPA data will also be useful in the study design for the Pathways of Riparian Stand Development to Maturity Project in the DFC Validation Program, and the Westside Type F Performance Target Validation -Project. The Exploratory Study-(Phase 2) is providing information about the status of riparian buffer stands after harvest using several riparian prescriptions and the variabilities associated with both independent and response metrics. Phase 23 will be a prescription effectiveness monitoring project, which when scoped the scoping of which, will consider at minimum a before-after control impact (BACI) study design as one of several possible alternatives is expected to be an experimental before after control impact (BACI) study that will answer questions on the effectiveness of specific current FP HCP prescriptions in achieving resource objectives and performance targets. Once this series of studies is completed, the results will help RSAG decide if there is a need to design and implement further experimental treatment studies to test the effectiveness of alternative treatments that are currently not included in the FFR/HCP prescriptions.

Commented [H(241)]: Insert "(Phase 1a)" here.
 Commented [H(242)]: Delete.
 Commented [H(243)]: Add "(Phase 1b)" here at end of sentence.
 Commented [AP244]: Confirm phase order. PSS refers to this as Phase 3
 Commented [H(245R244)]: The Project Summary Sheet poses "1a" as Phase 1, "1b" as Phase 2, and the Experimental BACI study as Phase 3, er go the discrepancy.
 Commented [JM246]: Remove at a minimum.

Figure 1. Relationships among projects in the Westside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Program.



Commented [PA(247): Make check at end of work plan edits, really fig 1?

5.3.7.2 Westside Type F Riparian Prescription Effectiveness Projects

Description:

The purpose of these studies is to determine how stand conditions respond over time to the Westside Type F riparian prescriptions and to evaluate the effectiveness of the prescriptions in meeting FP HCP resource objectives and performance targets. These projects evaluate both stands where active management of the inner zone has occurred (based on meeting DFC basal area/acre targets) and stands where no management of the inner zone has occurred when the adjacent stand is harvested. The Phase 24 - Exploratory Field Study used an after-impact only approach that focused on assessing riparian stand conditions and selected riparian functions across a range of prescription variants and site conditions. This is providing a large-scale, coarse-level assessment of current riparian stand conditions that focuses on addressing scientific uncertainty about mortality, stand trajectory (DFC), and riparian functions associated with different prescription variants following harvest (see *Riparian Stand Characteristics and Riparian Functions* in Table 19). In this study we investigated buffer stands three to six years post-harvest (After-Impact) in 110 riparian buffers, each using one of eleven riparian buffer variants (out of 24 possible variants). The variants studied were based on those found to be most common in the preliminary FPA analysis (Phase 1a). This study is providing useful information on the status of conditions, but the lack of information on conditions preceding harvest prevents us from directly answering questions on the effects of the harvest. We will utilize results from the exploratory study to estimate the direction and magnitude of change associated with the prescription variants and determine the potential influence of site conditions on riparian stand conditions and functions following treatments to tailor and focus the Phase 23 experimental Effectiveness Project study design. An evaluation of the three-to-six-year post-harvest stand potential to reach the 140-year DFC targets was part of this exploratory study (see 5.3.4.1 above).

Commented [H(248): "three- to six-year"

The Phase 32 experimental study is intended to provide fine-scale assessments of treatment effects for a

select set of prescription variants and site conditions and will focus on the response of riparian stands, riparian inputs (such as heat energy and large wood), channel habitat, and aquatic biota to riparian harvest buffer prescriptions. The study purpose will be to answer the critical questions regarding effects of the harvest prescriptions on habitat conditions. The use of a BACI design ~~will~~would allow us to draw conclusions regarding the effects of the buffer treatments for the selected prescription variants. It will also improve our overall understanding of and decrease scientific uncertainty about the linkage between underlying site characteristics, riparian prescriptions, changes in riparian stands and riparian functions, and the aquatic resource response (habitat, wood recruitment, temperature, and aquatic organisms). This study could be completed in approximately eight years.

Commented [H(249): Is this item still on the table for inclusion?

Status:

CMER assembled a technical writing and implementation group (the Westside Type F Riparian Prescription Effectiveness Monitoring TWIG) and a charter to initiate the scoping and study design process. The TWIG's initial tasks were to review and revise the critical questions for this project, review relevant literature, and develop and evaluate study design options to address the critical questions. In December 2015, Policy approved a "hybrid phased-approach" to answer the critical questions related to Riparian Stand Characteristics and Riparian Functions, Physical Stream Characteristics and Processes, and Aquatic Biological Response.

Phase 1~~a~~ of the scoping and study design ~~phase involved~~included an office review and analysis of forest practice applications and GIS data to determine how frequently different riparian prescription variants were being implemented; regional distribution patterns; and limited information on the characteristics of the sites and adjacent streams where the prescriptions are being applied. ~~Phase~~Step 1 ~~was completed in~~ FY 2016.

Commented [H(250): Suggest delete "phase" (redundant) and change "involved" to "included".

Commented [H(251): Replace with "Phase 1a".

Phase ~~4~~2 included the design and implementation of the Exploratory Study. The Exploratory Study Design was reviewed and approved by ISPR and then approved by CMER in spring of 2018. This study was implemented in 2018-2020 and the final exploratory report was approved by ISPR in April 2024 and CMER in May 2024 is currently in review. The Final Six Questions were approved by RSAG and CMER in August 2024. The Final Exploratory Report Findings Package was delivered to TFW Policy in September 2024.

~~The design of the Phase 2³ study, which when scoped the scoping of which, will consider at minimum a before-after control impact (BACI) study design as one of several possible alternatives an experimental (BACI) study, and will be informed by the analysis and review of the Exploratory Study, is in the preliminary design phase as we complete the analysis and review of the Exploratory Study being used to inform it. Scoping and design of this phase is planned for this workplan biennium.~~

Commented [H(252): Suggest "Phase 2 study".

Commented [H(253): Suggest replacing this with, "which will be informed by analysis and review of the Exploratory Study".

Formatted: No Spacing, Indent: Left: 0", Right: 0", Space Before: 0 pt

5.3.7.3 Westside Type F Experimental Buffer Treatment Project

Description:

The purpose of this project is to test the effectiveness of alternative treatments that are not part of the current FFR/HCP prescription package. ~~RSAG will recommend whether to pursue this project after reviewing the results of the Westside Type F Riparian Prescription Effectiveness Project~~Based on the findings of Westside Type F Exploratory, RSAG intends to investigate alternative riparian buffer/treatments as part of the Phase 3 Type F Effectiveness project described above.

Status:

~~This project has been neither scoped nor designed~~ See Westside Type F Effectiveness study in 5.3.7.2.

5.3.7.4 Type F Performance Target Validation Project

Description:

This project will evaluate the validity of the Type F performance targets and the measures of success in meeting resource objectives.

Status:

This project has been neither scoped nor designed.

5.3.8 Eastside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Program

5.3.8.1 Program Strategy

The purpose of the Eastside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Program is to conduct research and monitoring to evaluate the effectiveness of the eastside Type F riparian rules in meeting resource objectives and riparian functions. The goals of the eastern Washington Type F riparian rules are to provide for stand conditions that (1) vary over time within the range of historical disturbance regimes; (2) provide riparian functions needed to meet resource goals for fish, amphibians, and water quality; and (3) maintain forest health by minimizing risk of catastrophic damage from insects, disease, or fire.

Six rule group critical questions are covered under the Eastside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Program (see Table 20). Four projects are identified to address those critical questions. The BTO Temperature (Eastside Riparian Shade/Temperature) Project evaluated the effectiveness of the two shade rules (the standard shade rule using the nomograph, and the all-available-shade rule within the bull trout habitat overlay) for protection of stream temperature. A companion study (the Solar Radiation/Effective Shade Project) focused on effectiveness of the BTO shade rule for actually achieving all available shade within the bull trout habitat overlay. The Eastside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Monitoring Project (BTO add-on) used the same sites as the Eastside Riparian Shade/Temperature Project and the Solar Radiation/Effective Shade Project to assess changes in stand conditions, buffer integrity, and LWD recruitment. To understand how effectively the forest practices rules protect groundwater temperature and flow, a conceptual model needs to be developed to understand where the areas of sensitivity might be. The Groundwater Conceptual Model Project would provide guidance on where effectiveness monitoring should be focused. Table 20 lists the rule group critical questions and the projects identified to address each of those critical questions.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Commented [H(254): There seems to be a push underway to incorporate this into our other effectiveness studies, or to conflate it with those other studies. The upcoming experimental phase of the Westside F Prescription Effectiveness Study is an example. Should this merging be formalized rather than Alt' Rx entering the other studies "sideways"?

Commented [PA(255R254): RSAG 9/12/24, CMER please consider this.

Commented [TA(256R254): Edits added in 10/9 RSAG meeting to address this comment.

Table 20. Eastside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
Are the Type F riparian rules effective in meeting the performance targets, resource objectives, and overall performance goals of the FP HCP?	Bull Trout Overlay [BTO] Temperature (Eastside Riparian Shade/Temperature) Project Solar Radiation/Effective Shade Project Eastside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Monitoring Project (BTO add-on)
Will application of the prescriptions result in stands that achieve eastside FP HCP objectives (forest health, riparian function, and historical disturbance regimes)?	BTO Temperature (Eastside Riparian Shade/Temperature) Project Solar Radiation/Effective Shade Project Eastside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Monitoring Project (BTO add-on)
Are both the standard eastside prescriptions and the all available shade rule effective in protecting shade and stream temperature and in meeting water quality standards? Are there differences between the standard eastside rule and the BTO all available shade rule in the amount of shade provided and their effect on stream temperature? Is all available shade actually achieved with the densiometer methodology under the BTO shade rule?	BTO Temperature (Eastside Riparian Shade/Temperature) Project Solar Radiation/Effective Shade Project
Are forest practices riparian prescriptions effective at protecting groundwater flow and temperature?	Groundwater Conceptual Model Project

5.3.8.2 Completed Projects (See Appendix X for details)

- [Bull Trout Overlay Temperature \(Eastside Riparian Shade/Temperature\) Project](#)
- [Solar Radiation/Effective Shade Project](#)
- [Eastside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Monitoring Project \(BTO add-on\)](#)

5.3.8.3 Withdrawn Projects (See Appendix X for details)

- [Groundwater Conceptual Model Project](#)

5.3.9 Hardwood Conversion Program (Effectiveness)

5.3.9.1 Program Strategy

The purpose of the Hardwood Conversion Program is to inform the FP HCP strategy for converting riparian stands from hardwood to conifer-dominated. These riparian stands may include a variety of hardwood species, although red alder (*Alnus rubra*) is typically the most common in western Washington. Presence of alder-dominated riparian stands on the landscape is sometimes the result of past forest management practices, which historically did not always include conifer reforestation after harvest.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: No Spacing, Space Before: 0 pt, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Formatted: No Spacing, Outline numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: Bullet + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Table 21 presents the critical questions and projects of the Hardwood Conversion Program. The program began by implementing the Riparian Hardwood Conversion Project to provide information for Policy about the effectiveness of hardwood conversion treatments to regenerate conifers successfully, and about the economic costs and benefits of hardwood conversion. In response to guidance from Policy, a component to examine stream temperature response was added to the project after the silvicultural study design had been adopted.

In spring of 2005, another project was initiated in response to a request from the Small Forest Landowners Advisory Committee that was developing a small forest landowner hardwood conversion template. This group requested information on the effect of hardwood conversion on stream temperature as a function of buffer width and stream length treated. In response to this request, Ecology submitted a proposal to CMER for the Hardwood Conversion Water Temperature Modeling Project. The project was carried out and is described below under Ecology Water Temperature Modeling Project.

Table 21. Hardwood Conversion Program: Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions		Project Names
Where and how should hardwood conversion projects be conducted, and what are the ecological outcomes?		
Program Research Questions	<i>How effective are different hardwood conversion treatments in reestablishing conifers in hardwood-dominated riparian stands?</i>	Riparian Hardwood Conversion Project
	<i>When is hardwood conversion in riparian stands operationally feasible, and what are the economic costs and benefits of the hardwood conversion treatments?</i>	

Commented [HT(257)]: Fix table at the end of editing

Commented [HB258]: Why is there no reference to the HCP species in particular to the food chain benefits of hardwood leaf litter to both fish and amphibians. This should be a new rule group question.

Commented [PA(259R258)]: RSAG 9/12/24. CMER please consider.

Commented [PA(260R258)]: Can we develop another CQ regarding the influence of hardwoods on food web dynamics for covered fish and amphibians under the FPHCP?

Commented [AP261R258]: *Moved to RSAG internal parking lot.

	<p><i>What effects do hardwood conversion treatments in riparian stands have on shade, stream temperature, and LWD recruitment?</i></p>	<p>Riparian Hardwood Conversion Project – Temperature Component</p>
	<p><i>What is the effect of hardwood conversion practices on stream temperature as a function of buffer width and length of stream treated?</i></p>	<p>Ecology Water Temperature Modeling Project</p>

¹In 2011, RSAG decided to terminate the Annotated Bibliography: Riparian Hardwood Conversion. See status update below for explanation.

5.3.9.2 Completed Projects (See Appendix X for details).

- [Riparian Hardwood Conversion Project](#)
- [Riparian Hardwood Conversion Project – Temperature Component](#)
- [Ecology Water Temperature Modeling Project](#)

5.3.9.3 Withdrawn Projects (See Appendix X for details).

- [Annotated Bibliography: Riparian Hardwood Conversion](#)

5.3.10 Intensive Monitoring/Cumulative Effects Program (see Section 5.11)

Formatted Table

Commented [HB262]: We have the opportunity to review this table and the work of DDA to determine what

Commented [PA(263R262)]: Move to RSAG parking lot. Resolve comment when moved.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: No Spacing, Space Before: 0 pt, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Formatted: No Spacing, Indent: Left: 0.5", No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Font color: Text 1, Border: (No border)

Formatted: Font: 14 pt, Italic

Formatted: No Spacing, Indent: Left: 0.25", Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: Bullet + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25", Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Formatted: Justified

5.4 CHANNEL MIGRATION ZONE RULE GROUP

5.4.1 Rule Overview and Intent

The channel migration zone (CMZ) is an area within a river or stream valley where the active channel is prone to move laterally. The intent of the CMZ rule is to maintain riparian forest functions (e.g., woody debris recruitment, bank reinforcement, shade, and litter) along migrating channels, in their present or future location. No timber harvest, salvage, or road construction (except for road crossings) is allowed within CMZs without an alternate plan that specifies the conditions that will provide equal and effective protection of public resources as described in the forest practices rules and the Forest Practices Act.

5.4.2 Rule Group Resource Objectives and Performance Targets

Resource Objectives:

- Same as for Type F riparian prescriptions (see Section 5.3).

Performance Targets:

- Same as for Type F riparian prescriptions (see Section 5.3).

5.4.3 Rule Group Strategy

The strategy for the CMZ Rule Group is to answer a set of critical questions that address uncertainties concerning CMZ delineation and effectiveness (Table 22). The first question arises from the need to identify and delineate the CMZ so that the prescriptions can be implemented as intended. The rule assumes that the CMZ can be identified and that the extent of the CMZ can be consistently delineated by landowners. This assumption has high uncertainty because, although many CMZs are relatively easy to evaluate, their boundaries may be difficult to estimate and delineate depending on the quality of remote sensing data and resolution of geomorphic features in the field. **Incorrect delineation of the CMZ edge results in incorrect placement of the adjacent riparian management zone (RMZ), making the channel potentially vulnerable to losing riparian protection.**

The second question addresses the future patterns of channel migration. **The CMZ rule assumes that mechanisms of past channel migration will continue to occur in the future. Uncertainty exists for this assumption because changes in fluvial processes, and may result from potentially modern land management decisions (i.e., conversion, forest practices rules application) as well as other factors (i.e., climatic drivers and riverine processes, including in-channel wood, sediment, and flow). The interplay of these complex factors could change the frequency and spatial extent of channel migration.**

Table 22. CMZ Rule Group Critical Questions and Programs

Rule Group Critical Questions	Program Names	Task Type	SAG
What field/map criteria allow consistent, repeatable delineation of the CMZ lateral boundaries (“edge”)?	CMZ Delineation Program	Rule Tool	UPSAG
Will the physical processes that drive channel migration change appreciably due to the application of forest practices rules?	CMZ Validation Program	Intensive	UPSAG

Commented [HB264]: Is this speculation, assumption or someone’s opinion. What about the potential benefits of the diversity in shade, large wood, ect. from channel migration changes that wash out RMZ’s? We need a post harvest FPA exploratory study to see how frequently and where CMZ’s have caused substantial loss of or have benefited riparian protection.

Commented [HB265]: With the expected warming climate changes, this assumption is increasingly likely to be invalid. Lower flows may reduce very beneficial channel migrations that could be mitigated by timber harvest.

Commented [H(266R265): From UPSAG: Low flows do not generally result in channel migration, which is usually caused by peak flows. Harvest generally increases peak flows in the short-term, and climate change predications indicate flashier, more intense storms.

Commented [HB267]: What have the annual compliance surveys found out? Do we have a big enough problem?

Commented [H(268R267): From UPSAG: We are not aware of any CMZ monitoring or the results if there is. Agree that this should be investigated further.

5.4.4 CMZ Delineation Program

5.4.4.1 Program Strategy

The purpose of the CMZ Delineation Program is to assess the available methods and criteria for accurately identifying and delineating CMZs. The program will develop materials and procedures to aid field managers in the consistent and accurate delineation of CMZs. The program consists of two projects: the first would provide a screening tool to locate areas with potential CMZs and provide a methodology to accurately delineate their boundaries once located. The second project would assess whether new methods result in accurate and consistent CMZ delineations (Table 23 and project descriptions below). The program is not being actively developed because of its low ranking in the CMER priority list.

Table 23. CMZ Delineation Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
What field/map criteria allow consistent, repeatable delineation of the CMZ lateral boundaries (“edge”)?	CMZ Screen and Aerial Photograph Catalog Project and CMZ Boundary Identification Criteria Project Consistency and Accuracy of CMZ Boundary Delineations

5.4.4.2 Withdrawn Projects (see Appendix x for details)

- [CMZ Screen and Aerial Photograph Catalog Project and CMZ Boundary Identification Criteria Project](#)

5.4.4.2.5.4.4.3 Consistency and Accuracy of CMZ Boundary Delineations

Description:

The 2004 development of revised CMZ delineation guidelines (i.e., Board Manual, Section 2) leaves open questions as to whether new methods result in accurate and consistent CMZ delineations. Although this project has not yet been scoped, it would likely involve ~~remote~~air photo and field evaluations of a sample of CMZ delineations.

Status:

The project is not yet scoped. This issue may be included in the DNR Forest Practices Compliance Monitoring Program.

5.4.5 CMZ Validation Program (Intensive)

5.4.5.1 Program Strategy

There is general interest in learning how the protection and recovery of mature forests in CMZs will influence channel migration rates, aquatic habitat formation, and other functions. These questions could presumably be addressed by field and/or remote-based (i.e., air photos, LIDAR) studies. Such issues have never been elevated among CMER priorities, and thus no studies have been scoped to date.

Table 24. CMZ Validation Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
Will the physical processes that drive channel migration change appreciably due to the application of forest practices rules?	No projects scoped at this time

5.5 UNSTABLE SLOPES RULE GROUP

5.5.1 Rule Overview and Intent

The FP HCP goal for the management of potentially unstable slopes is to prevent forest practices from increasing or accelerating mass wasting (landslides) beyond the naturally occurring rates. The intent of the goal and its related rules is to protect water quality, aquatic habitat, and public safety by minimizing sediment delivery from management-related increases in mass wasting.

The rules as initially written assumed the following: (1) the administrative process of identifying, reviewing, and regulating forest practices on potentially unstable slopes will maintain a naturally occurring rate of mass wasting following forest practices; (2) implementation of the unstable slopes prescriptions will achieve the Schedule L-1 resource objectives of clean water and natural substrate and will maintain channel-forming processes; and (3) implementation of the unstable slopes prescriptions will meet FP HCP landscape-scale performance targets (there are no site-scale targets). The projects in this Rule Group are designed to test these assumptions.

The forest practices rules' default protective measure for potentially unstable slopes is avoidance. The rule protection strategy begins with definition of unstable landforms and the identification of unstable slopes. Based on the Forest Practices Board's recommendation, in 2014 DNR developed and implemented the Slope Stability Information Form to be completed by applicants that propose harvest on or near rule-identified landforms (RIL) and included with their forest practices application (FPA). This form provides additional information on the screening tools used by applicants and includes potentially unstable slopes within and adjacent to proposed forest practice activities. The strategy then is either to avoid the area or conduct a risk evaluation through the State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) process (WAC 222-10-030).

WAC 222-16-050(1) defines "Class IV-special," which includes timber harvest or road construction, on RILs that have been field verified by the department and have the potential to deliver sediment or debris to a public resource or threaten public safety. Section 222-16-050(1)(d)(i) lists the five RIL categories and directs the reader to Section 16 of the board manual where RILs and their criteria are described in detail. The rule protection strategy relies on the ability of forest managers and regulators to recognize and mitigate for unstable slopes within the FPA and approval process. If forest practices are planned on potentially unstable slopes, the FPA process includes a report written by a qualified expert and SEPA review.

5.5.2 Rule Group Resource Objectives and Performance Targets

Resource Objectives:

- Sediment: Provide clean water and substrate and maintain channel-forming processes by minimizing to the maximum extent practicable the delivery of management-induced coarse and fine sediment to streams (including timing and quantity), by protecting streambank integrity and unstable slopes, providing vegetative filtering, and preventing sediments from routing into streams.

Performance Targets:

- Road-related: Virtually none triggered by new roads; favorable trend on old roads.

- Timber harvesting-related: No increase over natural background rates from harvest on a landscape-scale on high-risk sites.

5.5.3 Rule Group Strategy

Table 25 contains critical questions for the Unstable Slopes Rule Group and identifies a series of programs to address them. The initial strategy was to first implement an unstable-landform identification program to address the first two critical questions, and then to design and implement programs for mass wasting effectiveness monitoring and validation and to assess the effectiveness of landform recognition and mitigation at various scales. All effectiveness, extensive, and intensive tasks related to unstable slopes are or will be administered by UPSAG; rule tools are developed by UPSAG, adopted by the FP Board, and administered by DNR.

Table 25. Unstable Slopes Rule Group Critical Questions and Programs

Rule Group Critical Questions	Program Names	Task Type	SAG
What screening tools can be developed to assist in the identification of potentially unstable landforms that minimize the omission of potentially unstable landforms?	Unstable Landform Identification Program	Rule Tool	UPSAG
Are unstable landforms being correctly and uniformly identified and evaluated for potential hazard? How does the rate of landsliding on managed lands compare to an estimate of the natural (background) rate? Are the forest practices unstable-landform rules effective at reducing the rate of management-induced landsliding at the landscape scale? Are the mass wasting prescriptions and mitigation measures effective in preventing landslides from roads and harvest units? Does windthrow on mass wasting buffers (leave areas) increase mass wasting?	Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring Program	Effectiveness	UPSAG
What levels of cumulative sediment inputs are harmful to aquatic resources at the basin scale? How does turbidity associated with contemporary forest practices affect salmonid populations (e.g., growth, survival, movement)?	Mass Wasting Validation Program	Intensive	UPSAG ISAG
Does harvesting of the recharge area of a glacial deep-seated landslide promote its instability? Can relative levels of response to forest practices be predicted by key characteristics of glacial deep-seated landslide and/or their groundwater recharge areas?	Deep-Seated Landslide Program	Rule Tool	UPSAG

Rule Group Critical Questions	Program Names	Task Type	SAG
Are unstable landforms being correctly and uniformly identified and evaluated for potential hazard?			

5.5.4 Unstable Landform Identification Program

5.5.4.1 Program Strategy

The purpose of the Unstable Landform Identification Program is to provide a set of screening tools to identify forested areas containing potentially unstable slopes and to focus field verification activities on potential problem areas, thereby improving our ability to avoid them.

The management strategy for regulating forest practices on unstable slopes consists primarily of an administrative process for identifying and reviewing forest practices on potentially unstable slopes. The main elements of the strategy include defining and screening unstable slopes and improving the FPA classification process. The success of the management strategy for unstable slopes is dependent on early recognition of potentially unstable slopes by forest managers to avoid or mitigate the hazards posed by them. The projects in this program are specifically referenced in the FP HCP as necessary for implementing forest practices that meet resource objectives.

This program consists of the five projects below, which provide statewide information on the distribution of unstable landforms. Because the projects develop screening tools that are used for information only and not as regulatory tools, program results to date have not required Policy action. Four projects have been completed and the fifth project is on hold (Table 26).

Table 26. Unstable Landform Identification Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names	Status
What screening tools can be developed to assist in the identification of potentially unstable landforms that minimize the omission of potentially unstable landforms?	Shallow Rapid Landslide Screen for GIS Project (westside completed, eastside not completed)	Partially-Phase 1 and 2 completed, Phase 3 withdrawn
	Technical Guidelines for Geotechnical Reports Project	Completed
	Regional Unstable Landforms Identification Project (RLIP)	Completed
	Landform Hazard Classification System and Mapping Protocols Project	Completed
	Landslide Hazard Zonation Project	On hold Withdrawn

5.5.4.2 Completed Projects (see Appendix x for details)

- [Shallow Rapid Landslide Screen for GIS Project](#)
- [Technical Guidelines for Geotechnical Reports Project](#)
- [Regional Unstable Landforms Identification Project \(RLIP\)](#)
- [Landform Hazard Classification System and Mapping Protocols Project](#)

Formatted: No Spacing, Space Before: 0 pt, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

5.5.4.3 *Withdrawn Projects (see Appendix x for details)*

- Landslide Hazard Zonation Project

5.5.5 *Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring Program*

5.5.7.1 *Program Strategy*

The purpose of the Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring Program is to assess the degree to which implementation of the forest practices rules is preventing or avoiding an increase in landsliding beyond natural background levels. Natural background rates are difficult to determine. The Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring Program will address the critical question that defines the program: “Are the mass wasting rules effective in preventing an increase in landslides that deliver to public resources or impact public safety?” The program strategy is to (1) evaluate the effectiveness of identifying unstable slopes for applying prescriptions (avoidance or mitigation); and (2) evaluate effectiveness at two scales: the landscape scale (extensive monitoring) and the site scale (effectiveness monitoring).

Four projects are proposed to address five critical questions (Table 27). The first, the Unstable Slope Criteria Project (which replaced the Testing the Accuracy of Unstable Landform Identification Project), was re-scoped as a series of projects, which are in progress as a pilot project under the LEAN process in response to Board direction and Policy feedback. The second, The Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring Project, was an examination of the landslide response to the December 2007 storm in Southwestern Washington. This project was submitted as a non-consensus report to Policy. The third, the Mass Wasting Landscape-Scale Extensive Monitoring Project, has been withdrawn preliminarily scoped. The fourth, Mass Wasting Buffer Integrity and Windthrow Assessment Project, has been withdrawn on indefinite hold.

Table 27. Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
Are unstable landforms being correctly and uniformly identified and evaluated for potential hazard?	Unstable Slope Criteria Project (which replaced the Testing the Accuracy of Unstable Landform Identification Project)
How does the rate of landsliding on managed lands compare to an estimate of the natural (background) rate?	Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring Project Mass Wasting Landscape-Scale Extensive Monitoring Project
Are the forest practices unstable slopes rules effective at reducing the rate of management-induced landsliding at the landscape scale?	
Are the mass wasting prescriptions and mitigation measures effective in preventing landslides from roads and harvest units?	
Does windthrow on mass wasting buffers (leave areas) increase mass wasting?	Mass Wasting Buffer Integrity and Windthrow Assessment Project

Commented [MM269]: Since the projects listed for most of these questions are completed or retired, what does that mean about addressing the critical question?

Commented [MM270]: Are we not answering this question, developing a future study, or moving this to RSAG?

Commented [JM271R270]: Policy asked some time ago that windthrow be investigated as part of other studies . If it is decided that windthrow be investigated in a separate study, RSAG should include this as a critical question. This could go into a new rule group that covers multiple rule groups like extensive monitoring.

5.5.7.2 *ed (see Appendix x for details)*

Comple

- [Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring Project](#)

5.5.7.3

Withdra

wn Projects (see Appendix x for details)

- [Mass Wasting Landscape-Scale Extensive Monitoring Project](#)
- [Mass Wasting Buffer Integrity and Windthrow Assessment Project](#)

5.5.7.25.5.7.4

Unstable

Slope Criteria Project: An Evaluation of Hillslopes Regulated under Washington Forest Practices Rules

Description:

This project will evaluate the degree to which the landforms described in the unstable slopes rules identify potentially unstable areas that are likely to impact public resources or threaten public safety. The project is being designed to evaluate the original Forests and Fish Report Schedule L-1 research topic: “Test the accuracy and lack of bias of the criteria for identifying unstable landforms in predicting areas with a high risk of instability” (FFR p. 127). The project replaces the Testing the Accuracy of Unstable Landform Identification Project, based on feedback from Policy at the November 2010 meeting. At that meeting, UPSAG presented two interpretations of the original Forests and Fish Report Schedule L-1 topic and asked for direction as to how to proceed and prioritize efforts. The TWIG developed alternatives and understands that Policy’s direction is to evaluate landslide susceptibility of different slopes/landforms in the interest of evaluating current rule-identified landforms and identifying/characterizing additional potentially unstable landforms. [This project is a CMER Clean Water Act Milestone.](#)

Status:

The TWIG received CMER approval for a document titled “Unstable Slope Criteria Project – Research Alternatives” on February 28, 2017, and then presented the alternatives to TFW Policy on March 2, 2017. Policy chose the TWIG’s recommended alternative on April 6, 2017.

The Unstable Slope Criteria Project consists of five distinct studies approved by Policy in April 2017

1. Compare/Contrast Landslide Hazard Zonation (LHZ) Mass Wasting Map Units with RIL (this project will be incorporated into subsequent projects per ISPR review comments).
2. Object-Based Landform Mapping with High-Resolution Topography
3. Empirical Evaluation of Shallow Landslide Susceptibility and Frequency by Landform
4. Empirical Evaluation of Shallow Landslide Runout
5. Models to Identify Landscapes/Landslides Most Susceptible to Management

The study design for the first phase of the project, Object-based Landform Mapping with High Resolution Topography, was approved by ISPR in 2019 and the Project Team is currently working ~~on Project 2, Object-Based Landform Mapping with High Resolution Topography Study, implementation. The report is schedule to be presented to CMER in fall 2022~~ on the final report which will be delivered to CMER for review and comment in ~~August~~ September of 2024, with the goal of obtaining final approval and present the findings report to policy by the end of 2024. A Study Design that ~~will cover~~ combined Empirical Evaluation of Shallow Landslide Susceptibility and Frequency by Landform (Project 3) and the Empirical Evaluation of Shallow Landslide Runout (Project 4) ~~is being into one project was developed using information learned in the Object-Based Landform Mapping with High Resolution Topography Study and gained final approval in September of 2023.~~ Implementation of Project 3 and 4 is ongoing and expected

Formatted: No Spacing, Left, Indent: Left: 0.5", Right: 0", No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74" + 6.06"

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Font color: Text 1, Border: (No border)

Formatted: No Spacing, Left, Indent: Left: 0.25", Right: 0", Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: Bullet + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25", Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74" + 6.06"

~~to be completed with a final report by June of 2026. The Study Design is scheduled to be presented to CMER in spring 2023.~~

5.5.6 Mass Wasting Validation Program (Intensive)

5.5.7.1 Program Strategy

No program strategy has been developed, but it is presumed that when UPSAG and/or ISAG have time to work on this program, the efforts of the Monitoring Design Team will be a useful starting point.

Table 28. Mass Wasting Validation Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
What levels of cumulative sediment inputs are harmful to aquatic resources at the basin scale? How does turbidity associated with contemporary forest practices affect salmonid populations (e.g., growth, survival, movement)?	No projects have been developed

5.5.7 Deep-Seated Landslides Program

5.5.7.5 Program Strategy

The purpose of the Deep-Seated Landslides (DSL) Program is to develop science, tools, and/or guidance for assessing the potential of forest practices to change groundwater hydrology in landslide recharge areas and accelerate or reactivate deep-seated landslides in glacial sediments. The twelve listed projects develop tools or science that help us address the two critical questions: “Does harvesting of the recharge area of a glacial deep-seated landslide promote its instability?” and “Can relative levels of response to forest practices be predicted by key characteristics of glacial deep-seated landslides and/or their groundwater recharge areas?” (Table 29).

Policy and Forest Practices Board Requests:

At the budget retreat in 2006, Policy requested that UPSAG investigate pathways to resolve difficulties in the application of rules governing timber harvest on groundwater recharge areas of deep-seated landslides. In 2007, UPSAG hired a contractor to assist in scoping several alternative studies. UPSAG evaluated the scoped projects and presented their findings to CMER in the fall of 2007. No further progress on this program occurred until efforts were revitalized in the spring of 2014. The Forest Practices Board drafted several motions directing Policy and CMER to review and update their mass wasting research strategy. A Mass Wasting Subcommittee of TFW Policy was formed; three UPSAG members participated and a document titled “Unstable Slopes – Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides and Their Groundwater Recharge Areas: Considerations for the CMER Work Plan” was written. These considerations were added to the FY 2017 CMER Work Plan. Notable additions include a second critical question, the initiation of the Literature Synthesis of the Effects of Forest Practices on Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides and Groundwater Recharge, and modifications to the Landslide Classification Project (Table 29).

Per Board request, Policy directed CMER via the UPSAG to develop a Deep-Seated Landslide Research

Strategy (hereafter Strategy). This Strategy includes descriptions of twelve projects, identifies their respective priorities, timelines, and estimated costs; sequencing relative to each other; and describes the relationship between projects and their associated critical questions from the CMER Work Plan (2017-2019). The Strategy evaluates existing deep-seated landslide projects and revises, adds or replaces projects. The scope of the program was expanded to include non-glacial, or bedrock, deep-seated landslides. CMER and Policy approved the Strategy in 2018. Hence the suggestion to rename this program to apply to all deep-seated landslide types.

5.5.7.2 Completed Projects (see Appendix x for details)

- [Model Evapo-Transpiration in Deep-Seated Landslide Recharge Areas Project](#)
- [Literature Synthesis of the Effects of Forest Practices on Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides and Groundwater Recharge](#)
- [Literature Synthesis of the Effects of Forest Practices on Non-Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides and Groundwater Recharge](#)

5.5.7.5.5.7.3 Deep-Seated Landslide Research Strategy

Description:

This project used the results of the literature reviews for forest harvest effects on glacial deep-seated landslides (completed August 2016) and non-glacial deep-seated landslides (completed June 2017) to form a research strategy to address key knowledge gaps identified during the literature reviews and to address questions from the Forest Practices Board and Policy regarding the potential effects of forest practices on deep-seated landslides (Table 29). This strategy included a description of projects, identified their priority, timeline, sequence, and estimated cost, and described the relationship between the project and the critical questions (Table 30). The strategy evaluated the existing CMER Deep-Seated Landslide Work Plan projects and revised, added or replaced projects.

Status:

The strategy is complete and composed of several projects. ~~UPSAG is currently developing a~~ Study Design ~~was developed~~ based on the Policy-approved Scoping Document ~~that combined the for the~~ Landslide Mapping and Classification Projects (4.5 and 4.6) under the Strategy. ~~The Study Design is anticipated to be reviewed by CMER in spring of 2023. The study design received final approval in September 2023. Currently, there is an RFQQ in development to solicit an entity to execute the approved study design for a pilot study for an initial geographic area. Implementation should begin before the end of 2024. UPSAG is also beginning to discuss developing study designs for strategy projects after 4.5 and 4.6.~~

Table 29. Summary of Deep-Seated Landslide Research Strategy projects and status

Project Title	Project Origin	Status
4.1 Model Evapotranspiration in Deep-Seated Landslide Recharge Areas	CMER Work Plan	Completed

Formatted: No Spacing, No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Formatted: No Spacing, Right: 0", Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Formatted: No Spacing, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Formatted: No Spacing, No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.13", Outline numbered + Level: 4 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: -0.51" + Indent at: 0.11"

4.2 Literature Synthesis of the Effects of Forest Practices on Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides and Groundwater Recharge	CMER Work Plan	Completed
4.3 Literature Synthesis of the Effects of Forest Practices on Non-Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides and Groundwater Recharge	Deep-Seated Landslide Proposal Initiation (PI)	Completed
4.4 Board Manual Revision	CMER Work Plan	Intermittent Process pending direction from the Board
4.5 Deep-Seated Landslide Mapping	CMER Work Plan	Current
4.6 Deep-Seated Landslide Classification	CMER Work Plan/ Revised by PI	Current
4.7 GIS-Based Landslide Stability and Sensitivity Toolkit	Recommendation from 4.2	Not scoped
4.8 Groundwater Recharge Modeling	CMER Work Plan	Scoped in 2007; On-hold
4.9 Physical Modeling of Deep-Seated Landslides	Recommendation from 4.3	Not scoped
4.10 Landslide Monitoring	Recommendation from 4.2	Not scoped
4.11 Evapotranspiration Model Refinement	CMER Work Plan	Scoped in 2007; On-hold
4.12 Empirical Evaluation of Deep-Seated Landslide Density, Frequency, and Runout by Landform	Unstable Slope Criteria TWIG	To be scoped with projects 4.5, 4.6, and 4.9 (see Strategy)

Table 30. Deep-Seated Landslides Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
Does harvesting of the recharge areas of glacial or bedrock deep-seated landslides promote their instability?	Model Evapo-Transpiration in Deep-Seated Landslide Recharge Areas Project
	Evapo-Transpiration Model Refinement Project
	Literature Synthesis of the Effects of Forest Practices on Glacial and Non-Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides and Groundwater Recharge
Can relative levels of response to forest practices be predicted by key characteristics of glacial or bedrock deep-seated landslides and/or their groundwater recharge areas?	Groundwater Recharge Modeling Project
	Deep-Seated Landslide Map Project
	Deep-Seated Landslide Classification Project
	Board Manual Revision Project

Commented [JM272]: This question should consider how much is harvested over what period of time as well as the type of harvest.

Commented [H(273R272): From UPSAG: Will be addressed at Scoping and/or study design level in current and future projects.

Formatted: Heading 3, Indent: Left: 0.13", Space Before: 0 pt, Outline numbered + Level: 4 + Aligned at: -0.51" + Indent at: 0.11"

5.5.7.4 Board Manual Revision Project

Description:

This project involves revisions of the Forest Practices Board Manual (Section 16) to more clearly describe which deep-seated landslides are at risk and what intensity of study might be needed based on the activity level of the landslide described by the groundwater recharge rule. In 2014, DNR convened an “Expert Panel” to revise portions of the Board Manual. The Forest Practices Board also convened subsequent expert panels to continue the guidance revisions particularly including a section on deep-seated landslides runout. However, the technical committee determined in 2015 that the state of knowledge for deep-seated landslide runout was insufficient to develop clear guidance. Instead, a section on shallow landslide run out and potential delivery was approved for inclusion in Board Manual when revisions were approved in May 2016, later revised by a TFW stakeholder group of qualified experts. The Board adopted the revised version of Section 16 in March 2015, and the section on run out and delivery in November 2015, and the current version in May 2016. The 2014–2015 revisions to Section 16 provided new guidance regarding the amount of study needed to address different situations. The 2016 revision added greater detail about deep-seated landslide characteristics and identification.

Status:

Intermittent process pending direction from the Board.

5.5.7.5 Glacial Deep-Seated Landslide Mapping Project

Description:

This project will build on ongoing Washington Geologic Survey (WGS) mapping efforts by providing a spatial inventory of deep-seated landslides where WGS does not focus its work, and increasing field work to acquire detailed attributes for a variety of geologic materials and environmental settings. This combined mapping effort is critical for establishing the population of landslide types, processes, and spatial extents for most of the subsequent strategy projects. The WGS is expected to continue mapping deep-seated landslides and UPSAG ~~is coordinating mapping with WGS staff to augment their efforts with the information we need to implement the strategy will utilize this standardized mapping in deep-seated landslide projects.~~

Status:

~~In the Study Design phase~~ Study design completed with Deep-Seated Landslide Classification Project (see below).

5.5.7.6 Deep-Seated Landslide Classification Project

Description:

This project will categorize deep-seated landslides to identify characteristics that indicate that a landslide may be sensitive to hydrologic changes from upslope timber harvest. The 2014 Policy recommendations clarify that the first step would bin glacial deep-seated landslides by landslide type, by stratigraphic section, by size of the landslide and size of its groundwater recharge area, and by proximity to a river channel as these attributes hypothetically have variable sensitivity to forest practices. Policy recommended a second step, as long envisioned by UPSAG, that the range of potential sensitivities be empirically analyzed to test the degree to which forest practices have influence on one or more of the bins. Policy approved the DSL Scoping Document in 2020 which expanded the project to include both glacial and bedrock deep-seated landslides.

Status:

Ongoing. UPSAG scoped (and CMER and Policy approved) a combined Deep-Seated Landslide Mapping & Classification Project in 2020. ~~UPSAG is currently developing a~~The Study Design ~~is~~ based on the Policy approved Scoping Document for the Landslide Mapping and Classification Project (4.5 and 4.6) under the Strategy ~~and received final approval in September 2023. The Study Design is anticipated to be provided to CMER for review in spring of 2023. The study design for for a pilot project an initial project will begin implementation upon choosing a winner from a RFOQ solicitation. Implementation should begin by the end of 2024.~~

5.5.7.5.5.7.7 **GIS-Based Landslide Stability and Sensitivity Toolkit**

Description:

Miller (2016) suggested developing a series of GIS-based tools for assessing the stability and sensitivity to forest practices of deep-seated landslides. The products of this project could include a map of the stability assessment results to use as a forest practice screening tool, a GIS-based toolkit for use in developing and reviewing geotechnical reports, and statistical relationships between landslide characteristics and slope stability that can be periodically refined as more landslides are assessed with the tools. Maps can also be produced to show the data elements used for the calculated rankings. These may include elements such as mapped landslide boundaries, landslide surface roughness, and delineation of the estimated contributing area, upslope geological and topographic features, proximity to streams, and other attributes that should be field-verified. Similar to the mapping project, the toolkit analysis may include glacial and bedrock deep-seated environments.

Status:

Not scoped.

5.5.7.5.5.7.8 **Groundwater Recharge Modeling Project**

Description:

This potential project would use groundwater modeling to determine ~~the degree to which different harvest prescriptions in the groundwater recharge area influences landslide movement and~~ whether there are ways of evaluating which parts of the groundwater recharge zone are most influential on landslide movement. This project might be useful if modeling efforts were focused on the common and probably sensitive types ~~of stratigraphic and geomorphic situations of landslide stratigraphy and geomorphology~~, as might be identified by the Landslide Classification Project.

Status:

Scoped (Waldrick 2007). ~~and on hold.~~UPSAG is beginning discussions to develop a Scoping Document to address groundwater recharge.

5.5.7.5.5.7.9 **Physical Modeling of Deep-Seated Landslides**

Description:

Physical models can be used to integrate available information about individual landslides based on geologic and hydrologic processes. Fully integrated models, starting with tools developed during GIS-Based Landslide Stability and Sensitivity Toolkit, and Groundwater Recharge Modeling Project, could be used to calculate the factor of safety of a landslide, the sensitivity to changes in pore pressure or toe

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.13", Outline numbered + Level: 4 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: -0.51" + Indent at: 0.11"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.13", Outline numbered + Level: 4 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: -0.51" + Indent at: 0.11"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.13", Outline numbered + Level: 4 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: -0.51" + Indent at: 0.11"

erosion, a water budget and fluctuations in water supply for the landslide, the effect of forest cover on water supply, and the response in pore pressure caused by fluctuations in the water supply. In concert with the Landslide Classification Project, the distribution of calculated values can provide another way to characterize a population of landslides. Statistical methods can then be used to see how calculated values of stability, sensitivity, and precipitation correlate with the observed activity level.

Status:

Not scoped.

5.5.7.55.5.7.10 Landslide Monitoring Project

Description:

Miller (2016) recommended an approach using a combination of remote sensing (e.g., synthetic aperture radar) and field measurements to quantitatively measure activity of a population of landslides identified in the Landslide Classification Project over time. Field data, such as precipitation, hydraulic head and landslide displacement could be collected to test assumptions about groundwater response and landslide activity in response to forest practices in different geomorphic settings. This recommendation was expanded in Miller (2017) to include dating of the landslide using surface roughness or direct 14C dating of materials in the landslide.

Status:

Not scoped. [This could be included in Extensive Monitoring.](#)

5.5.7.55.5.7.11 Evapo-Transpiration Model Refinement Project

Description:

This scoped project refines the evapotranspiration model (GAET), which was developed by Sias (2003) using better quantified parameters, or the experimental pursuit of important parameters that have yet to be quantified. This project was scoped to continue to inform the question: Does harvesting the recharge area of a glacial deep-seated landslide promote its instability? The model refinement project proposed to validate the GAET model using micrometeorological data from Vancouver Island, to establish model parameters and ranges for clearcut, intermediate and mature forests, and to field test the model. The field testing would yield information about model assumptions and direct researchers toward better quantification of important parameters. If field pilot testing is successful, then the model could be evaluated to determine if it is a cost-effective and robust tool for groundwater recharge modeling of forest practices.

At this time, our ability to interpret how additional water from loss of evapotranspiration influences shallow groundwater levels and then slope stability is limited. Refinement of the actual value for loss of evapotranspiration is not currently helpful, but may be after other research is accomplished. Specifically, if we do not know what 40 inches of water per year means to a deep-seated landslide (typically value produced by the model for loss of evapotranspiration in high rainfall areas of Western Washington), then refining the value to 36 inches or 44 inches is not useful. If Groundwater Modeling and Physical Modeling improve our understanding of the influence of additional water on deep-seated landslides of different types, activity levels and geologic materials, then this project or improvement of a different model may become important in the future.

Status:

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.13", Outline numbered + Level: 4 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: -0.51" + Indent at: 0.11"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.13", Outline numbered + Level: 4 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: -0.51" + Indent at: 0.11"

Scoped (Sias 2007) and on hold.

5.6 ROADS RULE GROUP

5.6.1 Rule Overview and Intent

The intent of the forest practices rules for roads is to protect water quality and riparian/aquatic habitat by minimizing sediment delivery to typed waters from road erosion and mass wasting, as well as minimizing road-related changes in hillslope and stream hydrology. Fish passage at road crossing structures is treated as a separate rule group. The road rules protect water quality and riparian/aquatic habitats through prescriptions and best management practices (BMPs).

Implementation of these prescriptions through road maintenance and abandonment plans (RMAPs) is intended to minimize road surface sediment production, the hydrologic connection between the road system and the stream network, and the risk of road-related landslides caused by inadequately built and maintained roads. The road rules specify prescriptions for road construction, maintenance and abandonment, landings, and stream crossing structures. In addition, the Forest Practices Board Manual identifies BMPs for roads and landings. The rules required RMAP inventories for all forest roads to be developed by 2006 for large forest landowners and construction completed by 2016. This was later extended to be completed in 2021. The work was to be done in conjunction with planned timber harvest activity for small forest landowners.

Unstable slope rules also minimize management activities, including road construction, in landslide-prone locations. Monitoring conducted under the Unstable Slopes Rule Group programs includes mass wasting associated with roads. The Roads Rule Group programs are primarily directed toward monitoring surface erosion and hydrologic disconnection.

The basic assumptions of the road rules are the following:

1. Implementation of road prescriptions will result in achieving FP HCP performance goals and resource objectives, including the following:
 - a. Meeting water quality standards.
 - b. Providing clean water and substrate and maintaining channel-forming processes by minimizing the delivery of management-induced coarse and fine sediment to streams by protecting stream-bank integrity, providing vegetative filtering, protecting unstable slopes, and preventing the routing of sediment to streams and associated wetlands.
 - c. Minimizing the effects of roads on surface and groundwater hydrologic regimes (magnitude, frequency, timing, and routing of stream flow) to be accomplished by disconnecting road drainage from the stream network, preventing increases in peak flows causing scour, and maintaining the hydrologic continuity of wetlands.
2. Assessment and planning using RMAPs is the best method to assure effective implementation of BMPs, and this will achieve the above objectives.
3. Roads differ in their degree and importance of impact to the resources of concern, and landowners and other Forests and Fish cooperators can identify and prioritize roadwork based on these differences.
4. Appropriately identified BMPs are effective at achieving functional objectives.

5.6.2 **Rule Group Resource Objectives and Performance Targets**

Resource Objectives:

- Sediment: Provide clean water and substrate and maintain channel-forming processes by minimizing to the maximum extent practicable the delivery of management-induced coarse and fine sediment to streams (including timing and quantity) by protecting stream- bank integrity, providing vegetative filtering, protecting unstable slopes, and preventing the routing of sediment to the streams.
- Hydrology: Maintain surface and groundwater hydrologic regimes (magnitude, frequency, timing, and routing of stream flows) by disconnecting road drainage from the stream network, preventing increases in peak flows causing scour, and maintaining the hydrologic continuity of wetlands.

Performance Targets:

- Road sediment delivered to streams: New roads — Virtually none.
- Ratio of road length delivering to streams/total stream length (miles/mile):
 - Old roads not to exceed — Coast (spruce), 0.15–0.25;
 - West of crest, 0.15–0.25; east of crest, 0.08–0.12
- Ratio of road sediment production delivered to streams/total stream length (tons/year/mile):
 - Old roads not to exceed — Coast (spruce), 6–10 T/yr;
 - West of crest, 2–6 T/yr; east of crest, 1–3 T/yr.
- Fines in gravel: Less than 12% embedded fines (< 0.85 mm).
- Road runoff: Same targets as road-related sediment; significant reduction in delivery of water from roads to streams.

5.6.3 **Rule Group Strategy**

The effectiveness monitoring program for roads is planned for two scales: the sub-basin scale and the site scale (or prescription scale). The FP HCP contains performance targets at the sub- basin scale. At this scale, road monitoring assesses the effectiveness of the rules at meeting the FP HCP performance targets for surface erosion sediment delivery and hydrologic connectivity across ownerships and regions of the state. Site-scale effectiveness monitoring assesses the effectiveness of individual prescriptions.

Site-scale effectiveness monitoring provides more insight into the success of individual road prescriptions than does sub-basin-scale monitoring. The timetable for forest landowners to implement forest practices prescriptions is tied to RMAPs. The site-scale monitoring program requires site-specific road performance measures (developed per prescription objectives), tests for site-level effectiveness using RMAP-implemented areas as a sampling stratum, and field protocols for site-scale performance measures. This site-scale monitoring will inform the rules at several levels by determining the degree to which strategies are achieving resource objectives at the site scale, assessing the need to modify individual RMAPs to achieve resource objectives, and assessing the need to modify guidelines and rules for road maintenance and abandonment planning.

Assessment of the rules leads to five critical questions, which are addressed by three monitoring and validation programs (Table 30). The monitoring strategy is based on CMER’s experience with road

sediment problems, BMPs, and implementation realities, as well as on the data from many watershed analyses that were used to develop the forest practices road performance targets for sediments. The effectiveness monitoring strategy includes both a site-scale program and a basin-scale program. Validation of the road performance targets, which is more complex and time-consuming, will come later. This approach will first inform the uncertainties about BMP effectiveness and BMPs’ ability to meet performance targets. If BMPs are ineffective, validation monitoring is unwarranted. If BMPs are proving to be effective, then validating the performance targets should begin (i.e., do we have the right target?).

Table 31. Roads Rule Group Critical Questions and Programs

Rule Group Critical Questions	Program Names	Task Type	SAG
Are road prescriptions effective at meeting sub-basin-scale performance targets for sediment and water? (Exclusive of mass wasting prescriptions, which are covered under the Unstable Slopes Rule Group)	Road Sub-Basin-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Program	Effectiveness	UPSAG/CME
Does the RMAP process correctly identify and prioritize road problems for repair? Are road prescriptions effective at meeting site-scale performance targets for sediment and water? (Exclusive of mass wasting prescriptions, which are covered in the Unstable Slopes Rule Group section)	Road Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Program		
Have the correct performance targets for sediment delivery and connectivity been identified? What levels of cumulative sediment inputs are harmful to the resource at the basin scale? How does turbidity associated with contemporary forest practices affect salmonid populations (e.g., growth, survival, movement)?	Roads Validation Program and Cumulative Sediment Effects	Intensive	UPSAG / ISAG

Formatted: Not Highlight

Commented [P(274)]: Consider changing to CMER

Commented [JB275R274]: I think leave as UPSAG and UPSAG/ISAG. I added CMER to the first one to reflect the current responsibility.

Formatted: Not Highlight

5.6.4 Road Sub-Basin-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Program

5.6.4.1 Program Strategy

The purpose of the Road Sub-Basin-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Program is to determine the degree to which the road rule package is effective at meeting performance targets for surface erosion, sediment, and water established at the sub-basin scale and as a whole across the state. This program is ranked fourth in priority among the 16 CMER programs.

The Road Sub-Basin-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Program currently consists of three projects that are related to critical questions in Table 31. Two projects, the Road Surface Erosion Model Update Project and the Road Surface Erosion Model Validation/Refinement Project, revise and validate the analytical model to estimate road surface erosion (the Washington State Road Surface Erosion Model, or WARSEM) that is used in the monitoring program to estimate sediment contributions and connectivity from selected road segments and road systems. The third project, Road Sub-Basin-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project, uses WARSEM to measure changes in the road conditions known to generate sediment and

hydrologic connectivity between those road segments and the stream-channel network.

Because the rules provide a 20-year window for implementation of RMAP upgrades, this program is long-term and results will provide a periodic evaluation of the trend and the trajectory toward meeting the performance targets through the RMAP efforts.

Table 32. Road Sub-Basin-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions		Project Names
Are road prescriptions effective at meeting sub-basin-scale performance targets for sediment and water?		Road Sub-Basin-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project
Program Research Questions	<i>Are field or analytical methods needed to support the monitoring program?</i>	Road Surface Erosion Model Update Project
	<i>How accurate is the road surface erosion model in predicting average road sediment from runoff at the site scale?</i>	Road Surface Erosion Model Validation/Refinement Project

5.6.4.2 Completed (see Appendix X for details)

- Road Surface Erosion Model Update Project

5.6.4.3 Road Sub-Basin-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project

Description:

This project is intended to provide data that can be used to assess the degree to which sub-basin-scale performance targets, and therefore resource objectives, are being met throughout the state. This project also characterizes the extent of road conditions that reduce surface erosion (e.g., improved surfacing, reduced runoff to streams). Data collected at the sub-basin scale will determine the status and assess trends of key indicators of road connectivity using WARSEM sediment delivery through time. This project does not address performance targets for road performance relative to mass wasting erosion processes, which are more readily evaluated through other monitoring projects. Forest road systems in randomly selected sample areas that are proportionally distributed statewide in areas under forest practices rules, independent of ownership, are being monitored. Small forest landowner properties are included in the study whenever they fall within the sampling blocks. Data are collected to determine the degree to which roads meet established performance targets and the strength of the relationship between those reported measures and the percentage of sample area under implemented RMAPs. Because road monitoring at the sub-basin scale extends through the 20-year road rule implementation period, this piece was put in place before model validation and performance target validation.

Status:

The original vision was to have a first sample before significant RMAP work had been accomplished, a second sample mid-way through RMAP efforts, and a third sample after RMAP was completed. However, the first sample was collected in 2006/2007. These results were reviewed by ISPR and approved by CMER in early 2010, and represent a point mid-way through RMAP efforts. In response to this timing and budgetary considerations, a second (and now final) sample intended to show trend and efficacy is scheduled to occur in 2028, well after RMAP completion in 2021.

5.6.4.4 Road Surface Erosion Model Validation/Refinement Project

Commented [AP276]: Is this in the MPS?

Commented [AP277R276]: What steps are needed before 2028?

Commented [JB278R276]: Design, if we have bandwidth. We have yet to finally decide whether and exactly how to resample previous sites or to generate a new set of sites. But that is not likely to occur before completion of the current work. If we get to it before FY2028, we will just be ahead of what are saying here and will be able to report that in the next workplan update.

Description:

WARSEM is based on a range of empirically derived data available in 2003. The Road Surface Erosion Model Validation/Refinement Project would measure sediment from selected Washington road sites to evaluate the accuracy of modeled sediment delivery rates. This study could be designed to also evaluate the effectiveness of individual sediment control strategies, such as sediment traps, silt fences, or enhanced cutslope vegetation, but the Road Prescription- Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project, currently in the implementation phase, may accomplish sufficient empirical research.

Status:

Timing of scoping and study design is planned to follow completion of the Roads Prescription- Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project. The need for this project will depend largely on results from the Road Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project and on the expansion of available relevant road erosion data sets and/or modeling tools due to research occurring outside of CMER.

5.6.5 Road Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Program

5.6.5.1 Program Strategy

The dual purposes of the Road Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Program are to (1) determine the degree to which maintenance activities within RMAPs have been appropriately identified; and (2) assess the effectiveness of specific BMPs in meeting their intended objective(s).

As described in Table 32, an important issue related to road effectiveness monitoring is the degree to which maintenance activities targeted in the RMAP assessments are appropriately identified and prioritized based on rule language to fix the “worst first.” Monitoring this aspect of the prescription strategy for roads is important because individual or collective prescriptions that are effective in meeting resource protection goals, if not applied to the right locations, may not achieve resource objectives and yet might still incur cost to the landowner. Equally important is the assessment of the degree to which BMPs are effective in meeting their stated objective of either reducing sediment delivery or disconnecting roads from DNR typed waters. This program is ranked ninth in priority among the 16 CMER programs.

We anticipate that the results of these studies will inform the forest practices adaptive management process about the effectiveness of RMAP rules in achieving the FP HCP goals. Should RMAPs prove to be ineffective, Policy may have to revisit the rules to refine requirements and application.

Table 33. Road Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
Does the RMAP process correctly identify and prioritize road problems for repair?	Effectiveness of RMAP Fixes Project
Are road prescriptions effective at meeting site-scale performance targets for sediment and water?	Road Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project

5.6.5.2 Effectiveness of RMAP Fixes Project

Description:

Commented [P(279)]: Julie/Jenelle. Should we add in the Roads Project Critical Questions here? (Referred in some of our project documents as out 7 study design critical questions?)

The primary purpose of this project is to evaluate the degree to which RMAP road repairs have been appropriately identified and implemented. The project is envisioned to follow the completion of the Road Sub-Basin-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring (for surface erosion and connectivity issues) and Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring projects (for road instability issues), so that results of these studies can be used to refine the list of treatments to be investigated and inform a sampling design for the RMAP project described here.

This project would determine the extent to which identified road problems were located in areas where RMAP repairs had been implemented and to determine why site-scale benefits were not achieved in these areas.

Status:

This project has not been scoped.

5.6.5.3 Road Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project

Description:

The objectives of monitoring forest roads at the prescription scale are to (1) evaluate the effectiveness of road maintenance categories in meeting road performance targets; and (2) identify sensitive situations where prescriptions are not effective. This project would address surface erosion sediment reductions from site-specific measures recognizing that significant efforts in both empirical research and modeling have been accomplished and can be built upon.

Status:

In 2014, CMER formed a technical writing and implementation group (TWIG) to begin scoping this project. In September 2014, Policy approved the initial scoping document. A second draft of the Best Available Science and Alternatives Document was submitted to CMER and accepted in January 2016. In February 2016, Policy picked Alternative #4, the TWIG's preferred alternative. The Study Design was submitted for CMER review in December 2016 and approved on February 28, 2017. ISPR occurred over the next year and the Study Design was finalized and approved by CMER on February 27, 2018. Site selection occurred in 2018, and installation of all 80 sites was accomplished in the summer/fall of 2019. By the end of summer 2024, the main experiment has collected 5 water years of precipitation, discharge, sediment, and traffic data associated with each study plot.

Alone, the Major Experiment cannot answer all the critical questions, nor will it provide all data needed for the empirical modeling effort central to this project. Six parametrization studies have been or will be implemented to augment the basic field results and enhance the modeling component of the project by establishing new relationships for processes that will not be specifically quantified in the Major Experiment.

The Ditch Line Hydraulics experiment was started in 2021 and completed in 2022.
The Road Microtopography Evolution experiment was started in 2021 and completed in 2023.
The Short Time Scale Interactions experiment was started in 2022 and completed in 2025.
The Cost vs. Maintenance survey was started and completed in 2023.
The Sediment Trap Efficiency Experiment was started and completed in 2024.
The GRAIP/WARSEM Delivery analysis and survey will be completed in 2025.

Commented [AP280]: Update nearer to workplan review, updates made now will quickly be out of date.

Formatted: Body Text, Justified

Commented [P(281)]: Potential to run again this winter?

Commented [JB282R281]: Yes, Charlie si planning that we will.

~~In 2022, the project completed its third year of the main experiment which has included the collection and assessment of plot discharge, fine sediment, and annual coarse sediment data. The first year of the Ditch Line Hydraulics Parameterization experiment was completed in May 2021, with the first half of the second year's assessment being completed in October 2022 (i.e., Siltstone Province has been completed and Volcanic Province will be completed in 2023). The first year of the Short-Time Scale Parameterization experiment was completed in March 2022. The second year of the Micro Topography Parameterization experiment was completed in June 2022. A second Interim Report (The first of which was delivered to CMER in 2021) was delivered to CMER in 2024. Maintenance of sites, data collection, and data analysis are ongoing with all fieldwork projected to be completed in ~~2025~~2026 and all data analysis completed in 2027.~~

5.6.6 Roads Validation Program and Cumulative Sediment Effects

5.6.6.1 Program Strategy

Validation of road effects and performance targets is envisioned to occur with CMER research in coordination with external cumulative effects research. This is because of the need to coordinate research on sediment generation with parallel studies of potentially affected biota, including fish and amphibians.

Table 34. Roads Validation Program and Cumulative Sediment Effects: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
Have the correct performance targets for sediment delivery and connectivity been identified?	Intensive Watershed-Scale Monitoring to Assess Cumulative Effects
What levels of cumulative sediment inputs are harmful to the resource at the basin scale? How does turbidity associated with contemporary forest practices affect salmonid populations (e.g., growth, survival, movement)?	

5.6.6.2 Intensive Watershed-Scale Monitoring to Assess Cumulative Effects

Description:

For a preliminary study description, see this Work Plan's Section 5.11.

Status:

Initial scoping began in 2008. Additional effort depends on prioritization.

Commented [AP283]: Any update needed?

Commented [JB284R283]: Not at this time. It is conceivable that CMER might do something with Intensive monitoring in conjunction with the ExMo project if we end up going with a HUC-based approach. However, any IMW addition planning will come later.

5.7 FISH PASSAGE RULE GROUP

5.7.1 Rule Overview and Intent

Fish passage blockages at road crossing structures are to be addressed as part of the road maintenance and abandonment plan (RMAP) process. Road crossing structures will be inventoried and evaluated, and those functioning as fish barriers are to be prioritized based on the quantity and quality of a potential fish-bearing stream being affected upstream of the barrier. Those structures that do not provide fish passage must be repaired or replaced within 15 years, typically on a “worst first” basis. WDFW’s hydraulic code rules, the associated barrier- assessment manual, and DNR’s forest practices rules apply to crossing structures on forest roads.

The fish passage rule is based on the following assumptions:

- Achieving the objective of no fish barriers is critical for recovery of depressed stocks and the health of fish at all life history stages.
- Implementation of the forest practices rules will result in achieving the objective to maintain or provide passage for fish in all life history stages and to provide for the passage of some woody debris likely to be encountered.
- Assessment, prioritization, and implementation of RMAPs will achieve the objectives in a timely manner.
- Current stream crossing replacement standards are adequate to address fish passage at all life history stages.
- Hydraulic rules are effective at achieving resource objectives.
- Performance targets can be developed for fish at all life history stages.
- Stream-simulation methods provide passage for fish (definition WAC 222-16-010) at all life history stages.

5.7.2 Rule Group Resource Objectives and Performance Targets

Resource Objectives:

- Maintain or restore passage for fish in all life stages and provide for the passage of some woody debris by building and maintaining roads with adequate stream crossings.

Performance Targets:

- Eliminate road-related access barriers over the time frame for road management plans.
- Test the effectiveness of fish passage prescriptions at restoring and maintaining passage.

5.7.3 Rule Group Strategy

Based on an analysis of the forest practices rules, CMER identified assumptions and uncertainties underlying the rules. ISAG developed critical questions in 2003 to address these uncertainties. Two

Formatted: Justified, Indent: Left: 0", Right: 0"

programs were set up to address these critical questions (Table 34). The Fish Passage Effectiveness/Validation Monitoring Program aims to validate the assumptions and test the effectiveness of the forest practices rules in providing passage at road crossings for fish (as defined by WAC 222-16-010) at all life history stages. The Monitoring Design Team (MDT) defines extensive monitoring as a population-scale assessment of the effectiveness of the forest practices rules in attaining forest practices-related performance targets across FP HCP lands (MDT 2002). The implied FP HCP performance target for fish passage, based upon the requirements for RMAPs, is to eliminate fish blockages on FP HCP-regulated lands. The purpose of this program is to evaluate status and trends in fish passage conditions at forest road crossings.

Table 35. Fish Passage Rule Group Critical Questions and Programs

Rule Group Critical Questions	Program Names	Task Type	SAG
Are the corrective measures effective in restoring fish passage for fish at all life history stages?	Fish Passage Effectiveness/ Validation Monitoring Program	Effectiveness	ISAG
What is the current status of fish passage on a regional scale, and how are conditions changing over time?	Extensive Fish Passage Monitoring Program	Extensive	ISAG

ISAG presented the proposed CMER research strategy for fish passage to Policy. Stakeholders differed in their perspectives on what the CMER research strategy should focus on; therefore, Policy designated a subgroup to determine which important issues and/or critical questions should be prioritized for the Fish Passage Rule Group. The Policy subgroup decided that if and when important policy and/or management issues are determined, Policy will then define an appropriate research and monitoring strategy for CMER.

The following sections describe ISAG efforts to date on the fish passage research and monitoring strategy.

5.7.4 Fish Passage Effectiveness/Validation Monitoring Program

5.7.4 Fish Passage Effectiveness and/or Validation studies have yet to been designed or completed. At this time, ~~This~~the entire program has been withdrawn from the active projects within the workplan. Some work has been completed but there has been no priority placed on this program and no plans to further develop it (see Appendix X for more details).

5.7.5 Extensive Fish Passage Monitoring Program

5.7.5.1 Program Strategy

In 2005, ISAG completed an extensive study design for fish passage monitoring. CMER delivered the study design to Policy. Policy decided not to fund the project due to budget considerations and also limitations in scope due to the absence of small forest landowners in the sampling design. Implementation of the study design has been delayed indefinitely. A single critical question has been developed for the program (Table 36).

Table 37. Extensive Fish Passage Monitoring Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Formatted: No underline

Formatted: No Spacing, Indent: Left: 0", Tab stops: Not at 0.61" + 0.61"

Formatted: No Spacing, No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: Not at 0.61" + 0.61"

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
What is the current status of fish passage on a regional scale, and how are conditions changing over time?	Extensive Fish Passage Trend Monitoring Project

5.7.5.2 Extensive Fish Passage Trend Monitoring Project

Description:

A study design for fish passage trend monitoring was developed using guidelines consistent with the Forests and Fish Report and supplied by ISAG. The contractor (WDFW) reviewed possible monitoring approaches and presented a recommended study design and methodology that was reviewed and approved by ISAG and CMER.

In addition to the WDFW study proposal, ISAG explored the potential of collecting data on stream crossing conditions in conjunction with the UPSAG Road Sub-Basin-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project. ISAG recognized that this approach would not provide all of the information needed to address the critical question but considered it a cost-effective opportunity to get supplemental information about culvert conditions from a statewide random sample. ISAG developed a set of questions for assessing culvert suitability and these questions were added to the UPSAG road survey.

Status:

Due to budgetary considerations and potential limitations in scope, Policy has delayed implementation of the WDFW design indefinitely. The UPSAG road survey was completed in 2008, and culvert conditions data were collected from approximately 1,300 stream crossings. These data have not been analyzed, and further investigation is pending [interest, need, and funding](#). ~~Policy direction.~~

5.8 PESTICIDES RULE GROUP

5.8.1 *Rule Overview and Intent*

The objectives of the Pesticides Rule Group are to manage pesticide use to achieve water quality standards, meet label requirements, and avoid harm to riparian vegetation. In the context of the forest practices rules, pesticide means “any insecticide, herbicide, fungicide or rodenticide, but does not include nontoxic repellents or other forest chemicals.”

Commented [JM285]: What about Department of Ag rules?

The pesticide rules include a series of regulations that cover (1) aerial application of pesticides, ground application of pesticides with power equipment, and (3) hand application of pesticides. The rules for aerial application of pesticides prescribe a setback (offset) to prevent application of pesticides within the core and inner zones of Type F and S streams, or the wetland management zone (WMZ) of Type A or B wetlands. In these cases, the offset is from the outer edge of the inner zone or the WMZ. Offsets are also prescribed for flowing Type N streams and Type B wetlands smaller than 5 acres; however, in these cases the offsets are measured from the edge of the bankfull channel or wetland. The offset distances vary depending on water type, the type of nozzle used, and wind conditions at the time of application. Separate guidelines govern ground application of pesticides with power equipment and hand equipment within RMZs and WMZs.

Commented [JM286]: What about species? Exotic weeds have different buffer rules.

The main assumption is that the pesticide rules will be effective in achieving the objectives of meeting water quality standards, label requirements, and preventing damage to vegetation in RMZs and WMZs. A level of uncertainty exists for the aerial application of pesticides because of the potential difficulties caused by terrain and wind conditions.

5.8.2 *Rule Group Resource Objectives and Performance Targets*

Resource Objectives:

- Provide for clean water and native vegetation (in the core and inner zones) by using forest chemicals in a manner that meets or exceeds water quality standards and label requirements by buffering surface water and otherwise using best management practices.

Performance Targets:

- Entry to water: No entry to water for medium and large droplets; minimized for small droplets (drift).
- Entry to RMZs: Core and inner zone — Levels cause no significant harm to native vegetation.

Commented [JM287]: What does this mean?

5.8.3 *Rule Group Strategy*

Three critical questions have been developed to eventually shape corresponding effectiveness and validation programs (Table 37).

Table 38. Pesticides Rule Group Critical Questions and Programs

Rule Group Critical Questions	Program Name	Task Type	SAG
Do the pesticide rules protect water quality and vegetation within the core and inner zones of Type S and F RMZs, the WMZs of Type A or B wetlands, and Type N streams and buffers?	Forest Chemicals Program	Effectiveness	RSAG
What is the exposure of aquatic organisms to herbicides that reach Type S, F, and N waters, and Type A and B wetlands? (How much gets in and for how long is it present?)	Forest Chemicals Program	Validation	LWAG ISAG
Do sublethal effects exist that affect the survival of a population of aquatic organisms from herbicide level reaching Type S, F, and N waters, and Type A or B wetlands?	Forest Chemicals Program	Validation	LWAG ISAG

5.8.4 Forest Chemicals Program (Effectiveness and Validation)

5.8.4.1 Program Strategy

The purpose of the Forest Chemicals Program is to address uncertainty concerning the effectiveness of the chemical application rules in protecting water quality and vegetation in riparian and wetland buffers. Alternative strategies with lower costs will also be considered.

CMER held a science conference in October 2016 to inform the members about the current use and related science concerning chemicals used in Forest Practices. This program is ranked last among the 16 CMER programs. No projects are proposed at this time.

Commented [HB288]: Pesticide violations are investigated by the state department of agriculture-- along with the forest practices compliance program records, these could be used to validate dropping the Forest Chemicals Program.

5.9 WETLANDS PROTECTION RULE GROUP

5.9.1 Rule Overview and Intent

The intent of the WAC 222 wetland rules is to achieve no net loss of wetland function (e.g., water quality, water quantity, fish and wildlife habitat, timber harvest and regeneration) by avoiding, minimizing, and/or preventing sediment delivery and hydrologic disturbances from roads, timber harvest, and timber yarding, and by buffering wetlands with wetland management zones (WMZs)). The application of WAC 222 rules is assumed to achieve and protect aquatic conditions and processes that meet resource objectives and consequently achieve the three Forests and Fish Report (FFR) performance goals. WetSAG understands that there is uncertainty regarding this assumption because the functional relationships between forest practices, wetland functions, and aquatic resource responses have not been well studied and are not fully understood.

Areas of uncertainty include: (1) how to quantify the functions and connectivity of wetlands to streams and functions related to fish and amphibian habitat; (2) how wetlands contribute to base- flow, or provide flood storage and attenuate downstream peak flows; (3) how wetlands contribute to water quality; (4) the effects of road management practices on sediment delivery to wetlands; and (5) the contribution of large woody debris (LWD) and exchange of nutrients between wetlands and streams.

The rules contain several additional assumptions:

- Implementation of the wetland prescriptions for timber harvest (WAC 222-30-010) will result in no net loss of wetland functions over the length of a timber harvest rotation, assuming that some wetland functions may be reduced until the midpoint of a timber rotation cycle.
- Application of the mitigation sequence in WAC 222-24-015 for road construction will result in no net loss of wetland function.
- Appropriately identified best management practices (BMPs) are effective at achieving resource objectives.
- Forested wetlands will successfully regenerate following timber harvest.

Several uncertainties exist about the validity of these assumptions based on a lack of applied research and accurate wetland mapping and typing. These uncertainties include the following:

1. The response of wetlands and wetland functions to management practices and the level of protection provided by prescriptions is not known.
2. The DNR wetland typing system (A, B, Forested) does not reflect the full complexity of different wetland functions across the landscape, potentially reducing the ability to target rule protection to aquatic resources (e.g., water quality, hydrology, and rule- covered species) in different, specific types of wetlands.
3. Forested wetlands as a class are not recognized by WAC 222-16-30 as “typed” waters. Some forested wetlands receive alternate protections such as those that are inundated fish habitat. However, other forested wetlands not covered under these alternate protections may not receive water quality protection measures and BMPs during road construction or harvest.

Commented [HB289]: This WAC contains wetland functions that are not in the HCP. The changes I suggest clarify that and include questions that avoid the fallacy of using fixed metric targets under dynamic (time and space) watershed conditions. (Reeves et.al. 2022.

“Environmental Regulation in Temporally Dynamic and Spatially Variable Watershed Environments: Implications for Forest Management”)

There may be useful SME guidance for all other wetland functions not included in the HCP. However, this needs to be a separate report from the HCP L1 update.

For example, the SME group could be asked to comment on a chronological WMZ exploratory study similar to the ongoing FWEP study. Note that the FWEP study simply measures changes and recovery back to conditions at the time of timber harvest. Depending on the results we could then discuss the need for functional objectives and targets to pursue important wetlands functions and processes not considered in the HCP.

Commented [DK290R289]: Neither WetSAG Nor CMER has the jurisdiction to answer this question. It belongs to Policy and/or the Board. There are also some scoping comments/suggestions here that could be linked to a specific project (not rule overview) but need to wait and be brought up during the scoping process.

Commented [HB291]: Additionally, not all wetland functions are considered in the FFR report nor the FPHCP.

Commented [DK292R291]: This is a policy comment that does not belong in an update document.

4. It is not known to what degree current rules for wetland mitigation related to road construction will achieve the “no net loss of wetland functions.”

Quantifying “no net loss” is difficult because there are no criteria available for determining:

- The range of wetland functions affected by road construction or harvest;
- Net loss or gain of these functions over time;
- Net loss of one or more functions with concurrent net gains in other functions;
- The cumulative impact across the FP HCP landscape of filling or draining individual wetlands that are less than 0.10 acre in size;
- The cumulative effect of creating or expanding wetlands through forest practices activities.

The forest practices rules (WAC 222-16-035) classify wetlands into three general categories: Type A, B, and Forested depending on soils, vegetation type, canopy closure, wetland size, and acreage of open water.

Mapping and delineation requirements in WAC 222-16-036 must be performed as outlined in the Forest Practices Board Manual, Section 8, for several wetland groups:

- Wetlands greater than 0.1 acre that will be impacted by filling and where mitigation for such filling is required;
- Forested wetlands greater than three acres;
- All forested wetlands in a riparian management zone, unless entry within the riparian management zone is not proposed as part of the harvest application.

Wetland management zones (WMZs) and harvest methods in WAC 222-30-020 are as follows: WMZs are prescribed for all Type A and Type B wetlands greater than 0.5 acre, or 0.25 acre for bogs. WMZ widths vary based on the wetland type and area; harvest is allowed within the maximum-width WMZ. The specific leave tree requirements within WMZs differ for eastern and western Washington. The use of ground-based harvesting equipment is restricted within WMZs. Harvest methods are limited to low-impact harvest or cable systems within forested wetlands, and landowners are encouraged to leave a portion of the wildlife reserve tree requirement within the wetland.

Road construction in wetlands (WAC 222-24-015) is as follows: A mitigation sequence applies to road construction to address no net loss of wetland function. The preferred option is to prevent impacts by locating roads outside of wetlands (avoidance). However, where this is not possible, the mitigation sequence and Board Manual guidelines seek to minimize and mitigate potential impacts.

5.9.2 Rule Group Resource Objectives and Performance Targets

Resource Objectives:

The wetland WMZ and road prescriptions are intended to accomplish the following stated FP HCP functional objectives under the Hydrology Resource Objective as stated in Schedule L-1:

- Maintain surface and groundwater hydrologic regimes (magnitude, frequency, timing, and routing of stream flows) by disconnecting road drainage from the stream network.

Commented [HB293]: vegetation diversity

Commented [TW294R293]: Vegetation "type" would be more appropriate than "diversity" in this context.

- Prevent increases in peak flows causing scour, and maintain hydrologic continuity of wetlands.

Performance Targets:

There are two performance targets under the Hydrology Resource Objective that include wetlands:

- Westside: Do not allow forest management activities to cause a significant increase in peak flow recurrence intervals resulting in scour that disturbs stream channel substrates providing actual or potential habitat for salmonids.
- No net loss in the hydrologic functions of wetlands.

A number of other FP HCP resource objectives specific to streams may also apply to wetlands but are not explicitly stated in either Schedule L-1 of the FFR or in the FP HCP. Schedule L-2 was published in 2003 after the HCP. It refers to the following functional objectives, performance targets, and projects regarding wetlands:

1. Heat Temperature Functional Objective: Provide cool water by maintaining shade, groundwater temperature, flow, and other watershed processes controlling stream temperature.
 - a. Performance targets: Stream temperature, groundwater, and shade.
2. Large Woody Debris/Organic Inputs Functional Objective: Provide complex and productive in- and near-stream habitat by recruiting large woody debris and litter.
 - a. Performance targets: Riparian conditions, litterfall, in-stream LWD targets, residual pool depth.
3. Hydrology Functional Objective: Maintain surface and groundwater hydrologic regimes (magnitude, frequency, timing, and routing of stream flows) by disconnecting road drainage from the stream network, preventing increases in peak flows causing scour, and maintaining the hydrologic continuity of wetlands.
 - a. Performance targets: Peak flows and wetlands.

Commented [HB295]: L2 was never an HCP consensus document and that should be made clear here. Using L2 in section 5.9.1 erroneously conflates the FP HCP wetlands protection purposes with the broader set of wetlands protection purposes in the rules.

Commented [DK296R295]: Neither WetSAG Nor CMER has the jurisdiction to answer this question. It belongs to Policy and/or the Board.

These objectives are discussed in more detail in the Wetlands Rule Group critical questions outlined below. Not all Performance Targets listed in the FP HCP are fully developed. The Wetland Research and Monitoring Strategy includes suggestions for some new wetland performance targets that will better inform the degree to which Resource Objectives outlined in the FP HCP are being met.

These **suggested** performance targets are as follows:

1. Return to pre-harvest levels of wetland functions
2. No net loss of water storage and streamflow maintenance
3. Return to pre-harvest levels of water storage and streamflow maintenance
4. No net loss of temperature regulation and water quality maintenance
 - a. Provide cool water by maintaining shade, groundwater temperature, flow, and other watershed processes controlling water temperature
5. Provide complex and productive in-stream and wetland habitat by recruiting large woody debris and litter
6. No net loss of hydroperiod maintenance
7. No significant increase in peak flow recurrence intervals of downgradient streams such that scour disturbs stream channel substrates providing actual and potential habitats for salmonids
8. No net loss of native species diversity
9. No net loss of state listed sensitive species or communities

5.9.3 **Rule Group Strategy**

An updated literature review was completed in 2013 and included all available literature on forest practices and wetlands in the Pacific Northwest (Adamus 2013). The results of the literature review were used to create a Wetland Research and Monitoring Strategy that outlined a comprehensive, scientifically sound approach to addressing whether forest practices rules are effective at protecting wetlands and wetland functions. This strategy guided the revision of the Work Plan's program and project structure, as well as the critical questions.

The strategy separated the effects of forest practices on wetlands into three categories; forest harvest, roads, and silvicultural chemicals. Forest harvest addresses effects of harvest within and outside of wetlands on both the wetland and downstream processes. Roads address the effects of road construction in a wetland as well as runoff from roads into adjacent wetlands. Additionally, the effectiveness of the wetland mitigation sequence was incorporated into the Forest Roads and Wetlands program since mitigation is generally triggered by road construction. Silvicultural chemicals will address the impacts of the application of pesticides (**herbicides for native or non-native vegetation management**) and fertilizers in and adjacent to wetlands.

There are six wetland programs:

- Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Program
- Wetland Management Zone Effectiveness Monitoring Program
- Forest Roads and Wetlands

Commented [HB297]: Each of these potential targets needs to be vetted against the need to protect the FPHCP fish, amphibian and water quality functions. Including them under the "degree to which Resource Objectives outlined in the FP HCP are being met" conflates the purposes of the HCP with those of the other rules.

We need a separate section that lists "potential" targets for the broader set of wetlands functions in the rules that could be verified with CMER research.

Commented [DK298R297]: Neither WetSAG Nor CMER has the jurisdiction to answer this question. It belongs to Policy and/or the Board.

Commented [HB299]: Do we still want this. Is there evidence that it is a problem.

Commented [DK300R299]: This question can be asked after the scoping process is complete.

Commented [TW301R299]: The subject of silvicultural chemicals is also included in the 2014 Adamus strategy document.

- Wetlands Intensive Monitoring Program
- Wetlands Mapping Program
- Silvicultural Chemicals and Wetlands

The Wetland Research and Monitoring Strategy prioritizes programs that are consistent with both Policy guidance and research needed to better develop and test hypotheses. The aim of the strategy is to examine the effectiveness of the rules at maintaining no net loss of wetland functions. Therefore, the highest priority reflects the hypothesized largest potential impact to wetland functions given the current forest practices rules. Subsequently, the remaining projects are organized in a phased approach. For example, Wetland Intensive Monitoring will be a subsequent project because it will be designed around the results and improved fundamental understanding yielded by the Forested Wetlands Effectiveness and Monitoring Program and the Wetland Management Zone Effectiveness Program.

Priority will be placed on scoping projects identified in the Clean Water Act (CWA) assurances milestones, specifically the Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Program and the Wetland Management Zone Effectiveness Program.

The Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Program is the top priority program because forested wetlands receive the least amount of protection compared to other wetland types (A and B). Forested wetlands can be clearcut and drained during reforestation under the Forest Practices Rules. The hydrologic and ecological functions that forested wetlands provide are not well understood and it is even less well-known how harvest in and around forested wetlands impacts those functions. The level to which forest regeneration restores pre-harvest wetland functions is also not known. Any improvements in understanding forested wetlands and how they change following timber harvest activities will help Policy to better understand the effectiveness of Forest Practices Rules.

Projects under the Wetland Management Zone Effectiveness Program are prioritized to follow the Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Program because it is not known whether buffering Type A and B wetlands under the current prescriptions successfully allows for no net loss of wetland functions. The Wetland Management Zone Effectiveness and Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Programs will provide fundamental information about the nature of forested, Type A and Type B wetlands. This information will inform research questions in future studies and foster a systematic understanding of wetlands across the landscape.

After wetland functions have been characterized more thoroughly, the Forest Roads and Wetlands Program will commence to determine the effects of forest roads on those functions. The effects of silvicultural chemicals on wetland functions will follow. The final program will be the Wetlands Intensive Monitoring Program, which is dependent on information yielded by preceding studies.

The assumptions and uncertainties described above guided the development of critical questions and research and monitoring programs to address them (Table 38). The revised project plan and priorities are consistent with the Ecology CWA assurances milestones for the Adaptive Management Program.

The Wetlands Rule Group strategy began in 2005 by conducting a comprehensive literature review with the Forested Wetlands Literature Review and Workshop Project. These efforts were undertaken to establish the current scientific basis for evaluating forested wetland functional relationships for salmonids,

FPHCP-covered species, and water quality and quantity. WetSAG then conducted a pilot study, the Statewide Forested Wetlands Regeneration Pilot Project, to evaluate regeneration of forested wetlands after harvest.

In combination, these efforts concluded that many research gaps exist around forested wetlands and that, in order to locate wetlands in a systematic and unbiased manner and study the effects of forest practices activities on these wetlands, the mapping data available needed improvement. A recommendation that emerged from the Statewide Forested Wetlands Regeneration Pilot Project led to creation of an additional pilot project, the DNR GIS Wetlands Data Layer Project. This second project added 165,000 polygons to the Forest Practices Application Review System (FPARS). Work on a process for continued improvement of the wetland data layer was redirected by Policy to DNR Forest Practices Division. A lack of funding and staff resources currently limits or prevents much progress on this task at DNR. A crosswalk between Forest Practices Wetland Classification and Hydrogeomorphic (HGM) Wetlands Classifications will be created in the future under the Hydrogeomorphic (HGM) Wetlands Classification System Project (which was folded into the Wetlands Intensive Monitoring Project). The HGM classification system defines wetlands based on landscape position and the source and connectivity of water to other water bodies. The crosswalk will facilitate better characterization, description, and assessment of impacts to wetland functions.

The 2010 strategy of completing the study design for the pilot project and Phases 1 and 2 of the Wetlands Mitigation Effectiveness Project was reprioritized in 2011 based on CMER review of the study design, FPA review, and discussions during field visits in follow-up meetings that led to returning the focus to the Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Program. Two main issues led to the recommendation of delaying the Wetlands Mitigation Effectiveness Program and reprioritizing how WetSAG proceeds in the wetland research program.

1. It is difficult, if not impossible, to know whether a landowner's decision on locating road segments is based on meeting the mitigation sequence; making the assessment on the effectiveness of the sequence problematic.
2. The effects of harvesting forested wetlands are uncertain and the risks to wetland functions may be greater than the effects of road construction/maintenance under current rules.

Ecology is charged with overseeing the CWA assurances milestones. In July 2009, Ecology developed the document 2009 Clean Water Act Assurances Review of Washington's Forest Practices Program, which outlines specific CMER projects targeted at answering critical questions associated with the CWA. Based on this review, research projects were reprioritized to improve the adaptive management program in meeting the intent of the CWA. Ecology's document also lists timelines and anticipated completion dates for those CMER projects. One of the CWA milestones was to develop a revised research strategy.

The first step in developing a revised research strategy was to conduct an up-to-date literature review. The Forest Practices and Wetlands Systematic Literature Review looks at how forest practices affect the capacity of wetlands to sustain fish, amphibians, and water quality in a watershed context. The Literature Review was intended to evaluate risk and uncertainty to wetland functions associated with harvesting and road construction in and around wetlands. The Literature Review identifies data gaps and developed testable hypotheses for other WetSAG projects to inform the scoping and design of future field studies. Projects identified in the CWA assurances milestones that needed to be addressed in a revised research strategy include the Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Study, Temperature and hydrologic connectivity

will be addressed as metrics in all projects.

Table 39. Wetlands Rule Group Critical Questions and Programs

Rule Group Critical Questions	Program Names	Task Type	SAG
<p>Are current forest practices rules for timber harvest in and around forested wetlands effective at meeting the Forest and Fish aquatic resource objectives and performance targets, and the goal of no-net-loss of functions of those wetlands?</p> <p>Are forested wetlands regenerating sufficiently to maintain no net loss of wetland functions?</p>	Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Program	Effectiveness	WetSAG
<p>Are current forest practices rules-specified wetland buffers (WMZ) for Type A and B wetlands effective at meeting the Forest and Fish aquatic resource objectives and performance targets, and the goal of no-net-loss of functions of those wetlands?</p>	WMZ Effectiveness Monitoring Program	Effectiveness	WetSAG
<p>Are road construction and maintenance activities in wetlands adequately mitigated to achieve no net loss of wetland functions?</p> <p>How and to what degree does forest road construction and maintenance near wetlands alter the water regimes, water quality, and habitat functions of the wetlands and downstream waters?</p>	Forest Roads and Wetlands	Effectiveness	WetSAG
<p>What are the magnitude and duration of effects of silvicultural chemicals on wetland processes, functions, and aquatic resources within the wetlands and connected waters?</p> <p>Do the pesticide and fertilizer Rules protect processes, functions, and aquatic resources within wetlands and connected waters?</p>	Silvicultural Chemicals and Wetlands	Effectiveness	WetSAG LWAG
<p>What are the spatial and temporal cumulative effects of multiple forest practices on wetlands connected waters at the watershed-scale level?</p> <p>What are the causal relationships and effects of forest practices on wetlands and connected waters?</p>	Wetlands Intensive Monitoring Program	Intensive Monitoring	WetSAG
Under Review	Wetlands Mapping Program	Rule Tool	WetSAG

5.9.4 Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Program

5.9.4.1 Program Strategy

This program consists of three projects (Table 39) that address uncertainty concerning the net loss of hydrologic function, water quality, fish and amphibian use, and recovery capacity of forested wetlands following timber harvest.

Table 40. Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
Are current forest practices rules for timber harvest in and around forested wetlands effective at meeting the Forest and Fish aquatic resource objectives and performance targets, and the goal of no-net-loss of functions of those wetlands? Are forested wetlands regenerating sufficiently to restore wetland functions?	
Program Research Questions <i>1. What are the effects, and their magnitudes and durations, of forest practices on water regimes, water quality, plant and animal habitats, and watershed resources in forested wetlands and linked (via surface or subsurface flow) downstream waters?</i> <i>a. How does timber harvest in forested wetlands alter processes that influence hydrologic regimes in those wetlands, in downgradient waters, and the connectivity between them?</i> <i>b. How does timber harvest in forested wetlands alter processes that influence water quality in those wetlands and in downgradient waters?</i> <i>c. How does timber harvest in forested wetlands alter processes that influence plant and animal habitat functions in wetlands, in connected waters, and in surrounding uplands?</i> <i>2. How well do current forest practices rules in forested wetlands meet the Forest and Fish aquatic resource objectives and performance targets, and the goal of no-net-loss of functions of those wetlands by half of a timber rotation cycle?</i>	Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project
	Forest Practices and Wetlands Systematic Literature Review
<i>How do post-harvest stand conditions and associated wetland functions compare with pre-harvest stand conditions and functions?</i>	Statewide Forested Wetlands Regeneration Pilot Project

5.9.4.2 Completed Projects (see Appendix x for details)

- [Forest Practices and Wetlands Systematic Literature Review](#)
- [Forested Wetlands Literature Review and Workshop Project](#)
- [Statewide Forested Wetlands Regeneration Pilot Project](#)

5.9.4.2.5.9.4.3 Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project

Description:

The Forested Wetland Effectiveness Project (FWEP) is a keystone program within the WetSAG’s workplan as it provides a scientific foundation from which to evaluate how forest harvest undertaken under current forest practice rules changes forested wetland hydrology and ecology. CMER and Policy recommended prioritizing this program following a WetSAG field trip with Ecology Wetlands Program staff that raised concerns about the potential effects of timber harvest on the function of forested wetlands and their hydrologically connected streams. Currently, the rules give limited protection to forested wetlands, and little is known about the effects of harvest on forested wetland hydrology and ecology. This project will look at the effectiveness of forest practices prescriptions to protect, maintain, and restore

Formatted: No Spacing, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Formatted: No Spacing, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

Formatted: No Spacing, Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

aquatic resources, namely water quality and wetland hydrologic and ecological functions.

This study is predicated upon hypotheses and questions developed in the Forest Practices and Wetlands Systematic Literature Review (below) and is designed to inform numerous WetSAG priority projects that will follow in future years. The FWEP will include two potential stages:

1. A Chronosequence Study designed to evaluate how forested wetland hydrology and ecology change over half a timber rotation cycle, using a space-for-time approach. This study is observational and capitalizes on DNR's forest practice application database to find sites of various ages, evaluating whether or not harvested forested wetlands' condition and function converge with unharvested wetlands over the half-timber rotation timeframe.
2. A before-after-control-impact (BACI) study that will prescribe manipulative forest harvest treatments and measure how forested wetlands' ecological and hydrologic functions change in real time following harvest. By tracking forested wetlands prior to harvest, during harvest, and immediately following harvest, this study will build on the chronosequence portion of the FWEP, reducing uncertainty associated with harvest practices, regeneration, and landscape variability that may arise in an observational study.

Status:

The project alternative was approved by Policy in early 2017. The study design was developed by the Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project Technical Writing and Implementation Group (FWEP TWIG). The history of the FWEP and anticipated future timeframes through this biennium are listed below.

- Chronosequence Study Design-
 - **Design-** Final design presented January 2018 and revised in July for CMER before being sent to ISPR in August 2018
 - **Review and Approval-** The study design received ISPR approval in October 2019 and CMER approval in December 2019. The study design was presented to the TFW Policy committee along with the prospective six-questions document in August 2020.
 - **Implementation-** ~~Development of the data management plan is ongoing.~~ Preliminary wetland mapping and development of Wetland Intrinsic Potential (WIP) maps occurred in Early 2022. Initial site reconnaissance began in Spring 2022 with site selection ~~planned for completion~~ in May 2023. ~~Site instrumentation will be complete by June of 2023.~~ Data collection will be ongoing through water year 2025.
- BACI Study Design-
 - **Design-** The BACI study design will be developed in 2026 after the completion of the Chronosequence.
 - **Review and Approval-** To be determined
 - **Implementation-** To be determined

5.9.5 Wetland Management Zone Effectiveness Monitoring Program

5.9.5.1 Program Strategy

The Wetland Management Zone Effectiveness Monitoring Program will be designed to assess the effectiveness of wetland management zones (WMZs) in meeting FP HCP resource objectives and performance targets (5.9.2). The WMZ rules are based on a number of assumptions, including the following:

- Meeting the wetland performance targets will achieve functional objectives.
- We can determine the effectiveness of BMPs, to a generalized degree, and standardize how we measure and document this effectiveness.
- Reaching BMP objectives at the site scale (i.e., applying WMZs and disconnecting road drainage to Type A and B wetlands) will lead to meeting sub-basin and watershed-scale functional objectives. (Note: Forested wetlands do not receive WMZs but may influence functional objectives at the sub-basin and watershed scale.)

These uncertainties form the basis for the critical questions that the program will be designed to address (Table 40).

Table 41. Wetland Management Zone Effectiveness Monitoring Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions		Project Names
Are current Forest Practice Rules-specified wetland buffers (WMZ) for Type A and B wetlands effective at meeting the Forest and Fish aquatic resource objectives and performance targets, and the goal of no-net-loss of functions of those wetlands?		
Program Research Questions	<p><i>What are the magnitude and duration of effects of timber harvest occurring upslope of Type A and B wetlands on processes, functions, and aquatic resources within and downstream of those wetlands?</i></p> <p><i>How effective are current forest practice wetland buffers at facilitating no net loss in wetland functions following timber harvest?</i></p>	Wetland Management Zone Effectiveness Project

5.9.5.2 Wetland Management Zone Effectiveness Monitoring Project

Description:

This project will evaluate wetland functions to determine if the target of no net loss of hydrologic function, Clean Water Act assurance targets, and hydrologic connectivity are being achieved. This would include informing two of the Schedule L-2 research questions listed below:

- TH8: Test whether the wetland prescriptions are effective in preventing downstream temperature increases beyond targets.
- LWD15: Evaluate the effectiveness of current WMZs in meeting in-stream LWD targets.

Status:

The effectiveness of buffers was researched during the Forest Practices and Wetlands Systematic Literature Review. However, most of the existing literature addresses stream buffers, which are not the same buffering prescriptions required for wetlands under current Forest Practices Rules. This project is in early scoping stages by WetSAG. The Project Charter was brought to CMER for review in April 2022,

Commented [HB302]: Note that this strategy is correctly limited to the FPHCP resource objectives and performance targets and does not all of the wetlands lands functions in the rules. Additionally, we need to include climate change within the FPHCP as requested by policy's F1 update request.

Commented [DK303R302]: This is a policy comment that does not belong in an update document.

gaining CMER approval the same month. Development of a scoping document is currently underway and slated for completion post schedule L-1 update. ~~in is slated for FY 2023-2024 and development of a study design is slated for FY 2024-2026.~~

Commented [S(304): This needs updating based off current schedule L-1 update needs.

5.9.6 Forest Roads and Wetlands Program

5.9.6.1 Program Strategy

The Forest Roads and Wetlands Program seeks to examine the effects of road construction, operation, and maintenance in and near wetlands. This program was created as a separate program outside of the Forest Roads Rule Group in order to examine the implications for wetlands specifically. The effects of roads are separated from timber harvest in order to understand how roads influence water regime, water quality, and habitat functions of all typed wetlands. The decision to separate the effects of roads was guided by the Wetland Research and Monitoring Strategy.

In order to achieve “no net loss of wetland function” when filling or draining more than 0.10 acre of wetland during road construction, forest practices rules require implementation of a mitigation sequence including avoidance and minimization (WAC 222-24); and replacement or restoration if filling more than 0.5 acre of wetland. Information on the effectiveness of these mitigation requirements is not currently available.

The Forest Roads and Wetlands Program has two projects: Road Effects on Wetlands and the former program, now-project, Wetlands Mitigation Effectiveness. The wetland mitigation sequence is primarily triggered by filling of wetlands for the construction of roads and landings. Because of this, and because the mitigation sequence is inextricably linked to forest roads, they are under the same program.

To address the performance target of “no net loss of hydrologic functions of wetlands” and Clean Water Act assurances, the Wetland Mitigation Effectiveness Project will evaluate several critical questions, including whether avoidance, minimization and replacement of lost functions are successful in achieving stated goals and objectives. This information can then be used to recommend any changes to the current process of wetland mitigation.

The Road Effects on Wetlands Project will test the effectiveness of Forest Practice Rules at meeting the performance target functional objectives and Clean Water Act Assurances.

Table 42. Forest Roads and Wetlands Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
Are road construction and maintenance activities in wetlands adequately mitigated to achieve no net loss of wetland functions?	
To what degree does forest road construction and maintenance near wetlands alter the water regimes, water quality, and habitat functions of the wetlands and downstream waters?	
	<i>Is the implementation of the wetland mitigation sequence ensuring no net loss of wetland functions?</i> Wetland Mitigation Effectiveness Project

Program Research Questions	<i>What are the magnitude and duration of effects of forest roads near wetlands on hydrologic regimes, water quality, habitat and aquatic organisms within and downstream of the wetlands?</i>	Roads Effects on Wetlands Project
----------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

5.9.6.2 *Withdrawn Projects (see Appendix X for details)*

- **Wetlands Mitigation Effectiveness Project**

5.9.6.2.5.9.6.3 *Roads Effects on Wetlands*

Description:

The Roads Effects on Wetlands project is a new project under the Wetlands Rule Group, and was identified as an important project in the Strategy. This project will seek to identify wetland functions that are altered by road construction, operation, and maintenance, and to determine the magnitude and duration of those changes.

Status:

This is a new project (and program) under the Wetlands Rule Group. During the Forest Practices and Wetlands Systematic Literature Review, the effects of forest roads on wetlands was examined in current literature. Few studies exist on how forest roads impact wetlands. The literature synthesis inferred that road impacts to wetlands may include increased delivery of sediments, changes in water regimes, and impacts to biota.

At this time, no further scoping is being done, but will be done in the future.

5.9.7 *Wetlands Intensive Monitoring Program*

5.9.7.1 *Program Strategy*

The Wetlands Intensive Monitoring Program will assess the spatial and temporal cumulative effects of multiple forest practices across a landscape. The program is meant to look at the long- term or residual, as well as the synergistic, effects of forest practices carried out under forest practices rules. Upon recommendation from the Wetland Research and Monitoring Strategy, this program will be delayed until the completion of other wetlands programs. In order to determine what functions will be assessed in this program, baseline information needs to be collected through the execution of other programs—the functions that have significant change or are subject to change because of interactions with the effects of multiple forest practices or accumulation across time and space will be considered in the Wetlands Intensive Monitoring Program. Until baseline information is collected during other programs, the projects for this program will not be fleshed out.

Table 43. Wetlands Intensive Monitoring Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
What are the spatial and temporal cumulative effects of multiple forest practices on wetlands and connected waters at the watershed scale?	Wetlands Intensive Monitoring Project
What are the causal relationships and effects of forest practices on wetlands and connected waters?	

Formatted: No Spacing, Space Before: 0 pt, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", Tab stops: Not at 0.74" + 0.74"

5.9.7.2 Wetlands Intensive Monitoring Project

Description:

Wetland functions are broadly defined in WAC 222-24 and -30 as water quality, water quantity, fish and wildlife habitat, and timber production, without specific species-related, wetland-type habitat criteria, narrative, or quantitative standards. Little to no research has been conducted within wetlands specific to forestlands or forest management in the Pacific Northwest relative to the species, resources, and critical processes (i.e., movement of surface and subsurface water) occurring within different types of wetlands and covered by the FP HCP. Without baseline information about expected species use, development and maintenance of structural habitat components, and connectivity of water through surface or subsurface flowpaths, and without numeric or narrative standards, it is not possible to evaluate whether the three performance goals of the FP HCP are being met through the application of forest practices regulations.

This project will evaluate the full suite of wetland functions in different ecoregions on both the eastside and the westside, stratified by HGM classification, forest practices type, Ecology wetland rating, and size. The HGM Wetlands Classification System Project was folded into this project.

Status:

To be scoped in the future and to be informed by the Wetland Management Zone Effectiveness Monitoring Project, Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project, and Forest Practices and Wetlands Systematic Literature Review Project.

5.9.8 Wetland Mapping Program

5.9.8.1 Program Strategy

This program is intended to address gaps in existing data on the location, distribution, size, and geophysical characteristics of wetlands, especially for forested wetlands. More accurate spatial data are enhancing the design and implementation of projects examining the effects of forest practices rules on wetland functions. In addition to aiding the location of potential wetlands to include in studies, the data can provide context for (1) focusing research on wetlands and associated typed-waters that may be vulnerable to harvest and road impacts, and (2) assessing the spatial applicability (inference) of study findings to other landscapes. The use of remote sensing and associated geospatial modeling with GIS is proving to be a viable tool to help fill these data needs. Although the WIP tool provides likely locations of wetlands, no suitable GIS model is currently available for grouping wetlands by functional type or landscape position.

Table 44. Wetland Mapping Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
How should wetlands be located, classified, and mapped?	Wetland Mapping Tool

5.9.8.2 Completed Projects (see Appendix x for details)

- [Wetland Intrinsic Potential Tool \(WIP\)](#)

5.9.9 Silvicultural Chemicals and Wetlands Program

5.9.9.1 Program Strategy

The Silvicultural Chemicals and Wetlands Program was developed in response to direction from the Wetland Research and Monitoring Strategy. It focuses on the forest practices rules on pesticide, herbicide, and fertilizer application on or near wetlands. The wetlands strategy did not specifically mention forested wetlands as being a priority ecotype when examining the effects of forest chemicals, and the Pesticide Rule Group does not cover the effects of fertilizers used during tree regeneration. This program seeks to examine the effects of forest chemicals on wetland functions.

CMER held a science conference in October 2016 to inform the members about the current use and related science concerning chemicals used in Forest Practices. No projects are proposed at this time.

Table 45. Silvicultural Chemicals and Wetlands Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
What are the magnitude and duration of effects of silvicultural chemicals (e.g., pesticide and fertilizers) practices on wetland processes, functions, and aquatic resources within the wetlands and connected waters?	None scoped.
Do the pesticide and fertilizer rules protect processes, functions, and aquatic resources within wetlands and connected waters?	

5.10 WILDLIFE RULE GROUP

Historically, Policy has funded a number of wildlife research projects since the late 1980s. These projects have addressed general multispecies and statewide issues, as well as species-specific concerns about the effects of forest practices.

Although the FP HCP is focused on water quality, fish, and stream-associated amphibians (SAAs), both Policy and CMER acknowledge that wildlife issues are important and need attention. To address this concern, CMER recently funded additional sampling and analyses of a study that examines wildlife use of two streamside buffer designs. However, because CMER's focus is currently on FP HCP priorities, the only funding available for additional wildlife projects is from the State General Fund.

5.10.1 Rule Overview and Intent

Forest practices rules directed at wildlife conservation take two approaches: (1) general statewide requirements; and (2) species-specific strategies. In addition, forest practices rules may benefit wildlife through the retention or enhancement of habitat, such as riparian buffers, upland management areas, channel migration zones, etc. The only statewide forest practices rule specifically directed at wildlife conservation is the provision for managing wildlife reserve trees (WAC 222-30-020[11]). Specifications for retaining wildlife reserve trees, green recruitment trees, and downed logs are provided for both eastern and western Washington.

Species-specific forest practices rules are closely tied to state and federal endangered and threatened species programs. Habitat of listed species is defined as critical habitat (state), and any proposed forest practices activity in critical habitat becomes a Class IV special forest practices under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) (WAC 222-10-040), requiring consultation, evaluation, an environmental impact statement (where appropriate), and mitigation. There are currently 10 species for which these rules apply (including the bald eagle [*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*], grizzly bear [*Ursus arctos*], northern spotted owl [*Strix occidentalis*], and marbled murrelet [*Brachyramphus marmoratus*]).

In some cases, the Forest Practices Board (Board) has endorsed a species-specific approach that avoids rule-making. This approach usually involves developing and adopting management plans or specifying "voluntary" guidelines. The Federal listing of the lynx (*Lynx canadensis*) prompted the state and a few large private landowners in northeastern Washington to develop and adopt lynx management plans. Similarly, the state listing of the Taylor's checkerspot butterfly (*Euphydryas editha taylori*) resulted in landowner commitments to develop management plans to protect, and possibly help restore, the few occupied sites. After the state listing of the western gray squirrel (*Sciurus griseus*), landowners agreed to apply forest practices guidelines developed by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) in areas known to contain the species. These species-specific rules and associated guidelines are very complex, with details on habitat definitions, monitoring methods, and provisions for site protection varying by species. In addition, the Board often adopts rule options that allow landowners to develop their own species-specific management plans.

5.10.2 Rule Group Resource Objectives and Performance Targets

No resource objectives or performance targets exist for wildlife rules.

5.10.3 Rule Group Strategy

Wildlife research pertaining to fish and amphibians (aquatic and riparian-dependent) are covered under the Type N Riparian Prescriptions Rule Group, specifically within the Sensitive Site Program and the Type N Amphibian Response Program. The Wildlife Rule Group contains only one active program, which focuses on wildlife species within upland management areas (UMAs) or riparian management zones (RMZs). This rule group’s critical question is listed in Table 46.

Table 46. Wildlife Rule Group Critical Questions and Programs

Rule Group Critical Questions	Program	Task Type	SAG
What roles do RMZs, UMAs, and other forest patches play in maintaining species and providing structural and vegetative characteristics thought to be important to wildlife?	Wildlife Program	Effectiveness Validation	LWAG

5.10.4 Wildlife Program

The purpose of the Wildlife Program is to (1) determine the species of wildlife that use managed forests; (2) estimate habitat conditions associated with wildlife use of managed forests; (3) assess the efficacy of regulations designed to provide habitat for wildlife in managed forests; and (4) identify emerging forestry-wildlife issues and develop research projects that address those issues.

5.10.4.1 Program Strategy

With the current emphasis of CMER on the Forest Practices Adaptive Management Program, there is little opportunity to fund projects for wildlife other than those species that are covered under the FP HCP (i.e., aquatic species and riparian-dependent amphibians). LWAG has identified and prioritized several wildlife issues (upland and/or riparian) that need attention. These issues are described in the rule group critical question in Table 47 and are primarily addressed with the RMZ Resample Project.

Table 47. Wildlife Program: Applicable Rule Group Critical Questions with Associated Research Projects

Rule Group Critical Questions	Project Names
What roles do RMZs, UMAs, and other forest patches play in maintaining species and providing structural and vegetative characteristics thought to be important to wildlife?	RMZ Resample Project

5.10.4.2 Completed Projects (see Appendix x for details)

- [RMZ Resample Project](#)

5.10.5 Other Wildlife Programs/Projects

Wildlife research priorities were developed as part of the original TFW stakeholder process. These research priorities were in place prior to adoption of the current adaptive management program developed in concurrence with the Forests and Fish Report. Under the current Forest Practices Adaptive Management Program, and to fulfill requirements of the FP HCP, research is prioritized and funded to primarily address aquatic resources. However, TFW stakeholders continue to see the importance of addressing effectiveness and monitoring of nonaquatic wildlife, and they hope to incorporate priority wildlife research in the future.

Formatted: No Spacing, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.36" + Indent at: 0.61", Tab stops: Not at 0.74"

Table 48 lists the critical wildlife research questions developed by TFW stakeholders.

Table 48. Wildlife Rule Group Critical Questions and Associated Programs (Developed as Part of TFW)

Rule Group Critical Questions	Program	Task Type
<p>What are the values of snags retained in upland management units and riparian management zones (RMZs)?</p> <p>Is there a threshold response by wildlife to snag density?</p> <p>What are the fates of wildlife reserve trees (WRT) and green recruitment trees (GRT) in managed forests?</p> <p>What are the most effective ways of retaining and replacing snags?</p>	Effectiveness of snags for wildlife	Effectiveness Validation
<p>What are the effects of variation in stand establishment practices, herbicides, thinning, fertilization, and rotation lengths on vegetation and wildlife?</p> <p>Does the concept of the steady-state shifting mosaic apply, and how does that process affect wildlife?</p>	Conifer management effects on wildlife	Effectiveness Validation
<p>What roles do RMZs, upland management areas (UMAs), and other forest patches play in maintaining species and providing structural and vegetative characteristics thought to be important to wildlife?</p> <p>What are the functions of large legacy trees (snags, down wood, high stumps) as compared to the smaller complements produced in intensively managed forests?</p> <p>What are the roles and fates of special sites (e.g., rock outcrops, cliffs, talus slopes, isolated small wetlands, etc.) in managed forests?</p>	Legacy features and their effect on wildlife	Effectiveness Validation
<p>What are the movement patterns, processes, and distances of amphibians in managed forests?</p> <p>Do amphibians persist in refugia following timber harvest, or is subsequent occupancy related to movements from other areas?</p> <p>How quickly do amphibians recolonize areas, particularly habitat outside the stream network?</p> <p>What are the roles of ponds created by beaver, slumps, rotational failures, road ditches, sediment traps, and off-channel habitats in the distribution and abundance of still-water-breeding amphibians?</p>	Amphibian movement and distribution effectiveness monitoring	Effectiveness
Rule Group Critical Questions	Program	Task Type
What are the status and trends of bats in managed forests?	Forest Bats	Extensive
What are the roles of WRTs and GRTs in bat ecology?	Forest Bats	Effectiveness
What are the relationships between forest management and bat foraging and roosting?	Forest Bats	Effectiveness
What is the relationship between the abundance and productivity of wildlife and gradients in the composition and structure of ponderosa pine stands?	Ponderosa Pine Habitat	Effectiveness

What are the effects of forest practices on the western gray squirrel and oviposition sites of egg-laying reptiles?	Oak Woodland Habitat	Effectiveness
What are the roles of isolated oak trees and small patches of oaks?		
What are the appropriate management approaches to maintaining and restoring oak woodlands at stand and landscape levels?		

5.11 INTENSIVE WATERSHED-SCALE MONITORING TO ASSESS CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Intensive monitoring is watershed-scale research designed to evaluate the cumulative effects of multiple forest practices and to provide information that will improve our understanding of causal relationships and the biological effects of forest practices rules on aquatic resources. The evaluation of cumulative effects of multiple management actions on a system requires an understanding of how individual actions influence a site, and how those responses propagate through the system. This understanding will enable the evaluation of the effectiveness of management practices applied at multiple locations over time. This sophisticated level of understanding can only be achieved with an intensive, integrated monitoring effort. Evaluating biological responses is similarly complicated, requiring an understanding of how various management actions interact to affect habitat conditions, and how system biology responds to these habitat changes. This program was identified in the Monitoring Design Team (MDT) Report (MDT 2002) as an essential component of an integrated monitoring program. CMER and Policy will be scoping intensive monitoring needs for the adaptive management program.

5.11.1 Resource Objectives and Performance Targets

Resource objectives and performance targets have not yet been identified.