

Timber, Fish and Wildlife Policy Committee

Tuesday, November 7, 2024 // 9:00AM – 12:54 PM

Virtual: Zoom (Link Listed Below)

In-Person: 401 North Riverpoint Boulevard Spokane, Washington 99202

Motions	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
<p>October (Sept 24th) Meeting Notes</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Ken Miller moved to approve the October 2024 meeting notes.</p> <p>The motion passed.</p>	<p>Seconded: Brandon Austin</p> <p>Up: Ken Miller, Darin Cramer, Court Stanley, Brandon Austin/ Chris Briggs *, Cody Thomas, Rico Vinh,</p> <p>Sideways: Saboor Jawad (he did not attend the Sept 24th meeting)</p> <p>Absent: Rob Purser</p>
<p>Westside Type F Findings Report</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Saboor Jawad moved that following TFW Policy's acceptance of the Westside Type F Exploratory Report and the agreement that the report does not warrant a rule change by the FPB, the following actions will be taken:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Request the AMPA to forward and facilitate a presentation by the PIs to the FPB. 2. TFW Policy to initiate a dialogue with CMER on the Type F Experimental Buffer Treatment Project (ex. 25-27 CMER Work Plan 5.3.7.3) <p>The motion passed.</p>	<p>Seconded: Cody Thomas</p> <p>Up: Dave Roberts, Darin Cramer, Court Stanley, Brandon Austin/ Chris Briggs*, Cody Thomas, Rico Vinh, Rob Purser, Saboor Jawad</p>
<p>Type Np Discontinuous Flow Scoping Document</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Brandon moved that Policy approve the Discontinuous flow scoping document moving forward with the recommended alternative 3.</p>	<p>Seconded: Rico Vinh</p> <p>Up: Dave Roberts, Darin Cramer, Court Stanley, Brandon Austin/ Chris Briggs*, Rico Vinh, Rob Purser, Saboor Jawad</p> <p>Sideways: Cody Thomas (hesitation on approving this given funding issues and low priority, long standing concern over funding amphibian experiments)</p>

*Department of Ecology and Department of Fish and Wildlife share one State Agency vote.

Action Items	
Action Items	Responsibility
AMPA to forward and facilitate the Westside Type F presentation by the PIs to the FPB.	AMPA
TFW Policy to initiate a dialogue with CMER on the Type F Experimental Buffer Treatment Project	AMPA will facilitate a meeting
Alternate Harvest Prescription – Dispute Resolution- will be on the November 20 th work group meeting.	Alternate Harvest Prescription work group
Rico will bring the proposed BM 22 changes related to Outside Science / Non-CMER Science to the December TFW Policy meeting.	Rico Vinh

Cody Thomas read ground rule #7

Caucus Updates

- Saboor Jawad provided the update that he will be the interim DNR representative for TFW Policy until Donelle Mahan can take over.

Staff Updates

- Theryn provided an update on the SL-1 SME process. UW has secured 8 out of 9 contracts for the three SME groups. The Wetlands group will kick-off on November 14th.
- The Washington State Department of Natural Resources’ Forest Practices Program will be hosting the Q4 fpOnline Town Hall Meeting on Monday, November 18, 2024, from 9:30 AM - 11:00 AM

CMER Updates

- Ash Roorbach, CMER Co-chair, gave a brief update on what was discussed at the October 2024 CMER Meeting and let TFW Policy know of a few different items that will be coming their way.

Forest Practices Board Update

- First topic?
- CR 102 decision is pending cost-benefit evaluation. Board is receiving biennial compliance monitoring update.
- Board is considering approving Board Manual 17 (FREP).
- Board will receive updates on Western Gray Squirrel.

Commented [C1]: @Jawad, Saboor (DNR) do you have your notes on this?

Public Comments

- None

ENREP extension update/discussion

TFW Policy discussion summary:

- Rico provided an update on possible next steps for ENREP extended monitoring (beyond FY25) decision. He shared that a proposal was developed within his caucus that would support the requested ENREP extension (caucus already approved a 1-year extension). He shared: The TFW Policy Committee approves the collection of a total of three additional years of post-harvest data for ENREP, beyond the approved study design two years post-harvest, contingent upon availability of funds in the 2025-2027 biennium budget. The additional data and information will be included as a separate appendix to the original study. The TFW Policy Committee reaffirms its commitment to respond to the ENREP study report as originally scheduled, two years post-harvest, and will follow the timelines outlined in the DNR AMP Board Manual (Section 22) in determining the type of action to be taken based on this report. The approval of this extended monitoring does not negate or imply that the original study design will fail to produce sufficient information for TFW Policy to act as required.
- Other TFW Policy members said they largely understood the proposal Rico shared. Cody sought to clarify the total timeline of the project, including extension.
- Lori clarified that the ENREP extension request is for an additional 5-years post-harvest (for a total of 7 years post-harvest).
- The request is to extend monitoring additional 5 years beyond the study design previously approved by CMER, Independent Scientific Peer Review (ISPR) and TFW Policy for a total of 7 years post-harvest at the ENREP sites to monitor the persistence of the observed changes and the recovery dynamics
- This will be added to the December TFW Policy meeting as a decision item.

Westside Type F Findings Report

The Westside Type F exploratory preferred alternative was originally to inform the BACI. Given the conclusion of the exploratory findings there is discussion on incorporating alternative buffer treatments into a Type F Experimental project. At the October meeting, TFW Policy did approve a motion to take action. Per BM-22, TFW Policy Committee has 60 days (November 23rd) to develop appropriate alternative courses of action, and an additional 45 days (December 8th) to reach a consensus decision on an alternative to recommend to the Board.

TFW Policy discussion summary:

- Court shared that he had issues finding the WTF Findings Package online, but it was clarified that it is available on DNR's website and on SharePoint. He added that the windthrow should be looked at more specifically moving forward.
- Cody shared some ideas on next steps, initially doesn't think a next full-scale project would be necessary. Would like to focus on LWD, specifically, how the current Type-F rules affect wood loading and existing LWD.
- Darin C. shared that he is also interested in wood loading questions and in RMZ management. He does not support the recommendations to include the sites in the ExMo Project at this time.
- Chris shared that he would want to know how long it takes for standing wood to fall and enter the stream and if we can manage and accelerate large wood loading. (on the topic of) He supports recommending RSAG to consider including WTF sites in ExMo, but not demand or deny inclusion. He shared that it's important to consider operational differences in RMZ management in both the short-term and long-term benefits. Biggest takeaway from report is the impact of inner

zone harvest on achieving DFC. He also asked how much detail is needed in their directive to CMER.

- Brandon A. shared that we should give CMER the leeway to consider the full range of options. Looking at large wood would be good. Supports the idea of RSAG considering the inclusion of the WTF sites in ExMo. He suggested that the SDM training/workgroup experience could be applied here. He also clarified that no rule change recommendation would come of this, but instead a directive to CMER for next steps.
- Dave shared that ID teams could be used for site selection.
- Saboor shared his interest in the finding the of impact on inner zone harvest on DFC. He also advocated for sharing the report and preliminary decision of no rule change with the FP Board sooner rather than later.
- Rico shared that alternate harvest prescriptions are relevant to potential WTF next steps.
- Court asked for a joint workshop between CMER and TFW Policy to decide next steps. Cody countered that he felt this would be premature and Policy needs more time to review and think.
- Saboor made the motion: Following TFW Policy acceptance of the Westside Type F Exploratory Report and agreement that the report does not warrant a rule change by the FPB, the following actions will be taken: 1. request AMPA to forward report and facilitate presentation by the PIs to the FPB, and 2. TFW Policy to initiate dialogue with CMER on a Type F experimental buffer treatment project (ex. 25-27 CMER Work Plan, 5.3.7.3).

Alternate Harvest Prescription (AHP)– Dispute Resolution Phase 1 Update

The Alternate Harvest Prescription (AHP) was originally brought to TFW Policy at the June 2024 meeting. It was noted as a decision item at the August 2024 TFW Policy, but it was postponed to September 2024. Dispute was initiated (formally) October 2, 2024. Position papers were due on October 9th and that was extended to October 16th. All caucuses have provided the position papers into the dispute folder. The Alternate Harvest Prescription dispute was removed from the October 16th workgroup meeting because the disputing party could not attend the meeting. The TFW Policy meeting today counts as Meeting #3.

Stage 1 may conclude prior to November 27, 2024, if a consensus agreement is reached. If consensus is not reached, Stage 2 can be initiated if a caucus wishes to elevate the dispute to a mediated process. Stage 2 is not automatic – the process can end if a dispute is resolved or dropped by the initiator.

If Stage 2 is initiated, Lori will work with Triangle & Associates to begin setting up the mediation process.

TFW Policy discussion summary:

- Ken sought to clarify Rico’s position on the thinning prescription.
- Chris shared that he felt incorporating the thinning prescriptions in the next phase of the WTF project would be a good idea and could be efficient and save the AMP money.
- Brandon reiterated that for AHP, some monitoring will be required and that the WTF project team could include that monitoring as a part of the WTF project next steps.
- Cody agreed that it would be a good compromise to include the AHP monitoring in the WTF project next steps.
- Saboor shared his perspective of AHP process history, context, and next steps.
- Brandon corrected minor elements of Saboor’s point on dispute resolution outcomes in reference to DNR commitments to the Board.
- Ken asked to separate the 2 AHP elements. He underscored his overarching goals and understanding of process. Discussed how the FREP program affects SFLO riparian harvesting.
- Chris clarified Ken’s points and shared his sentiment of separating the two AFP elements for separate consideration.
- Saboor shared that the WTF 53% shade results should offer a measure of confidence with the

40% shade option for the alternate harvest prescription.

- Rico shared that there has been a lot of reliance on the WTF Exploratory Report, that the findings have limited implications due to scope of work of the exploratory study. There is a pathway/process for SFLOs to participate in this prescription. Need answers with a higher degree of certainty. There is not a strong rationale to move ahead too quickly and putting undue risk on resource.
- Cody shared that it seems TFW Policy needs more time to continue these conversations.
- Ken stated that we need to decide if want to help DFC (thinning prescription). He shared some duties of the SFLO Office are not being done (monitoring and additional assistance with alternate plans).
- Court shared that this (AHP) is minimal risk thus there is no reason to hold off on moving forward helping landowners manage their RMZs.
- Chris clarified that the WTF report is not and was not used to develop the prescription(s). In terms of risk to the resources, eligibility criteria is very important. This is meant for specific stands that have a loss in potential growth/sensitivity to disturbances.
- Rico wants more science to underscore the sentiments and observations others have shared.
- Cody shared that the December Policy meeting that it would have to move to stage 2.

There was discussion of consensus for TFW Policy to attend the workgroup meeting on November 20th and if an agreement cannot be made, this will move to stage 2. No formal motion was made. The process document will be updated after the meeting today to reflect progress toward the dispute.

Outside Science/ Non-CMER Science

Work group members reviewed combined (Outside Science) proposal(s) for changes to the PI process. All TFW Policy members were invited to provide suggested edits to BM22 in preparation for the October SAO workgroup meeting. Mostly comments were provided. Edits are pending further discussion.

TFW Policy discussion summary:

- Court asked if TFW Policy has agreement that outside science could be incorporated into decision making is a process is added to Board Manual. Rico responded “no”.
- TFW Policy members were discussing the basics of initiating a dispute.
- Dave shared that the reason the AMP needs outside science is that it takes too long for the AMP to complete research and monitoring projects.
- Rico shared that the slowness of our process is resulting from our consensus approach, outside science doesn't fit that process. Rico considered the purpose and usefulness of operating outside of our existing consensus processes.
- Cody identified that there seems to be an issue still of should we do this at all, or should we identify a process through revising BM22?
- Darin underscored the status quo per BM22 and that not allowing outside science would require a rule change discussion. He also mentioned how much time has been spent on this process and that we need to get to the dispute so we can move the conversation forward. Continued discussion over process, what had been agreed to in previous motions, and what the dispute details could be over.
- Rico will develop a paper defining his position and changes to BM-22 that could be used to initiate dispute over.

Type Np Discontinuous Flow Scoping Document

TFW Policy reviewed the CMER-approved Discontinuous Flow Scoping Document September 26th – October 26th, 2024. Today the Type Np Discontinuous Flow Scoping Document is up for approval.

Chris walked through his minor edits and Aimee responded to questions. Details will be clarified in the Study Design about what we expect to get from the study. This project is of interest to ECY to better understand the intermittent reaches of Type Np waters. Alternative 3 was recommended by CMER. Saboor asked what about the MPS-approved funding for the Type Np Discontinuous Flow Study Design. Lori responded that there is \$80,000 approved for FY25 for the Study Design development and that there are “placeholder” funds approved through FY2030 for implementation. Following the approval of the Scoping Document the Project Team will need to firm up the cost estimates and adjustments will be made to the MPS for TFW Policy consideration.

List of Attendees

Attendees Representing

§Austin, Brandon*	WDFW
§Briggs, Chris*	Department of Ecology
§Cramer, Darin	Large Industrial Landowner Caucus/WFPA
§Jawad, Saboor	DNR
§Miller, Ken	Small Forest Landowner/WFFA
§Purser, Rob	Skokomish Tribe/Westside Tribes
§Stanley, Court	WSAC
§Thomas, Cody	Eastside Tribe Caucus/UCUT
§Vinh, Rico	WCA/Conservation Caucus/TFW Policy Co-chair
Belleveau, Lisa	Skokomish Tribe
Black, Jenelle	CMER Scientist
Clark, Lori	Adaptive Management Administrator
Franquemont, Maggie	DNR
Heimburg, John	WDFW
Henkel, Theryn	Supervisory Project Manager/DNR
Holy, Shae	Skokomish Tribe
Kautz, Kyle	Nisqually Tribe
Kay, Debbie	Westside Tribes CMER Voting Member
Mahan, Donelle	DNR
McIntyre, Aimee	WDFW/CMER Voting Member
Mendoza, Chris	CMER Voting Member/Conservation Caucus
Murray, Joe	RSAG Co-chair
Prescott, Alexander	Project Manager/DNR
Roberts, Dave**	Small Forest Landowner/WFFA/SFL Caucus Alternate
Roorbach, Ash	CMER Co-chair/NWIFC
Schofield, Jenny	Project Manager/DNR
Smith, Kendra**	Skagit County/Counties Caucus Alternate
Toledo, Anna	Project Manager/DNR
Zirkle, Karen **	DNR/ Caucus Alternate

§TFW Policy Voting Member

*Department of Ecology and Department of Fish and Wildlife share the State Agency vote

**TFW Policy Caucus Alternate