

Timber, Fish, and Wildlife Policy Committee
 Thursday, November 5th, 2020 // 9:00 am – 1:20 pm
 Remotely held using Zoom

Prepared for the TFW Policy Committee by Jacob Hibbeln, AMP Administrative Assistant

Motions November 5, 2020	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
1. Approve the October 1 Meeting minutes as amended.	Steve Barnowe-Meyer/Ray Entz (Up: SFL, Industrial Timber, Conservation, DNR, WDFW/ECY, Counties, Westside Tribes; abstained: Eastside tribes; Absent: Federal caucus.

Action Items November 5, 2020	
Action Items	Responsibility
1. Have a monthly update on the Hard Rock Phase II project.	Hibbeln, co-chairs
2. Discuss the subject of expedited rule making at the December Policy meeting.	Co-chairs
3. Have a monthly process check-in for a funding request to the legislature related to the Adaptive Management Program (AMP).	Hibbeln, co-chairs

MINUTES

Welcome, Introductions, and Old Business

Marc Engel, co-chair

Engel took roll call and asked caucuses for any updates. Steve Barnowe-Meyer, SFL caucus, stated that the progress of the SFL Experimental Alternate Harvest Prescriptions Workgroup is currently on schedule to deliver a recommendation to the Policy committee in January 2021.

After reviewing edits sent in, motion #1 was made to accept the October meeting minutes as amended.

CMER Updates

Jenny Knoth, CMER co-chair

Knoth reviewed the CMER SAG updates sent out to Policy and recapped the decisions and discussions at the last CMER meeting.

SFL Template Supporting Science Review

Knoth

Knoth stated that the group's next meeting is on Friday, November 6th and then requested for a 30 day extension to deliver a full review of the SFL Template. There was a question of whether or not the extension needed to be voted on. Darin Cramer, WFPA, and Engel agreed that this does not need to be formally approved by Policy. Barnowe-Meyer referenced the original motion language and confirmed that a formal decision was not required. Ken Miller, SFL caucus, requested progress reports at each meeting.

Forest Practices Board (FPB) Agenda Review

Engel

Engel stated that the FPB meeting will take place on November 12th and then reviewed topics that were relevant to Policy. This included the FPB identifying an ongoing list of rule clarifications that are needed.

Alec Brown, WEC, asked a question about expedited rulemaking in order to address necessary rule clarifications. He asked about what brought this up and if people felt the need to review the rules needing clarification. Engel responded that these rules were clerical and grammatical corrections and involved no changes to the protection of resources which would have included a Policy and public review of the proposed rules. Brandon Austin, Ecology, stated that the rule chapters are reviewed in their entirety so that everyone is clear on contents and if anyone objects to changes it goes back into review. The point was that before any objection is made, people should have an opportunity to review any rule changes.

It was decided that there would be a conversation regarding rulemaking by the FPB at the December Policy meeting.

SFL Dispute Resolution Update

Meghan Tuttle, co-chair, and Ben Flint, DNR

Tuttle stated that at the last Dispute Resolution meeting, the group agreed to enter into Stage II of dispute resolution. She stated that the Policy meeting discussion would consist of three parts: Any discussion about stage I, a status update on the contracting process for a mediator, and a follow up with the discussion about the WFFA Proposed Discussion Topic document clarifying the scope of the dispute presented at the October meeting to ensure that there is not a process foul by Policy affirming their understanding of the document.

Flint stated that the solicitation request has been developed and the contracting process is no longer constrained by a master contract due to the specific nature of the Adaptive Management

Program's work. The process should be completed and a mediator should be under contract by mid-December.

Miller asked if there would be any interim meetings before Stage II begins in order to avoid losing momentum. Tuttle stated that while keeping momentum is important, there would need to be a specific desired outcome of any meeting scheduled.

Barnowe-Meyer then discussed the Proposed Discussion Topic document which was used at the beginning of the Dispute Resolution process. The purpose of this conversation was to ensure there are no process fouls by working towards something that is not in the verbiage of the dispute. Barnowe-Meyer made it clear that the dispute is centered on riparian buffer widths.

Ray Entz, Eastside tribal caucus, stated his lack of concern regarding a process foul. In terms of attempting to secure funding for the Small Forest Landowner Office (SFLO) and Forest Riparian Easement Program (FREP), he thought that buffer widths are seen as alleviating some economic burden of small forest landowners. Entz sees this as another way to resolve the issue, while others might view this as a process foul. No caucuses raised concerns about any process fouls.

Type Np Workgroup Update

Cramer and Jim Peters, Westside tribes

Cramer stated that the group is on track to complete work in February 2021 in accordance with the charter. He understands that Hard Rock Phase II final report should be completed soon and that Soft Rock report is due in the spring of 2021. While this is not ideal, it will not halt the progress of the workgroup. Policy is not anticipating the workgroup recommendations report will be significantly off schedule.

Mark Hicks, AMPA, asked if the results from Hard Rock Phase II and Soft Rock studies are integrated into the charter. Cramer stated that the workgroup will try and finish their reports by February regardless of when the final versions of these two reports are received. After more discussion of how the Hard and Soft Rock study results would impact this work group, Hicks added that it might take until June 2021 for both studies to get through ISPR.

Members agreed that a monthly update on the Hard and Soft Rock studies are needed at each Policy meeting.

Extended Monitoring Workgroup Agenda

Austin

Austin reviewed the main points of the proposed agenda which was sent out, stating that the workshop should happen sooner rather than later. He commented that help from CMER with building an Extended Monitoring data base would be beneficial. Cramer stated that data management is important albeit not top priority.

Austin added that CMER members and federal caucuses should be invited to the workshop. Cramer commented that it is best to begin contacting participants fairly soon.

Protocol and Standards Manual (PSM) Chapter 8 Presentation

Teresa Miskovic, DNR, and Ash Roorbach, NWIFC

Roorbach briefly covered the history of revisions to the PSM, clarifying that Chapter 8 focuses on the CMER review process.

Miskovic then gave a presentation on chapter 8, after which Policy members had the opportunity to ask clarifying questions. Austin inquired about the typical cost of publishing a CMER study. Knoth responded that this could cost anywhere between \$2500 and \$5000, depending on the journal and publication.

Adaptive Management Program (AMP) Legislative Report

Hicks

Hicks introduced the report and explained that he was attempting to show that the AMP has a strategy for the speed at which the program moves from project to project. This year, DNR is asking for twice as much in General Fund and State (GF-S) as usual.

Cramer commented that the report has room for improvement in terms of making the AMP more understandable for legislators who are not familiar with the program. He asked that a one pager of the AMP's priorities be developed that gives a solid rationale for more funding. The intent of this critique is to make people aware about the prioritization of program needs.

Peters emphasized the importance of educating legislators on the reasons for full funding for the AMP, adding that it would be ideal to have a dedicated source of funding for the program. Peters added that he would like to include budget experts at DNR that might help with the strategizing process.

Tuttle proposed the idea of a subgroup that she would be willing to lead in order to organize AMP legislative priorities.

Legislative Representative Priorities

Department of Natural Resources (DNR)

Amanda Jahshan, DNR

Jahshan first addressed that funding for the AMP is not reflected in the DNR legislative priorities document because there is a meeting next week to discuss this specifically. After covering the budget situation, Jahshan stated that the three priorities for DNR are job creating, community resilience, and revenue generation.

Cramer commented on the lack of a request for more funding for the Small Forest Landowners Office (SFLO) and also commented on what the plan was to deal with future budget cuts. Jahshan responded that the agency is working to preserve the AMP and will have to follow up with Stephen Bernath, DNR, to fully answer the question. Peters added that he cannot be involved with asking for more funds, but he can be involved in educating the legislature on why a fully funded SFLO and FREP are important.

Todd Bolster, Western Washington tribal caucus legislative representative, stated that last year elevating legislative priorities was a scramble and this year, the caucus is considering additional avenues for greater funding so as not to rely solely on the Office of Financial Management.

Darci Nonemacher, WEC legislative representative, commented on the need for a specific strategy to maintain funding for the AMP. It is important to clarify what the budget priorities are.

Several caucuses agreed that all members should be on the same page in terms of legislative priorities and strategy.

Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)

Tom McBride, WDFW

McBride commented on the difficulty of having a remote session this year. WDFW has made a 15% cut for GF-S. WDFW's strategy will focus on projects that will put people to work, therefore stimulating the economy.

Washington Environmental Council (WEC)

Nonemacher

Nonemacher stated that the top 3 priorities for the WEC are holding the line on environmental funding in operating budgets, a clean fuel standard, and transportation funding. Land use and the Growth Management Act will also be focused on. The budget will be focused on as much as possible due to the impact it could have on other legislative priorities.

Jahshan stated that DNR cannot participate in a grassroots lobbying effort but can be better at communications to help facilitate legislative education. Nonemacher commented that it is very important to have a specific amount of money that it will take to accomplish a goal.

After caucuses agreed that this should be discussed again at the December Policy meeting, Peters asked if DNR would schedule a meeting in order to begin the discussion of legislative education and strategy.

The action items and motions were reviewed, after which the meeting was adjourned.

Attendees by Caucus

*Caucus representative

Conservation Caucus

*Alec Brown (WEC)
Chris Mendoza (CMER co-chair)
Darci Nonemacher (WEC)

County Caucus

*Court Stanley
Kendra Smith (Skagit)

Large Industrial Landowner Caucus

*Darin Cramer (WFPA)
Doug Hooks (WFPA)
Meghan Tuttle (Weyerhaeuser/ co-chair)
Joe Murray (WFPA)
John Gold (Sierra Pacific)

Small Forest Landowner

*Steve Barnowe-Meyer (WFFA)

*Ken Miller (WFFA)
Jenny Knoth (WFFA/CMER co-chair)

State Caucus

*Brandon Austin (ECY)
Don Nauer (WDFW)
*Chris Conklin (WDFW)
*Marc Engel (DNR/co-chair)
Julie Gilling (DNR)
Amanda Jahshan (DNR)
Tom McBride (WDFW)
Marc Ratcliff (DNR)

Westside Tribal Caucus

*Jim Peters (NWIFC)
Ash Roorbach (NWIFC)
Curt Veldhuisen (SRSC)
Mark Mobbs (Quinault)
Todd Bolster (NWIFC)

Eastside Tribal Caucus

*Ray Entz (Kalispel)
John Sirois (UCUT)

Adaptive Management Program/CMER Staff

Mark Hicks (AMPA)
Ben Flint (DNR)
Teresa Miskovic (DNR)
Eszter Munes (DNR)
Jacob Hibbeln (DNR)