W7: The Upstream-Downstream connection- gaining knowledge to strengthen the relationships

Session note taker's notes

Session Goal: focus on the platform statement, and want to see what enhancements will improve the statement.

- **Platform statement overview: Jagoda Perich-Anderson, Shared Strategy**

  Goals:
  - To discuss how to support an ongoing linkage between salmon recovery efforts and the forest fish program.
  - To identify the most important goals and opportunities for coordination between the tow efforts.
  - To learn about the F&F adaptive management program.
  - To explore ways to work together over time to achieve mutual goals while acknowledging and respecting differences.

- Why is it important to connect Forests and Fish (F&F) program and salmon recovery?
  - Recovery plans cover the land and water from each river's headwaters to the Sound.
  - Recovery plans have to include expected results for salmon from all recovery-related actions by various entities across the region.
  - Regarding F&F, a recovery plan has to say:
    - How will F&F rules and compliance activities contribute to recovery?
    - How can results of F&F actions be quantified and integrated with other habitat actions in the recovery plan?
      - One example of where this is occurring is the Intensively Monitored Watersheds for Effective Monitoring program- focus on a few locations to achieve results for salmon- the idea is that by focusing on a few locations; will be able to extrapolate to other watersheds from there.
        - May need other ways to do this too.

- Common strengths and interests support the connection.
  - Both Programs:
    - Are recognized as the strongest of their kind.
    - Share a commitment to salmon and economic vitality.
    - Have a strong interest in having their respective investments pay off.
    - Can learn from each other and coordinate activities.
      - Fish passage can be coordinated on- working together we can figure out what aspects are most important to fish timing,

etc. May be a practical way to coordinate and have mutual benefit.

Differences to take into account:

-Two programs developed as separate processes so respective needs and goals were not correlated.

-Differences in scale, scope, goals, roles and results tracking need to be better understood.

What are the Key Differences?

-F&F- Scale difference- divided within the state between east and west, recovery plan- divided at local watershed level and regionally.

-Scope- F&F- habitat only, Recovery Plan- all four H's

-Goals- F&F-Manage habitat to support harvestable fish, and support viable timber industry, Recovery Plan- Recover and maintain an abundance of naturally spawning salmon at harvestable levels.

- How do we address the differences?
  - Gain knowledge to strengthen the relationship:
    - Identify and focus on areas of mutual interest.
    - Understand the implications of the differences

- What can we work on together to the mutual interests of both efforts?
  - Share lessons learned from monitoring/ research
  - Communicate monitoring/ research needs and who covers them
  - Coordinate restoration efforts- passage barrier projects
  - Work together on legislation and funding

- How could we structure an ongoing linkage?
  - Use existing mechanisms per the F&F rules
  - Develop ongoing relationship between the two groups
  - Serve a coordinating and bridging function between local watersheds and F&F managers
  - And coordinate efforts in funding

Understanding F&F Adaptive Management Program is logical start.

Presentation by Joseph Pavel, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission and Co-Chair F&F Policy Group

Forests and Fish Adaptive Management Program

- History of management practices between agencies is complex.
  Started out calling selves "forestry module"-with the idea of developing a state plan.
- Started a science team- worked for about 6 months- that did not work.

- Want to explore the parameters of the landscape inclusively- now building an adaptive management strategy around these parameters.

- Adaptive Management Program- good way to have feedback loop on monitoring- is what we are doing good enough, and adequately addressing the issues? F&F adaptive management program addresses these issues.

- Regulatory- the forest Practices board has directed the adaptive management program to be implemented and has structured the program in the rule (WAC 222-12-045)

- Public Participation- Interested parties are encouraged to participate through the cooperative monitoring evaluation and research committee. The forest practices board will consider research requests directly from the public as well.

- Forest and Fish report goals:

    - 1. Provide compliance with the Endangered Species Act for aquatic and riparian-dependent species on non-fed forest lands

    - 2. Restore and maintain riparian habitat on non-federal forest lands to support a harvestable supply of fish.

    - 3. Meet the requirements of the Clean Water Act for water quality on non-federal forest lands.

    - 4. Keep the timber industry economically viable in the State of Washington.

- ** Focus on what you can control! Can't control hatchery practices, harvest, fed agencies. Need to do what we can with forest lands to do our part in protection.

- Resource Objectives- resource objectives consist of:

    - Functional objectives- which are broad statements of objectives for the major watershed functions potentially affected by forest practices, and
    - Performance targets- which are the measurable criteria defining specific, attainable target forest conditions and processes.

    Functional objectives categories include: heat/water temperature, LWD/Organic inputs, sediment, hydrology, chemical inputs, stream typing and fish passage.

Performance targets accompany each functional objective and are measurable goals that are being tested through the F&F adaptive management program.

-Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER) is the committee assigned to test the effectiveness of forest and fish prescriptions, validate performance targets, and provide validation monitoring. What are our current research issues, what is our agenda and ranking. Accountability is built in to ensure we are on track.

CMER Studies:

- Extensive Status and trends Monitoring- planned studies to address status and trends resulting from implementation of the F&F.
- Effectiveness Monitoring- a site specific effort- has 62 planned studies to test effectiveness of F&F- arranged by program area.
- Validation monitoring- planned studies to validate and verify the assumptions underlying the functional objectives - are we getting a biological response to monitoring efforts- more of a long term tool.
    - How we manage quantitative stands- going through a process to make sure they had good information to base quantitative rules on based on study efforts.
    - Perennial flow- are we getting the correct starting points- validating assumptions.
- Intensive Monitoring- a watershed-scale program designed to evaluate the cumulative effects of multiple forest practices and provide information that will improve our understanding of causal relationships and the biological effects of F&F and Fish rules on aquatic resources.

-Evaluation of cumulative effects of multiple management actions on a system requires understanding how individual actions influence a site and how those responses propagate throughout the system. This understanding will enable the evaluation of the effectiveness of management practices applied at multiple locations over time.

- Conclusions- Adaptive Management is essential!
- Questions for Joseph- none.

- Issue Experts comments
    - Representative Jim Buck- Forests and Fish is an agreement between government, agencies, tribes and the timber industry, and is fairly set in stone. Agency lands make up a good component of forest lands, and can lead way for water quality in western Washington. One important issue was getting property owners to go along with us…one important thing Billy (referring to Billy Frank, Jr.) taught me, was to gain recognition from stakeholders- been the most important part of my legislative career. This last fall is the first time that fish that spawned in the first year of the Salmon Act made it full cycle and come back to spawn. To think that

what we started 5-6 yrs ago has just started to take root- is a long term planning process. We need to take that home to people.

- Small forest land owner perspective: Worked hard to explain the issue to small land owners, and no one was really sure at the time what the hardship would be. One thing that came out was for legislation to come through with help to pay for part of the riparian buffer costs. Thanks to the wisdom of lawmakers the program continues to be funded- is always a challenge to ensure. Particularly in case of budget deficit- we have more demand than money. A lot of small forest land owners take this very seriously. 50 yr timeframe- selling riparian zone at 50 yrs- by time the easement is done will have 100 yr old riparian buffers.

  Education and outreach is critical to success- have staff in the regions and Olympia- help with education, rules, regulations, programs, technical assistance. This is a worthwhile project for us. Also subject to funding- important to keep the office staffed. After 2019- HB 2095- house bill fish program- legislature recognized that current enforcement at the time would cause undue burden- now is cost share. Can apply to get the cost share- has positive effect opened; up a lot of fish stream lands, and watershed lands. Need to think about the people that live on their tree farms- need to recognize the burden placed on them- could have a purchase of development rights- they have generational perspective, want their kids and grandkids to continue to live on the land. Incentive programs would encourage them to stay on the land and continue to be a buffer between urban and rural.

- Steve Bernath, Dep. Of Ecology- One of the goals of forests and fish was to meet conditions of the clean water act. Basically, anything you do for clean water is good for salmon and visa versa- helping to deal with non-point pollution in forest practices- this helps a lot. Real strong relationship between the two goals (clean water and salmon recovery). How to make the upstream downstream work better- need to understand what we are both doing- forest land managers are providing habitat, and lessening run off issues. Both trying to remove fish barriers. Looking for funding and shared opportunities is always important. It is a public process- as research comes out it will be available to all of us. There is not enough money in any pot to measure and provide for all goals. Acknowledge common goals- and there will be the ability to collaborate.

- Jim Peters, Squaxin Island Tribe- Future, people, salmon. It is our responsibility to make decisions today that consider the seventh generation. Those are my kids and your kids. Was talking to a classroom in Olympia the other day- someone asked- are you only interested in seventh generation of tribe? No- have to protect for everyone. Part of that is making sure salmon and clean water are still around. Growing up- was

not a problem to swim in the stream without catching a skin disease. There are water quality issues now. Forests and Fish was probably one of the first salmon recovery projects that the tribes did. Stepped up and wanted more habitat for fish. Dealing with forest landowners- both state and private. Need to do the research and evaluate what to do/what we have done- adaptive management will help us to know where to back off and where to step up on effort. We also want critters and strong timber industry provided for. Trying to maintain habitat quality and forestry interests. I'm on the state conservation board- and there is the idea that the small farmer may have struggles- but that the corporate leaders will help out. But ones that have not bought into this idea will have a very hard time. It is a little easier for the big corporate land owners to take on some of the process- but tougher for the small land owners. Have to have some incentive programs for the small landowner to allow them to continue their lifestyle. Tribe's part of this and the number one reason for forest and fish that we all understand the goal and where everyone is coming from- we agree on processes and federal government must step up and say does this provide for all stakeholders.

- Josh Weiss, WFPA- The timber industry skipped the step of pointing fingers and went to what do we need to do. Certainty is important. During the 1980's timber went through a huge hit due to the spotted owl. With the salmon issue, the industry saw the prior impacts and no one wanted to go through that again. We have done an impact analysis on harvest from prior work in the 80-90's--good way to show the ability of adaptive management to provide guidance for the future. Need to know what you are going to be able to get out at the end. It does say that it is science driven, and can at least plan a bit for change and incorporating that change. The industry is absolutely supportive of adaptive management.
- Joe Ryan, Washington Environmental Council- very supportive of Adaptive Management in Forests and Fish- good that it is science based. It is real important that the plan be funded. Are trying to work toward securing funds.
- Bob Turner, NMFS- F&F vs Recovery- there are differences, but in both instances ESA is an important gorilla in the closet. The ESA has two independent tracks- one for recovery planning, in the ESA there are no regulations to enforce a recovery plan. Directions on how to develop one, but can not force imposition. On the other hand- it is also a blanket statement that indicates it is illegal to harm listed species--which is all of everyday life. We can enforce this side. But that is only directed at individual activities. People bring lawsuits on take- ESA allows that. F&F is consistent with recovery, but is not recovery- is motivated by people that do not want to be sued by agencies. The recovery planning is different- is driven by people that want healthy fish and water. Recovery plans need a rigorous adaptive management strategy. Activities so far have been overseen with the state- the framework is in state for regulation. A

challenge for Shared Strategy is to close the loop- how to provide for feedback and a regulatory entity that ensures the proper outcome.

- Lenny Young, DNR- Shared strategy needs to hit the performance objectives (re: adaptive management) and to know why you set out to collect the data going forward. Asking why is important- the better definition between research and monitoring the better off you will be. Also the issue of accountability- we have accountability in place for FFR- for specific organizations, and projects- all know the timing of research labs, stations, etc. Very little forest research info has come directly into the management arena quickly. Challenge for adaptive management. Question- have we made an entity that will swamp us with information and perhaps make it very difficult to respond.

Think about the Questions posed at the beginning.

Questions:
1) How can we support ongoing linkage between F&F and salmon recovery groups over time to help them achieve desired habitat improvement goals for salmon?

Discussion:
- Don't the limiting factors provide the ongoing recovery linkage?
-Forest and fish addresses water quality- how can you convey to the Shared Strategy community all that it takes to come together on this issue—need more communication between F&F and salmon recovery.
- F&F is specifically directed at people doing forest practices. Does not cover agriculture. Does not cover other commercial or residential land uses. So when you ask how does it apply to recovery- think about how recovery effort can work on the pieces that F&F does not address.
- Forest silt and upstream practices does affect the downstream water quality- and is that not worthy of address?
- You will get that through adaptive management.
- Shouldn't that be provided for?
- It is connected, due to riparian stream management- woody debris is provided for. Some of the F&F stuff has a timeframe on completion, and it will be updated, on what limiting factors we are talking about. So will occur as we re-evaluate.
-NMFS- from an ESA perspective- will not be approved unless the woody debris is acting as it naturally would. The land owner can not make sure that the woody debris goes all through the system. Forest and fish is designed to commit woody debris to the system. F&F will provide as best as it can for a natural later serial stage forest.
- In the lower watershed, it is important to ensure that woody debris from upstream will not blow out redds and such.
- Knowing what those linkages and connections are is important to figure out…having the conversations is good, and over time it will help, through the adaptive management approach, to coordinate on various aspects of the work. Question on the table is how can we do that?

- In forest practices rules- land owners are to prioritize fish first, and ask people to come together on fish passage issues. There is a mechanism to connect all that on the Forests and Fish part- cannot speak to whether that is already happening. Your local watershed should be working with the local landowners so that they can cooperatively make more progress.
- NMFS- Simpson HCP (Habitat Conservation Plan) example- they spent a lot of money to make a plan very particular to their acreage. Simpson said- we will do one that is very particular to landscape- but now we have FFR that has rules to apply to all of Western Washington. Right in that example you have two different ways- cookie cutter vs. particular plan to go about this. FFR is backing up to deal with particular ways to deal with the problem of cookie cutter approach. Simpson was very prepared to expend the money to make their plan work well for them- but we cannot do that all across the state.
- There is hope that what is done upstream will help downstream. There is a time factor that is important- will take time to see if that is actually happening and adapt from there. There are some things where the linkage needs to be addressed more up front.
- Does not happen within Forests and Fish. Regardless of how many forest recovery programs you have wit in your watershed- you have to prioritize each year. And that process can help address the problems you are talking about.
- One of the challenges is there is no incentive for the large timber companies to take the lead and be involved in the long process. If there is a way to provide some incentive- working with HCP's maybe not forest and fish related- but still working on it with them may help.
- Recovery planning is not necessarily done by lead entities. The process may involve some of the same people, but because planning is broader, it can be a different composition of the group. The Lead Entity strategy is one component.
- As we get fuller and fuller effect of implications of woody debris down stream- how can we proactively think about how this will affect the downstream area. Shared Strategy could help minimize negative effects of forest/fish work that is helpful for river process when it gets down stream, and may cause havoc.
- We (WFPA) encourage our members to be involved to understand what is going on in the watersheds. Don't think it is appropriate to have monetary incentives for this. Probably the biggest thing we could give the land owners, would be to have watershed groups be aware of what is in F&F. Fact of the matter is that regulations are in place- do not have assurances that it is ESA compliant. But have the education process enough so that the watershed groups understand what is currently going on, and that it takes time to see progress.
- Being involved in a watershed group, we have a hard time seeing different targets. Finding it hard to quantify how our targets are being affected by F&F.
- One of the limiting factors in some watersheds is diking and not allowing sediment loads to be natural- smothering redds and so on. So eventually through F&F and through Shared Strategy there need to be dikes taken out to deal with the sediment issues that are identified as a limiting factor. Whole other issue though that affects agriculture.
- Management choices should be coordinated in time and space within the watershed. The effect of limiting factors can change from year to year- and between cohorts. How can we exchange that kind of information to help make decisions together? How can

F&F and Shared Strategy work together to ensure that the decisions upstream and downstream are in balance?
- Perhaps that is an aspect of adaptive management that we have not considered to date.
- Responsibility of managers to make sure that the data comes in and gets processed in a timely fashion, and I think it is there. Probably the state agencies will be able to make those linkages happen.
- It is inevitable that F&F will preclude options for downstream areas. For example, with spotted owls--on federal lands decision was made to ensure habitat- so that spurred land use practice decisions. And depending on how the legislation happens will affect the availability / flexibility of options to others. One last thing- primary benefit of F&F is not the technicalities of what happened- it is the process and the relationships between the people involved to make a deal happen. It is rare to see that, and that is what should be critically examined- to see how did that happen, and try to replicate it for the watersheds.
-Similar processes are happening in many watersheds- with various stakeholders. If we could have that happen between the watershed groups and the forests and fish managers- that is the missing link.
- When the legislature acted on F&F, the state took the responsibility for managing the permits. And that has to be done for federal tribal and state landowners. When this final process comes together as a Shared Strategy, you have to consider how you want us- the State to proceed. You can have a bottom up effort, but if you say you are going to do something- you have to stand by it- because the State is liable.
- the ESA plays a big role- generally speaking we (NMFS) do not have a requirement to start a relationship with everyone…. Generally not all entities want to have a regulatory relationship with the federal government. Government is trying to be hands off- wants to be high on the umbrella- to make sure it is a democratic process and then judge at the highest level possible.
- Downstream info should inform upstream in adaptive management. Don't want it to mean that if time goes by and we do not have enough of an impact downstream that we should then adaptively manage to downscale what we are doing on the upstream effort- we are not prepared to do that. This process may take time- and we need to give it time.
- Since F&F has only been in place since 1999- it is too soon to see how well adaptive management is working quite yet.
- Adaptive management is very good at dealing with scientific uncertainties. It is not dealing with people's bottom lines. So if adaptive management decision ends up outside of the economic ability of folks to stay in business. Adaptive management is not prepared to deal with this. Let's not deny that the ecological ramification is important, but let's find another way to keep the economics inside the box of what is viable.
- If we can do work at less cost- then that is a good thing- because we are trying to protect so much with limited resources.
- in FFR the assumptions and decisions are easier to understand, because they are not dealing with the socio-economic standpoint, but it will be harder for all to understand where decisions are coming from if they are representing economic considerations as well as the scientific uncertainty.
- Can we have less than 100% function and still be able to have recovery, or will decisions that focus on socio-economics cause us to not really bring the salmon back?

Have to balance that out. Reality is we have to balance it out for the betterment of the fish.
- Example of an economic model of the ecosystem services of a watershed- to put a monetary value to the ecosystem services. Take GIS data and then look at the health of that system- and compare the policy of that site to somewhere else where the econometric study has already happened somewhere else in the world.
- When we did HB2496 the term "managed volunteerism" was established. We wanted to put together a schedule to address issues, and get volunteers to take on projects. I want to reinforce the effort that Shared Strategy is trying to find out what it takes to turn one of these watersheds around. And I appreciate the work you have put into it.
- Important thing to remember is the building of relationships. In the first initial weeks of dealing with the FFR- started by pointing fingers- and then put the issues up, and learn where the different stakeholders were coming from. And having that clear understanding of the background- we can respect each other enough that we continue to go on with the process.
- There are miscommunications and lack of communications out there- and DOE is very committed to working with WFPA and others to help make that a smoother process to help make it work.