

Effectiveness Monitoring Committee Strawman Framework
November 23, 2009

Initial Outline (Developed at the MSG Meeting held on July 22, 2009)

Mission of Committee: To advise the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection on how to build a water quality-related monitoring program that could provide an active feedback loop to policymakers, managers, agencies, and the public.

Goal: To ensure a collaborative science-based monitoring effort to credibly evaluate the effectiveness of the Forest Practice Rules related to water quality and plan review process for:

- (a) Adaptive management (i.e., monitor actions and adjust management actions accordingly).¹
- (b) Meeting stakeholders' goals.
- (c) Improving listed anadromous fish species numbers.
- (d) Joint ownership of product.

Objectives:

- A. Involve credible representatives of key stakeholders that are publicly trusted.
- B. Identify critical research questions to address the goals, using input from all stakeholders.
- C. Select priority projects to jointly monitor.
- D. Develop effective partnerships to share the costs of evaluation.
- E. Provide for social time to develop partnership relationships.
- F. Promote joint fact-finding at local, regional, and state levels.
- G. Spread awareness of results to partners, decision-makers and the public through:
 - 1. Field tours.
 - 2. Internet availability.
 - 3. Workshops and conferences.
 - 4. Other user-friendly formats.

Detailed Outline (Discussed at the MSG meeting held on November 12, 2009):

- 1. Set up a BOF appointed 12+ member Effectiveness Monitoring Committee (EMC) with voting privileges, representing the main stakeholder groups (public, timber industry, environmental groups, etc.). Members should be well respected scientists representing each stakeholder group. Co-chairs are to be appointed by the BOF.² Strong leadership is critical for successful adaptive management (Gregory et al. 2006).

¹ An adaptive management program should ensure that the BOF bases its regulations for aquatic resources on the best available scientific knowledge and technical information.

² This group is to provide accountability and a formality of process for effectiveness monitoring to reach the resource objectives for water quality-related regulations set forth in the Forest Practice Act and Rules.

DRAFT

2. Set up a BOF appointed Effectiveness Monitoring Policy Committee (EMPC) with voting privileges, representing the main stakeholder groups. Those individuals appointed to the Policy Committee must be able to make decisions for their agency or stakeholder group.
3. Require both the BOF appointed EMC and EMPC to follow modified TFW ground rules. These include a commitment to: (1) attempt to reach consensus, (2) attend all scheduled meetings (or send a designated alternate), (3) listen carefully and ask questions to better understand unclear issues, (4) having the committee receive priority attention, staffing, and time, (5) having all parties bring legitimate purposes and goals of their organizations to meetings, (6) having all parties recognize the legitimacy of the goals of other organizations, and (7) having negotiations that will attempt to maximize all the goals of all the parties, as far as possible. Note that facilitation may be necessary to arrive at agreement over the committee ground rules.
4. Set up a schedule of regular meetings, to be held monthly or bi-monthly, with proper notice given and minutes taken and approved. Decisions are to be made by consensus. The public may attend, and may provide public comment in a short section at the end of each meeting. Facilitation may be necessary until the consensus process is understood and successfully employed by all.
5. Solicit caucus groups (e.g., timber industry, environmental groups, public, etc.) to submit questions (key areas of concern) about the effectiveness of specific water quality-related forest practice rules in meeting established resource objectives to the committee.
6. The EMC will prioritize the submitted questions that require scientific investigation (mechanisms to prioritize questions include: risk to public resources, study cost, feasibility of study, study implications). When consensus is reaching on ranking, the EMC and staff will develop a study plan and budget for the highest rated projects.
7. Funding for the highest rated projects is expected to come from a combination of state and private sources, as well as grants. Note that due to the current extended recession affecting both state and private entities, if funding is to be obtained, monitoring priorities must be merged so that there is a commonality in monitoring goals.
8. The EMC and staff are responsible for completing the scientific investigations, securing peer review, and synthesizing the results into final reports for the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection. All stakeholders are invited to help collect the data in the field. The reports are to include technical analyses and evaluation of implications for resources and operations, but are not to attempt to provide policy or regulatory recommendations. Generally accepted scientific and statistical techniques are to be used.

9. All final reports will be made widely available to the public on the internet.
10. Implications of the EMC reports are to be discussed by the EMPC, including possible rule language options based on study results. Discussion is to continue until consensus is reached on a needed rule change, possibly using facilitation. A recommendation for rule language(s) change is then sent to the BOF for their consideration.

Obstacles to Overcome and Possible Solutions³

1. Inadequate funding and technical skills for adaptive management (i.e., inadequate institutional capacity of the implementing institution): creative solutions involving state/company partnerships and possible federal grants.
2. Inadequate “buy-in” from the top down from agencies and caucus groups (i.e., inadequate institutional support to successfully undertake adaptive management): setup workshops with key members of agencies and caucus groups to gauge their interest and commitment to this new approach to monitoring and adaptive management in California.
3. Agency regulatory/legislative constraints prohibiting reduced protection levels (i.e., inadequate flexibility within the existing regulatory framework to respond to new information from adaptive management): negotiate ranges within which rules can change; determine policy negotiation space prior to monitoring efforts.
4. Inadequate agency staffing (i.e., inadequate staff capacity) to support adaptive management: develop new BCP (unlikely), reprioritize existing staff time.
5. Temporal and spatial scales chosen for determining rule effectiveness are unmanageable (e.g., adaptive management may implicitly assume that in-channel changes can be rapidly detected, but this is often not the case, particularly for larger watersheds—see MacDonald and Coe 2007): prioritize projects that have appropriate temporal and spatial scales for adaptive management (Gregory et al. 2006).

References

Gregory, R., D. Ohlson, and J. Arvai. 2006. Deconstructing adaptive management: criteria for applications to environmental management. *Ecological Applications* 16(6): 2411-2425.

MacDonald, L.H. and D. Coe. 2007. Influence of headwater streams on downstream reaches in forested areas. *Forest Science*: 53(2): 148-168.

³ See Table 1 in Gregory et al. 2006 for a more complete list of questions to consider prior to beginning a project for adaptive management.

DRAFT

Pleus, A. and H. Rowton. 2005. Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research Committee (CMER) protocols and standards manual. Provisional Edition. Report prepared for the State of Washington Forest Practice Board's Adaptive Management Program. Olympia, WA. 167 p.

Quinn, T. 2007. Adaptive management for the Forest and Fish Agreement. PowerPoint presentation. Dry Forest II Workshop, Wenatchee, WA, May 1-3, 2007. Available online at: <http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/wenatchee/projects/dryforest/Quinn-WA-State-Forest-Adaptive-Management.pdf>

Washington Forest Practice Board. 1987. Timber/Fish/Wildlife agreement: a better future in our woods and streams. Final Report. Olympia, WA. 57 p.

Washington Forest Practice Board. 2005. Guidelines for adaptive management program. Section 22. Olympia, WA. 31 p. Available online at: http://www.dnr.wa.gov/Publications/fp_board_manual_section22.pdf

Williams, B.K. 2009. Adaptive management of watersheds and related resources. Pp. 27-33 in: Webb, R.M.T., and Semmens, D.J., eds., Planning for an uncertain future—Monitoring, integration, and adaptation. Proceedings of the Third Interagency Conference on Research in the Watersheds: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2009-5049. Available online at: <http://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2009/5049/pdf/WilliamsManuscript.pdf>