

Wildlife Diversity Advisory Council

Meeting Agenda

Thursday, Oct 3, 2024: 9am- 4pm

WSDOT Offices: 900 East Selah Road, Yakima

Materials: Draft Solar/Wind Guidelines; Link to review survey [here](#), due 10/15.
 Budget Request: Restoring Washington's Biodiversity
 Budget Request: Invest in Lands Stewardship
 Budget Request: Reduce Emissions, Build Resiliency
 USFWS Barred Owl Management Strategy; link [here](#)

TIME	SUBJECT	TOPIC LEAD/SPEAKER
8:45	Arrival, Settle in	
9:00 – 9:30	WDAC Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome, Agenda Review • Minutes Review and Approval • Action item review 	Patrick Gallagher, Chair Kathleen Gobush, Notetaker
9:30 – 10:15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vice-chair nomination/vote • Charter update 	Patrick Gallagher, Chair Nancy Lee
10:15 – 10:30	BREAK	
10:30 – 12:00	Barred Owl Management in Washington	Emilie Kohler, Spotted Owl Species Lead Julia Smith, Endangered Species Recovery Taylor Cotten, Conservation Assessment
12:00 – 12:45	LUNCH - Provided	
12:45 – 1:30	25-27 BN Legislative Session <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PLP renewal fee increase • Restoring Washington's Biodiversity • Invest in Lands Stewardship • Reduce Emissions, Build Resiliency • Partner efforts: shrubsteppe; ... 	Hannah Anderson, Wildlife Diversity Division WDAC members
1:30 – 2:45	Solar/Wind Guidelines – WDAC Discussion Forum	Mike Ritter, Solar and Wind Unit Supervisor Discussion Facilitation – Patrick Gallagher, Chair
2:45 – 3:00	BREAK	
3:00 – 3:40	Subcommittee Report Outs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Species of Concern • Wildlife Area Planning • State Wildlife Action Plan 	Patrick Gallagher Denis DeSilvis/Jeff Kozma Glen Mendel, John Farnsworth

3:40 - end	Wrap up and next steps: action items, agenda items, notetaker selection for next meeting	Patrick Gallagher, Chair
4:00	ADJOURN	

WDAC Committee Assignments – updated 9/18/24

Members	Species of Conservation Concern	Wildlife Area Planning	State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP) 2025 Update
Trina Bayard			***
Matthew Danielson	***		
Denis DeSilvis	***	Co-Chair (W)	***
John Farnsworth			Co-Chair
Patrick Gallagher	Chair		
Joe Gaydos	***		
Kathleen Gobush	***		
Sarina Jepson			***
Jerry Joyce	***		
Jeff Kozma		Co-Chair (E)	
Nancy Lee			
Glen Mendel			Co-Chair
Marie Neumiller	***		***
Anne Van Sweringen			***

Monika Wieland Shields	***		
Todd Wildermuth	***		
Staff Support	T. Cotten	J. Gorrell	H. Anderson

Minutes

Note taker: Kathleen Gobush (KG)

I. WDAC Business

Patrick Gallagher (PG)- Chair, led meeting

Minutes and Action item review-

-Review Charter

Nancy Lee (NL): modifications made to clarify, e.g., when our terms run- follows fiscal year (ends June 30); attendance requirements/expectations- consistent with Department's guidance on committees (don't miss more than 2/ year); editorial comments.

Charter accepted

-WDAC to review Connectivity mapping work – draft products- internal regional review

*Email received from Julia Michalak: Please [follow this link](#) to access the instructions, view the maps, and submit your comments. Your feedback on these draft maps is crucial, and we kindly ask you to submit any comments by **Thursday October 10, 2024**.*

These maps represent the first phase of review, focusing on the draft cores and corridors. There will be future opportunities to comment during the prioritization and implementation phases of the plan. However, this is the key time to provide your input on the maps themselves.

-SWAP meeting- PG, Denis DeSilva (DD) and two others attended- recorded virtual meeting for more link: [Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife - TVW](#) and webpage [State Wildlife Action Plan \(SWAP\) | Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife](#) for additional information
Survey open now- was forwarded by Hannah Anderson (HA)

- Minutes- notetaker up'd the bar (Glen Mendel (GM)) on producing minutes
Minutes accepted

Vice-Chair nominations—duties include scoping meetings/agenda discussion, etc.

Jerry Joyce (JJ) offered a nomination that was conditional on no other nominations. Therefore, it was withdrawn once another nominee stepped forward. KG self-nominated

KG voted as new Vice- Chair

II. Barred Owl Management in Washington

Barred Owl (BO) invasive management

HA introduction- barred owl management not taken lightly – support USFWS BO Management Strategy (BOMS)

Commission briefing in December

WDAC request: help with feedback on how we message this story/ how does it land, is it clear, recognizing it's a polarizing issue

Test run of messages (to be made as a Commission briefing in mid-December 2024)

Presentation: Julia Smith (JS), then Emilie Kohler (EK)

Set stage of impact of invasive species, offered facts (Soule 1990), example of invasive species /management actions—not controversial; very expensive/kill a lot of individuals animals, killing one to save another; straight forward;

Other examples (cull sea lions to save salmon), wild horses, cats/birds— big picture discussion on these of the need to eradicate invasive; there are consequences of doing nothing- that's a decision too; these controversial ones are mammals; controversy speaks to our values

EK- Northern Spotted Owl (NSOs)—timeline of protections- 1990 ESA-listed Threatened, 2020- Endangered status warranted

In WA- 3 study sites (Olympic, Cle Elum, Mt Rainier)- 1995-2018- demography studies show 59% decline

BO competition impeding NSO recovery—where the 2 co-occur- NSO extinction (extirpation?), rate of decline increase, hybridization

Exec Order 13112- classified BO as invasive

History of BO invasion- Plains (habitat) was a barrier, break down of Plains ecology opened door to invasion—WA- 1974

BO not a direct (ecological) replacement of NSO—BO more of a generalist, small home ranges, larger clutches than NSO

Interactions with a long list of sensitive species—BO diet studies- made conservation investments in these; BO predation on them can erode this work.

Barred Owl Management Strategy (BOMS) Record of Decision (RoD) 8/27/24, 30 year plan, removal -4 provinces in WA- not W WA lowlands bc NSO doesn't have numbers to occupy territories (and exclude BOs)

Why is BO removal important? It works, combine with NSO augmentation

Lethal removal- 15,600/yr BO's range wide- this is a cap

Requires 2 permits- Federal -Migratory Bird Special Purpose permit, State-WDFW Director permit (via WAC stipulations)

BLM starting right away- this Fall
Requires a monitoring plan- report out every 5 years

Where? Within 4 provinces- GMAs- focal management areas—first areas are those with NSO occupation in last 5 years—study saw after BO removal- NSOs back in within 1 year

Land owner removal

NL: how many land owners doing this, is there a disincentive?

Examples of land owners- Yakama Nation, agencies, timber companies (Green Diamond)

USDA- APHIS-Wildlife Services- often the implementor

NSO breeding program in BC, Canada- BO removal since 2007- eye-opener

May start an implementation working group for WA

Dave Weins- Corvallis, OSU- helping dig into logistics

Funding- no Fed appropriation for BO removal

Matt (CNW)- what about urban(?) parks, Eastern WA—other species still impacted by BO's (even though NSOs long gone)—defensible eastern WA wall

Taylor emphasized RoD is BO removal for NSO recovery

Summary—BO management at some scale is a reality for NSO recovery

WA- in a bad spot with low NSO occupancy- will likely require twin activities of BO management & NSO augmentation

Polarization because: 1) people love owls, 2) (Matt (CNW))-logistical argument- why are we doing this if habitat is not on track—but NWFP is on track, especially if we use fire- there is available habitat/ timber harvest lower than allowed in NWFP 3) (PG)- headlines make situation negative

Misconception- how BO's got here from its eastern range—think its natural, its not since human-induced landscape changes allowed movement across the much reduced prairie areas.

EK- removing 1% of BO's global population or its loss of 100% of NSO population - outcompeted

USFWS website- great resource for Qs with As listed

EK has key facts sheet (created with WDFW Communications)

Jeff Kozma (JK)– opinion – horrendous management of NSO habitat outside of federal lands. For example, Weyerhaeuser in Chelan County systematically harvested non-habitat within NSO circles. Then, they did habitat vegetation surveys within areas typed as habitat to verify the habitat typing. According to the Forest Practice Rules (WAC 222-16-085), if one of the 9 habitat metrics was not present, a common one being % intermediate trees, it was deemed non-habitat and could be cut. This happened in multiple areas of eastern WA throughout Yakima, Kittitas, Klickitat and Chelan counties. There was no incentive to

conserve habitat. Thus, habitat is now degraded to the extent that recovery is very difficult outside of federal lands given the way things were managed over the last 20 years—meanwhile, NSO populations continued to decline.

Note: 2008 is timing of BO uptick

BOMS acknowledges the habitat issues mentioned by JK (but not a part action implementation?)

Joe Gaydos (JG): animal welfare and conservation science lexicons different; animal use and care committee (IACUC protocol) – avian lethal/euthanasia guidelines— suggest getting all those ducks in a row

Monica Weylands (MW): emphasize science is there—want to see you are convinced its going to work? Source/sink issue—explain this

Trina Bayard (TB): great content on process/ invasive species theory/impact, was expecting more on NSO vulnerabilities—habitat needs to be emphasized, polarizing issue—deeply held shared value that we want to see wildlife thriving—we want to be good stewards of these birds (NSOs)- emphasizing this, explain how WDFW are grappling with this tough situation

JF: wrote about this in his last book, people don't think this is going to work—show some positive stuff—e.g., captive breeding, trophic cascade issue—need more of this

JJ: early 2000's (the then Seattle Audubon, now Birds Connect Seattle) made a decision to support removal, but concerned about what other birds might get shot? People don't have faith in USFWS and particularly Wildlife Services—need deep monitoring/training- frequent and in-depth reporting of the results. Also discuss fragmentation of suitable lands...

Politicians may not give a budget because confidence not there in the implementation

EK: BOMS has very detailed sections on some of these

PG: words confidence, faith, ethics and trust—messaging needs a face to represent the issue; is there a WDAC role- something we can do?

Todd W (TW): 3 questions- Animal Welfare groups- suing? [JS: haven't heard of any yet, maybe because first bird hasn't been killed yet]- could result in a “stay” [EK: could do it under a research permit], seems like a united front except DNR (current land commissioner leaving soon though)? [JS: can't speak for DNR—DNR requested and got more of their land included in last draft of BOMS- this seems to contradict land commissioner's statement], enforcement?

KG: BC work- can it be used to dispel any of the uncertainty about “is this going to work”? [EK: explain why it won't really help]

Suggested using slick visuals (utilize these so WDFW can more easily explain & emphasize main points—because there's a lot of words and bullet points in the factsheet and presentation)

Asked about the Commission briefing- what would you like to accomplish with that? [HA: WDFW cooperative partner in this all along the way, but now RoD is signed, have augmentation feasibility product coming, we need to know where are our NSOs—the who, how and how do we pay for it...need to get full support of Exec Management, no decision for Commission to make—need it to be clear to get out in front of what we might hear (because of what hear in the public), WDAC could lend voice- show up and give public comment, need an external organization to give a view]

JK: will require a long-term effort, nature abhors a vacuum... meaning that as soon as you remove Barred Owls, other Barred Owls will eventually move in to that space if not filled with Spotted Owls.

JG: vote on WDAC support or not

GM: what are you planning to do at the end of the 30 years and what are the expectations after 30 years for NSO and management actions?

Matt (CNW): trust in government issue, cross- department communication- more discussions- some ask about turkeys (their removal?) and removing other invasives impacting SCGNs— lots of pinch points—need cross-departmental communication on this

JJ: who will run the show? (on BOMS implementation)

EK/TC/JS/HA: we are in front of the Feds on this because we need to help NSOs (yesterday) given situation here, Fed (USFWS)- lead management authority but State is implementor on the ground (ESA outlines this)—we are driving this piece now (given RoD is now out)—Fed won't prioritize WA (Fed is concerned range-wide). Points made here today will vastly improve how we message this.

TW: WDFW should own this forthright—"we do this because... (on behalf of the people of WA)"

The forever timeline needs to be addressed; that's a disappointment to many 30-year vision- create a situation where we have returned the ecological balance, NSOs can thrive and the need to kill BOs is at much less frequency than today
Add humility- this is a risk : risk analysis, we are building with small models with what we can
Summed up: Independent ownership, some humility, here's the positive you'll see 30 years from now

JF: weak spot- long term conservation reliance issue – EK offered a bureaucratic response— but a scientific response needed

TB: a lot of this pegged as a WDFW responsibility to make more NSOs, but it's a shared responsibility – it's a tirage issue/ all hands-on deck needed—all need to work together

Matt (CNW)- shot-gun silencers could be useful. These are investments—lots of jobs/pay to people attuned with nature—build a program and a culture

[GM added: “after the meeting I remembered the timber wars of the late 1980s and early 1990s when many in the public blamed spotted owls for destroying the timber industry and many jobs. Now the government wants to kill thousands of barred owls to save spotted owls? That is a tough sell.”]

JS: question about being worried about a spotlight being placed on other actions of lethal removal to manage other (less controversial) invasives (which are par for the course)

KG (to JS): suggestion to own it (as TW mentioned previously)—it would be tangential to get into those and there is enough content on NSOs/BOMS to simply pivot back to (and not get into the weeds on tangential items)

TB: dysregulation of systems, being strategic in order to mitigate issues

Next Steps: Need to know where we have NSOs- surveys now use acoustic monitoring recorders, NSO augmentation feasibility, BO diet study- do they prey on other SGCNs (start on JBLM)

Wrap up- four main points

KG: suggestion- could do bottom line first, then walk audience thru reasoning/support/evidence rather than wait to clearly articulate those 4 main points at very end (could repeat them again at end though)

TW: used word “recover” – is that a mandate of WDFW there to recover? {JS it says: “Ensure their survival”-(WAC 2020.161.10)}

PG: Are there proposals of what we should do about this?

JG: Write a letter of support under charge to “advise the Director” [cc the Commission]

Is there a second? Yes, any opposition? No

Drafting group: JF, JG, NL- letter prior to December Commission meeting

Discussed- National Audubon takes no position, Cle Elum chapter-supported, Birds Connect Seattle submitted a [letter](#) to US Fish & Wildlife Service expressing conditional support for their plan to lethally remove Barred Owls in priority areas across its range.

No motion occurred for a presentation by an external organization at Commission meeting

Discussed idea of attending the Commission- be present, show up and provide public comment—in Cle Elum (Dec 12-14, won't be on agenda for 12th though)—sign up online (2 minutes for each speaker)- speak from letter on WDAC

Motion supported to:

Send a representative WDAC, make a comment to express what's in our letter, PG volunteer to attend & do this, other members could go as well [JJ reminded us its in our charter to go to Commission meetings] [FYI KG will try to go too if she can]

FYI- upcoming Commission meetings from: [2024 WDFW Commission meeting minutes and agendas | Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife](#)

Information on how to register to testify at the public hearing is available at wdfw.wa.gov/about/commission.meetings, or contact the Commission office at 360-9022267

October 24-26, 2024	Hybrid - Ellensburg
November 15, 2024	Web conference
December 12-14, 2024	Hybrid - Cle Elum

LUNCH BREAK

III. 2025-2027 BN Legislative Session

1. Personalized License Plates (PLP) renewal fee increase
2. Restoring Washington's Biodiversity
3. Invest in Lands Stewardship
4. Reduce Emissions, Build Resiliency

Partner efforts: shrub steppe

HA:

1) PLP. Our (relatively big) budget and policy request have gone through the internal processes and then to OFM. We may get some questions from OFM yet. Then we wait for Governor's budget that comes out in December (note session ends at the end of April). Intention with this agenda item is to signal what you might find interesting. Packages sent to WDAC members already vial email.

Policy change requested- increase the fee by \$10 for renewing the PLP -this revenue generated comes straight to Wildlife Diversity Division/ Non-game conservation work. Also supports wolf conversation and some to the Science Division.

2) Restoring WA biodiversity. We had originally requested \$47m, got \$24m [split across yr 1 (\$9m) and yr 2 (\$15m)].

The new request is \$14m?; second year amount will biennial-ize.

HA explained break down of these funds to the different divisions and programs. HA sent members biodiversity videos—on webpage, factsheets that highlight projects—videos here: [Biodiversity in Washington | Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife](#)

This round what's different- our champions-
Sen Rofles was chair of Ways and Means – she has moved on...
Tom Mc Bride, our Leg Director, has moved on...

3) Invest in Lands Stewardship. From Lands Division; Wildlife Diversity isn't author. WDFW managed lands has increased- managing these wildlife areas (33 of them) is understaffed. A number of details shared about the activities that need funding; includes invasive management and monitoring. \$10m ask

Janet Gorell can share more details with subcommittee.

TB suggested best if advice sought from members because that's where we are at our best (versus sharing a lot of information?).

4) Reduce Emissions, Build Resiliency. From Climate Change Officer/Harriet Morgan; Wildlife Diversity isn't author. This is climate dec-pack. \$13m ask,

Shrub steppe : DNR author. **Wizri** space-WDFW working with DNR- State Conservation Commission- habitat friendly-fencing etc. to support restoration. \$5m ask.

TB: policy priorities-proposal shrub steppe easement program – National Audobon, CNW, Lands Trust, build a program in Recreation & Conservation Office (RCO).

Also- build ready solar sighting- conundrum on sighting—system isn't working well; current developer-led model- leading to issue with wildlife/Tribal values- slows permitting. Build ready- NY model- the State takes the leadership role in prescreening sights; developers get more certainty in the process. This is with CNW and TNC. Likely to be a pilot program to get at the heart the issues we have seen.

JF: suggested “new Tom” do a briefing to members to get us going on Op Eds etc.

TW: prioritization?

HA: Department priorities-1)Safety and 2)Biodiversity. Morgan Stinson gave a presentation at recent Commission meeting- the powerpoint will be shared out with members. Here's link: [2020 Supplemental Capital and Operating Budget Requests \(wa.gov\)](https://www.wa.gov/2020-Supplemental-Capital-and-Operating-Budget-Requests)

Email sent during meeting to WDAC: links to a summary sheet and slides about the WDFW legislative requests (policy and budget) if you scroll down on the August Commission meeting here, for Friday's topics: [August 8-10, 2024 Meeting agenda - WDFW Fish and Wildlife Commission | Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife](#)

JJ: Since the WDFW proposals are submitted to the Governor, who decides which items are included in the submitted budget to the legislature, when will that budget be submitted and which Governor will submit the budget (current or incoming)? [HA:??] Note: Check with Hannah—I think the answer was the incoming Governor.

III. Solar/Wind Guidelines – WDAC Discussion Forum

Mike Ritter, Solar and Wind Unit Supervisor

Responsibility for permitting

Developed Guidelines- displayed timeline of meetings with Tribes, species-specialists, focus groups- to feed into draft

Public review- comments on the different sections

Ross & Strategic—provide comments in the Feedback survey or else emails

New guidelines- improve on 2009 wind power guidelines that are archaic & not user friendly, 30-year permits—added adaptive management options

A lot of new sighting/ GIS analysis to understand context/issues before knocking on doors to get input

Integration of Tribal knowledge/ better tool to inform Tribes

Cumulative impacts – framework- certain resources (some species) can't have more impacts—spatial and temporal boundaries – have developer explain cumulative impacts over next 30 years

Take a landscape look- use landscape-level tools and see what's neighboring the project in question.

If there are cumulative impacts, then we are going to ask for more mitigation

Attempting to be more in-step with Tribes

-New mitigation table based on SWAP and Priority Habitat & Species (PHS)- unprecedented to use SWAP in regs

“Mitigation levels” undefined; industry wants certainty/predictability

-Criteria for in-lieu-fee options but doesn't go to WDFW must be a third party- none in E WA

- Don't want in-lieu-fee, want to do better than that

- Monitoring reports- only a few people see these, should be more available

Mike walked thru Process steps- 1-6

Appendices A-E- holds all technical details

PG: in doc, saw draft describes these as Guidelines/ not permitting (in the permitting process), can you kill a project?

Clean Energy Transportation Act (CETA) 2019—this is about balance

Looked at examples where projects are not mitigated – CA, OR, NV, MA – high impacts on wildlife. Is there a recap on lessons learned?

Scope question- does it go far enough? Just right?

Trina: long list of resources (30)- can Department presenting it as a buffet could lead to conflict down the line—can Department weigh in more clear recommendations how to use the tools, which ones with the Department will be using?

TW: Super authority- Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) in order to go around local permitting; inquired about WDFW authority – don't have enforcement authority – so can be more prescriptive

PG: Does no net loss kill a project [Mike: no]

Mike: SEPA process with WDFW is a technical expert, there's a check box- did you visit with WDFW—we make recommendations (we have no authority unless HPA process). If thru County-process- 6-7 critical areas- have code language- no net loss/ avoid/ minimize WDFW build relationships and we provide input, look to us for those recommendations Most Counties accept it 100% and tell the project you should do this...

Enforcer- F-Sec or Counties

FYI- 3 types of solar-one is incendiary and we have no incendiary in our state

JF: Liked that it used language to the SWAP; liked Table 3; liked making it a living document structure

JJ: 3 questions

1) How does this interact with leg. mandate for Department of Ecology to produce programmatic impact statement (due next June)? [Yes, working with them, be consistent where we can be]

2) Does the structure where F-Sec submits its recommendations to the Governor for their acceptance or rejection make the ecological evaluation more political and thus possibly reduce the objective evaluation of plans? [No direct comment]

3) The plan states mitigation for no net loss, now Legislature and others often speak of seeking net ecological gain, do you have that?

GM: Offered compliments to Mike, his staff and WDFW for completing these guidelines because they are really needed and they are very helpful. Mitigation not specific- problem is conservation partners have nothing there to work with if they want to help the process with EFSEC and Counties [Personally I would like to see ratios in there—used “mitigation levels” because focus groups over-focused on numbers.

Should be consistent with ratios in County codes]

Mike stated that personally, he would like to see ratios stated there. GM offered to coordinate with Mike to suggest a few sentences to be added that could make the mitigation section much more useful.

DD: Developers' view- is this a single point of contact- call that out. Is there a critical path analysis on this? [Here's the process- developer likes an area, they sign a provisional lease, then the project decides to move forward [we still don't know anything about this], they come to WDFW for a shapefile of what's on the land—this is when we first hear of it. They make business decisions already; we won't kill it because we support renewables, we can suggest other sights/ but they're already invested]

PG: asked something (unsure)

[Mike-91% of 62 projects in Columbia Plateau – low ranch, range, conservation conflict areas next to a transmission lines. So much secrecy- it's like staking your gold claim] Least Conflict Solar process identified best places for solar as range, cropland, or natural conservation with low value and high solar development potential next to transmission lines.

TB: can we trust project consultants? In Guidelines, could you say more about the expertise on consultants? [Mike- Counties say some of this. Certainly, can say more qualifications. I have worked with same Developers/Consultants for 16 years—very professional, I do trust them]

JG: Data-sharing issue—can only recommend they share the data? [Consultants collect data and Developer owns the data; our data-sharing agreement (PHS) right now is us sharing with them; we don't get that data...HA- this is standard]

PG: It's solar and wind guidelines—there are other forms of clean/green energy [Mike- no not at this point, green hydrogen, tidal energy, offshore energy]

Matt (CNW): how do you find what you don't know? [Mike described protocols- transects, parameters, visual/auditory]

MW: WDFW still tech role for other energy? [Yes, battery storage systems, green hydrogen]

Mike: Industry asks why are using the SWAP?

PG: Do we want to something action oriented here?

HA: Explained that when WDAC says good job, it's meaningful

JG: put in comment in portal – PG

Motion: As a group we will take comments from our discussion today, Chair takes the notes and generates a bulleted statement. This draft will be circulated for comment/confirmation and then uploaded to the comment portal from the group.

Comment due October 15, 2024

This motion was adopted.

IV. Subcommittee Report Outs

1. Species of Concern

Pygmy rabbit status report will be out next week (Oct 7-10)

Island Marble Butterfly (didn't hear)

Crabbing regs- comments due by Oct 15- we don't do crabs but it involves humpbacks and blue whales; entanglement of killer whale in crab pot off of CA- but rare

2. Wildlife Area Planning- DD & JK

Cowlitz W/L Area

Methow W/L Area

First application of recreation (something) and land stewardship (dec-pack?)

How comments from WDAC are responded to? Line by line response from a consultant on Simpac (?)

DD: what we are looking for- Jeff did a line-by-line analysis and consultant came back and counter-commented to each rather than a generalized response—this impactful

Janet Gorell: it's appropriate for transparency

It will be a while before WDAC needs to comment

WDAC's role is to advise the Director but planners report to Regional Director and don't know if planners distribute comments/responses

3. State Wildlife Action Plan -GM & JF

Meeting with Wendy in July, and committee had put together the agenda.

Discussed letter from Committee and Department's response – generated 2 versions of minutes, which were different, and shared them with WDAC. After the meeting, Denis and JF had email exchange about peripheral species definition, and shared references - all of which was sent to Wendy.

JF: tuned into staff SWAP webinar, neat to see staff relate to the material

HA: staff that nominate SGCN- tech leads will make recommendations (divided up by taxa)
Soon will have a draft SCGN list

JF: Nice if we could get a report back on that SCGN list

TW: Fear that SCGN keeps getting longer

JF: We have >100 SCGN that we don't have good data

Janet Gorell: We are including plants this time; we are changing criteria—we can highlight advances in 268 species on there now

Wrap Up

Action items:

BO Input letter

Cle Elum Commission meeting in December- Chair to attend/sign up to comment

S/W Comments uploaded to portal- Oct 15

Pygmy rabbit letter

Agenda items for next meeting:

TB: Request for Director to say hello

JG: Meet n Greet with "new Tom" Legislative Director

Notetaker selection for next meeting- Joe and back-up Nancy

Meeting schedule- send doodle

Discussed February meeting- (TB) in Olympia and (MW) summer meeting (before end of terms of WDAC members) virtual because difficult to meet?

TB: Mentioned lobby day and talking to your representative

KG: Asked if as individual or as WDAC [HA: ask individual but can mention you are a WDAC member]

Early January schedule a short legislation meeting with new Director

Legislation schedule- Jan 13- April 27, 2025

Review of term- 3 year term- ends in end of June 30, 2025; like to maintain continuity- more than half retained/ add some new people

GM: net ecological gain, will we be able to provide input to that? That is, when does the plan go to the legislature and will WDAC have an opportunity to provide input before presentation to the legislature?

HA: will find out

Meeting Closed on time at 4pm