

1 **FOREST PRACTICES BOARD**
2 **REGULAR BOARD MEETING**
3 August 13, 2013
4 Natural Resources Building
5 Olympia, Washington
6

7 **Members Present**

8 Aaron Everett, Chair, Department of Natural Resources
9 Bill Little, Timber Products Union Representative
10 Bob Guenther, General Public Member/Small Forest Landowner
11 Carmen Smith, General Public Member/Independent Logging Contractor
12 Court Stanley, General Public Member
13 David Herrera, General Public Member
14 Joe Stohr, Designee for Director, Department of Fish and Wildlife
15 Heather Ballash, Designee for Director, Department of Commerce
16 Julie Morgan, Designee for Director, Department of Agriculture
17 Paula Swedeen, General Public Member
18 Phil Davis, General Public Member (9 a.m. - 2:45 p.m.)
19 Tom Laurie, Designee for Director, Department of Ecology
20

21 **Members Absent:**

22 Dave Somers, Snohomish County Commissioner
23

24 **Staff**

25 Donelle Mahan, Acting Forest Practices Division Manager
26 Marc Engel, Forest Practices Assistant Division Manager
27 Patricia Anderson, Rules Coordinator
28 Phil Ferester, Assistant Attorney General
29

30 **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

31 Aaron Everett called the Forest Practices Board (FPB or Board) meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Everett
32 welcomed new member Joe Stohr who replaced David Whipple.
33

34 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

35 **MOTION:** Phil Davis moved the Forest Practices Board approve the May 14, 2013 meeting
36 minutes as amended.
37

38 **SECONDED:** Bob Guenther
39

40 Joe Stohr suggested changes to page 3 lines 17-19 and page 7 lines 19-25 to read as follows:

41 Don Nauer, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), said it was not easy to
42 mesh the more ~~instructive~~ site-specific prescriptive nature of the WDFW hydraulic project
43 rules into the ~~certainties~~ more minimum standard (one-size-fits-all) nature of the forest
44 practices rules, and noted collaboration in FPA pre-application planning is key to success.
45

46 David Whipple explained that WDFW's current statutory authority only applies to nest tree
47 protection. He said an FPA slipping through the cracks is not the norm, WDFW does not

1 think a forest practices rule for nest trees is necessary, and ~~recommended~~ committed WDFW
2 to:
3

4 Paula Swedeen suggested a change to page 7 lines 40-41 to read as follows.

5 Paula Swedeen requested ~~WDFW the Board~~ reconsider whether rule making is necessary
6 after the results of the November meeting and consider landscape planning approaches, and
7 asked whether there currently is conditioning authority. Engel replied DNR has conditioning
8 authority given specific situations.
9

10 **ACTION:** Motion passed unanimously.

11 **REPORT FROM CHAIR**

12 None.

13 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

14 Mary Scurlock, Conservation Caucus, supports the adoption of the adaptive management program
15 reform rule proposal. She also commented on the “Type F Dispute Resolution” currently in Forests
16 and Fish Policy.
17

18 Doug Hooks, Washington Forest Protection Association (WFPA), commented on the compliance
19 monitoring report. He said he appreciated the attention to detail and thought it was well written. He
20 also noted that the report contains just one year of the two year field sampling, therefore it is difficult
21 to conclude anything.
22

23 Peter Goldman, Washington Forest Law Center (WFLC), provided additional detail than what was
24 provided in the Forests and Fish Policy’s memo on the Type F (fish habitat) issue that may come
25 before the Board. He said the question before the Board will be whether or not to proceed with
26 defining fish habitat in rule.
27

28 **STAFF REPORTS**

29 Everett asked Tami Miketa, DNR, to provide additional detail on the conservation efforts within the
30 Small Forest Landowner Office, specifically the Family Forest Fish Passage Program (FFFPP) and
31 Forestry Riparian Easement Program (FREP) projects.
32

33 Everett said he appreciated the staffs work and working with the partners to get these projects
34 completed. He added that the Board will review the roster of approved projects for FREP and the list
35 of completed projects for the last fiscal year in November.
36

37 There was no further discussion on the following staff reports:
38

- 39 • Adaptive Management
- 40 • Rule Making Activity & Work Plan
- 41 • Upland Wildlife Working Group
- 42

43 **COMPLIANCE MONITORING ANNUAL REPORT**

44 Walt Obermeyer, DNR, provided a summary of the 2012 results of the interim report (one year
45 results of a two year reporting period). He provided an overview of the standard sample, riparian
46 rules and road activities, and concluded:
47

- 48 • The first year of standard sample is too small to confirm any trends;

- 1 • There is no significant change in 20-acre riparian management zone compliance between 2008
2 and 2012; and
- 3 • The program continues to detect compliance deviations that need to be corrected.

4
5 He also noted that 75 percent of the 2013 sample has been completed, well ahead of other years.

6
7 Board Discussion:

8 Everett asked for additional clarification on the measurement errors and the precision of the
9 measurements. Obermeyer stated that the issues rotate around the type of measurements taken from
10 streams and riparian management zone widths. Staff finds that their measurements are more precise
11 and where the ribbon gets placed is where the trees get counted, thus a counting issue. There is no
12 measurement error associated with the inner and outer core but there is a 5 percent measurement error
13 rate in the core area.

14
15 Carmen Smith asked what type of landowner had the issue. Seth Barnes responded that it varies but
16 the compliance monitoring staff does not know who the landowner is. That information is passed on
17 to the Operations side of the Division who then work with the landowners to avoid a repeat of the
18 issue.

19
20 Smith also asked what the goal is for getting everyone compliant and how are landowners educated
21 so they don't repeat the same errors. Mahan responded that it's about the pattern that is completed on
22 the landscape and education occurs through multiple ways via Timber, Fish, Wildlife meetings, staff
23 training, and Washington Contract Loggers training. Landowners are also notified by the region
24 offices of the issues.

25
26 Paula Swedeen asked what the issues are with the non-compliant 20-acre exempt parcels. Obermeyer
27 responded that these types of applications are a small portion of the total applications reviewed and
28 staff reviews all of them. He said, typically, these types are small landowners who do not have
29 experience in harvesting and retain contractors to do the job. The focus is on what is missing from the
30 RMZ, e.g., a measured stream is too small or need a larger RMZ. Staff does not know who is at fault.
31 Swedeen said her inquiry was based on previous public testimony from the small landowner
32 community requesting expanding the use of the 20-acre exemption, and there were significant
33 compliance issues she would rather have staff resolve them before the Board considered expanding
34 the application of the exemption.

35
36 Tom Laurie said he had similar concerns and asked when the Board will engage in a discussion on
37 the matter. Mahan said staff did not want to include recommendations at this time because final
38 results will not be available until the report is final in 2014.

39
40 **TFW CULTURAL RESOURCES ROUNDTABLE ANNUAL REPORT**

41 Jeffrey Thomas, co-chair thanked all the members of the Roundtable for all their contributions. He
42 also provided an overview of 2013 work activities which included amendments to question #7 of the
43 Forest Practices Application (FPA) instructions, the development of historic maps, and an
44 information guidance document.

45
46 Karen Terwilleger, co-chair, provided an overview of the survey and results for WAC 222-20-120
47 and the Cultural Resources Protection and Management Plan (CRPMP). A survey to assess how well
48 the "notice of forest practices that may contain cultural resources to affected Indian tribes" (WAC

1 222-20-120) and the techniques of CRPMP are working was broadly distributed, and 134 responses
2 were received. The results indicated that the process outlined in WAC 222-20-120 is working well
3 with the option of “meeting took place and plan was agreed to” used most often.
4

5 Terwilleger summarized the anticipated 2014 activities which included continued efforts on
6 education and outreach.
7

8 In response to Thomas’ concern about the lack of coordination between the Roundtable and the Small
9 Forest Landowner Advisory Committee, Everett said he would instruct the Committee to have a joint
10 annual meeting with the Roundtable at least once a year. He added that he appreciated the
11 Roundtable’s work on the FPA instructions.
12

13 **Clean Water Act Assurances Annual Report**

14 Stephen Bernath, Department of Ecology, highlighted the completed milestones. He noted the
15 continued challenges in completing the milestones:

- 16 • long term funding for the Adaptive Management Program;
- 17 • lack of principal investigators/research scientists to serve as lead in getting study designs
18 completed and moving forward;
- 19 • competing priorities; and
- 20 • the lack of trust amongst parties of the settlement agreement.
21

22 He encouraged the principles of the settlement agreement to discuss legislative strategies for
23 continued funding and all the caucuses within the Adaptive Management Program to work on
24 building relationships to regain trust.
25

26 Bernath also recognized the need to find partnerships with organizations to help with research needs
27 in order to fulfill the CMER Master Schedule.
28

29 Paula Swedeen asked at what point Clean Water Act assurances are lost if milestones are not being
30 met. Bernath responded that it would be a good conversation to have at a future date. In the meantime
31 making incremental progress is sufficient.
32

33 **TFW POLICY COMMITTEE’S 2013 ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND 2014 PRIORITIES**

34 Stephen Bernath, co-chair, reviewed the priorities for the remainder of 2013:

- 35 • Board Manual Section 22
- 36 • Type N Water Strategy
- 37 • Type F Waters
- 38 • Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring Project
- 39 • CMER Work Plan and FY 2014 Budget
40

41 Priorities for 2014 include:

- 42 • Water Typing – Type N and F
- 43 • Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring
- 44 • FY 2014 CMER Work Plan and Budget
- 45 • Completion of CMER Research
46

1 Bernath said there is a current issue in making progress on the 2013 priorities: the Department of Fish
2 and Wildlife (WDFW) will request the Policy Committee to conduct a review of their revised
3 Hydraulic Code Rules. The capacity for the Policy Committee to accept any new work may require
4 delaying existing priorities for the remainder of this year and early next year.

5
6 Everett acknowledged the workload conflicts, however he stated the Board needs to provide the
7 Policy Committee with some guidance on how to move forward. He asked Marc Engel, DNR, to
8 provide the pros and cons of conducting the review of the Hydraulic Code Rule revisions now or at
9 later date.

10
11 Engel stated that regardless of timing, the Adaptive Management Program will need to review the
12 Hydraulic Code Rules as drafted by WDFW. Changes to the fish protection standards will trigger an
13 update the forest practices rules. Bernath added that his preference would be to provide WDFW with
14 feedback now prior to initiating rule making which would facilitate an easier rule making process
15 when the Board incorporates the new hydraulic code rules into the Forest Practices Rules.

16
17 Joe Stohr stated that WDFW is obligated if revising the Hydraulic Code Rules that may impact forest
18 landowners to seek a review from the Adaptive Management Program. He said that WDFW is on
19 target to request the Policy Committee in October to review the draft rule proposal by February 2014
20 Stohr said that the Legislature did not impose a timeline but did have an expectation that WDFW
21 would move forward in revising the Hydraulic Code Rules.

22
23 Swedeen noted that it seemed likely that on the ground improvements of physical resources could be
24 impacted if some priorities were delayed and to not take action could pose a risk to public resources.
25 She said the decision could be made easier if the Board knew whether delaying the review of WDFW
26 rules would have similar known implications for resource protection.

27
28 Stohr said he recognized the difficulty in the decision making without seeing the rule proposal. He
29 stated that perhaps WDFW could gather the requested information to present to the Board at the
30 November meeting; however WDFW would still seek to engage the Policy Committee in October.

31
32 Everett agreed that the Board would discuss this further at their November meeting and that no action
33 is needed at this time.

34
35 He also encouraged the Policy Committee to rededicate to the TFW ground rules, which is essential
36 to making the program work.

37 **PUBLIC COMMENT ON BOARD'S 2013 WORK PLAN ADJUSTMENTS**

38 Pete Heide, (WFPA), encouraged the Forests and Fish Policy Committee to go through the Thurston
39 County Dispute Resolution Center for collaborative negotiations training.

40 **REVIEW OF BOARD'S 2013 WORK PLAN**

41
42 Marc Engel, DNR, requested the Board approve changes to the 2013 work plan that included
43 changing the completion date for two CMER studies.

44
45 **MOTION:** Bob Guenther moved the Forest Practices Board approve the 2013 Board Work
46 Plan to delay presentation of the Policy Committee's recommendations for the
47 Extensive Riparian Status and Trend Monitoring Type F/Eastside Temperature
48

1 Study to the Board at their November 2013 meeting and the Mass Wasting
2 Effectiveness Monitoring Project to the Board at the February 2014 meeting, if
3 necessary.

4
5 **SECONDED:** Tom Laurie

6
7 **MOTION TO**

8 **AMEND:** Paula Swedeen moved to amend the motion by adding “if necessary” at the end of
9 the motion.

10
11 **SECONDED:** Carmen Smith

12
13 **ACTION ON**

14 **AMENDMENT:** Motion passed unanimously.

15
16 **ACTION:** Motion passed unanimously.

17
18 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

19 Chris Mendoza, Conservation Caucus, responded as CMER co-chair to concerns heard earlier in the
20 meeting relating to the Policy Committee. He said the Policy Committee’s tasks are much broader
21 than CMER. CMER is more single focused and able to move a project through quickly whereas the
22 Policy Committee has many pathways to a decision in order to reach consensus. He also said the
23 Board-approved pilot to conduct three projects through the LEAN process has had limited success in
24 some areas and more in other areas. He is hopeful that more of the “bugs” can be worked out for
25 more success.

26
27 Rob Kavanaugh encouraged the Board to revise procedures relating to petitions for rule making by
28 assigning staff to assist public members in drafting the petition and allowing adequate time for the
29 public member to discuss the issues with the Board. He also expressed dissatisfaction in how the
30 meeting minutes were prepared for the May meeting.

31
32 **PUBLIC COMMENT ON NORTHERN SPOTTED OWL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM’S**
33 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

34 Cindy Mitchell, WFPA, provided a historical look back at the regulatory approaches taken related to
35 spotted owl issues and said the new voluntary incentive based approach brings hope and a positive
36 pathway forward.

37
38 Graham Taylor, Sierra Club, expressed concern about efforts on private and state lands to make up
39 the difference of protection of owls over time. He encouraged the Board to create the conditions on
40 the ground that can work towards change and recovery of the spotted owl. He also expressed concern
41 about how the spotted owl will adapt to climate change and what mitigation efforts can be created.

42
43 Don Halabisky, Sierra Club, said he is concerned that the spotted owl population continues to decline
44 despite the efforts and recommendations of the 2009 Spotted Owl Policy Working Group.

45
46 Mark Johnston stated he shares the same concerns of Graham Taylor, that on-the-ground conditions
47 have not been improved for the spotted owl. He would like the Board to take a more aggressive
48 approach in spotted owl protection.

1
2 Shawn Cantrell, Seattle Audubon, encouraged the Board to get actively engaged in the spotted owl
3 issues to be ready to take action in November on the recommendations provided by the Northern
4 Spotted Owl Implementation Team.

5
6 Kara Whitaker, WFLC, urged the Board to consider stronger conservation measures to prevent
7 further decline of spotted owls.

8
9 Dave Wertz, Conservation Northwest, said that the current rules for spotted owl protection are not
10 working. He asked the Board to create a policy that meets the social and biological responsibilities.

11
12 Becky Kelly, Washington Environmental Council (WEC), encouraged the Board to develop measures
13 that fully support spotted owl sites and habitat within and outside the SOSEA. She stated that WEC
14 is committed to working together in creating regulatory tools and incentives the work on the ground.

15
16 Miguel Perez Gibson, (WEC), summarized the Board's spotted owl activity for the past few years.
17 He also stated that at some point U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Washington Department of Fish
18 and Wildlife should question the effectiveness of the existing Forest Practices Rules to avoid "take"
19 of the spotted owl.

20 21 **NORTHERN SPOTTED OWL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM'S RECOMMENDATIONS**

22 Lauren Burnes, DNR, provided a summary of Board actions since 2008 and reviewed the team's
23 work plan.

24
25 Andy Hayes, DNR, reported that the Board's motion in 2012 that directed the team to "investigate
26 and recommend whether the State should consider seeking voluntary "opt-in" federal assurances for
27 forest landowners . . ." has been the primary focus of the team for the past eight months. along with
28 researching voluntary incentives and the Eastside Pilot Project.

29
30 He said the agreement on the recommendations has not occurred; however, the team will continue to
31 work towards reaching consensus by November 2013.

32
33 Hayes recommended the Board direct the team to complete its work by November 2013.

34
35 Everett supports the recommendation to allow the team to continue its work and extend the timeline
36 to present recommendations to November 2013.

37
38 Paula Swedeen stated that there has been a lot of creative thinking and genuine interest to develop
39 incentive tools that work. She thinks the consensus agreements among the team members is important
40 and will form the basis for doing good work and moving forward.

41
42 **MOTION:** Aaron Everett moved the Forest Practices Board allow the Northern Spotted
43 Owl Implementation Team until November 2013 to complete developing
44 recommendations as assigned by the Board at the November 2012 meeting. In
45 addition, an interim report be completed by August 23, 2013 and distributed to
46 the Board.

47
48 **SECONDED:** Bob Guenther

1
2 **ACTION:** Motion passed unanimously.
3

4 **RULE MAKING ON ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT REFORM**

5 Marc Engel, DNR, requested the Board adopt the Policy Committee’s consensus rule proposal that
6 implements the changes outlined in the 2012 settlement agreement for the Forest Practices Habitat
7 Conservation Plan. The amendments include:

- 8 • Reestablishing the Policy Committee as a consensus-based body composed of nine caucus
9 principles or their representatives with one vote per caucus.
10 • Adjusting the dispute resolution process timelines.
11 • Expanding the CMER work plan process to include a Master Project Schedule.
12

13 **MOTION:** Tom Laurie moved the Forest Practices Board adopt the rule proposal amending
14 WAC 222-12-045 Adaptive Management Program that incorporates the
15 recommendations of the settlement agreement regarding the Forest Practices
16 Habitat Conservation Plan. He further moved the Board direct staff to file a CR-103
17 Rule Making Order with the Office of the Code Reviser.
18

19 **SECONDED:** Court Stanley
20

21 **ACTION:** Motion passed unanimously.
22

23 **RULE MAKING ON FOREST PRACTICES HYDRAULIC PROJECTS AND FOREST**
24 **BIOMASS**

25 Marc Engel, DNR, requested the Board adopt the Forest Practices Hydraulic Project and Forest
26 Biomass rules. The rule proposal incorporates fish protection standards from the Hydraulic Code
27 Rules into the Forest Practices Rules as prescribed by Second Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6406
28 (2102) and include recommendations made by the 2012 Forest Biomass Working Group.
29

30 Engel said the rule proposal includes the following recommendations based on public comment and
31 re-analyzing the legislation:

- 32 • Include Type N Waters in the definition of “forest practices hydraulic project” so there is
33 common terminology for all projects that use, divert, obstruct, or change the natural flow or bed
34 of forested streams.
35 • Retain the current definition of bankfull width. Rules brought in from the Hydraulic Code Rules
36 maintain the “ordinary high water line” metric.
37

38 He also recommended the effective date of the rules be December 30, 2013.
39

40 **MOTION:** Court Stanley moved the Forest Practices Board adopt the rule proposal as
41 presented today that:
42 • Pursuant to chapter 1, laws of 2012, incorporates into the Forest Practices Rules
43 the fish protection standards from the Hydraulic Code Rules applicable to forest
44 practices activities; and
45 • Incorporates recommendations by the Forest Biomass Working Group relating
46 to the harvest of forest biomass.
47 He further moved that the Board direct staff to file a CR-103 Rule Making Order
48 with the Office of the Code Reviser specifying an effective date of December 30,

1 2013.

2
3 **SECONDED:** Joe Stohr

4
5 **ACTION:** Motion passed unanimously.

6
7 **PUBLIC COMMENT ON BOARD MANUAL SECTIONS**

8 Pete Heide, WFPA, supports the approval of Board Manual Section 5, Forest Practices Hydraulic
9 Projects. He thanked all the members of the board manual group for their commitment and efforts to
10 the process and getting the board manual section done.

11
12 **BOARD MANUAL SECTIONS**

13 Marc Ratcliff, DNR, requested the Board approve Board Manual Section 22 as presented. The
14 amended changes are a result of the Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan Settlement
15 Agreement and include the following:

- 16 • re-defined the Forests and Fish Policy Committee caucuses, establishing nine principle voting
17 caucuses
18 • stream lined the dispute resolution process and now allows CMER to utilize stage 2 of the dispute
19 resolution process
20 • added reporting guidelines and management of the CMER Master Project Schedule

21
22 **MOTION:** Carmen Smith moved the Forest Practices Board approve Board Manual
23 Section 22, Adaptive Management Program. She further moved the Board
24 allow staff to make minor editorial changes if necessary prior to distribution.

25
26 **SECONDED:** Bill Little

27
28 **ACTION:** Motion passed unanimously.

29
30 Marc Ratcliff, DNR, also requested the Board approve a new board manual section and four others
31 relating to the incorporation of the fish protection standards into the Forest Practices Rules as directed
32 by 2012 legislation.

33
34 The new Board Manual Section 5 includes:

- 35 • Concepts from WDFW's 2003 culvert design manual for fish passage projects.
36 • Using the term 'channel bed width' to define the starting point or design parameter for forest
37 practice hydraulic projects.
38 • Removing guidance for water crossing structures in Type N waters from Board Manual Section 3
39 and adding to Section 5 for consistency.

40
41 Tom Laurie questioned why the hydraulic design option (in Part 4.5.2.3) was included in the board
42 manual given the uncertainty for fish passage and failure to provide adequate transport of sediment or
43 organic material.

44
45 Marc Engel clarified that the legislation directed DNR to incorporate the fish protection standards
46 and the guidance in place when the statute became effective. Since the hydraulic method is included in
47 the 2003 WDFW culvert guidance, the stakeholder group opted to present methods for design in
48 descending order of preference and added language that discourages the use of this method.

1 David Herrera said that inclusion of the hydraulic design option in the board manual was not
2 supported by the Tribes. He said the federal agencies recognize the best available science to be the
3 stream simulation design method.

4
5 Ratcliff briefly mentioned the changes to Board Manual Sections 3, 4, 21 and 26 and also noted an
6 additional correction needed in the Glossary of Section 3. The following will be added to the “Forest
7 Practice hydraulic project” definition:

8 “Stand-alone proposals involving channel change and realignment, dredging in fresh water
9 areas, and constructing outfall structures are not forest practices hydraulic projects and remain
10 governed by chapter 77.55 RCW and chapter 220-110 WAC. “

11
12 **MOTION:** Carmen Smith moved the Forest Practices Board approve Board Manual
13 Section 5, Guidelines for Forest Hydraulic Projects along with Section 3,
14 Guidelines for Forest Roads as presented today, Section 4, Guidelines for
15 Clearing Slash and Debris from Type Np and Ns Waters, Section 21,
16 Guidelines to Alternate Plans and Section 26, Guidelines for Large Woody
17 Debris Placement Strategies. She further moved the Board allow staff to make
18 minor editorial changes if necessary prior to distribution.

19
20 **SECONDED:** Bob Guenther

21
22 **Board Discussion:**

23 Tom Laurie said he supported the motion, but looks forward to amending the manual section and
24 rules as WDFW revises its rules.

25
26 **ACTION:** Motion passed. 10 Support / 1 Oppose (Herrera)

27
28 **PUBLIC COMMENT ON PETITION FOR RULE MAKING**

29 Rob Kavanaugh, Friends of Western Gray Squirrel, shared some Western gray squirrel (WGS)
30 habitat material. He also requested the Board to list the WGS as a threatened species; include the
31 WGS as a Class IV-special trigger; develop best available science to create a regulatory system;
32 employ a landscape level management approach; and develop procedures and rules to provide
33 compensation for private landowners, counties and trusts who may experience adverse economic
34 impacts from WGS management.

35
36 Bill Little asked Kavanaugh how the compensation would work. Kavanaugh responded that he
37 envisioned landowners would be compensated through trust monies and conservation easements.

38
39 Paula Swedeen recalled the action the Board approved at the last meeting, and asked Kavanaugh if he
40 was willing to allow time for the report to be presented to the Board. Kavanaugh responded that he
41 would be agreeable if there was a memorandum of agreement between WDFW and DNR to do what
42 the Board thought they were going to do.

43
44 **PETITION FOR RULE MAKING FROM ROB KAVANAUGH**

45 Marc Engel recapped the motion passed at the last meeting, the process for petitions for rule making,
46 and historical actions and review taken by the Board.

47
48 The Board requested the following for the November meeting:

- 1 • More information about the species, the history of the Board's regulatory approach, and the
2 effectiveness of the current voluntary protection methods.
- 3 • Expanded presentations regarding the status of WGS populations, a review of Forest Practices
4 Applications in areas containing WGS, and successful collaboration between WDFW and
5 forest landowners.

6
7 **MOTION:** Swedeen moved the Forest Practices Board deny the petition for rule making on the
8 Western Gray Squirrel at this time and reemphasize the instructions given to Board
9 staff at the May 14, 2013 meeting to report back to the Board in November including
10 information items requested by the Board. Staff is instructed to reference the
11 broadcast of the August meeting for further content.

12
13 **SECONDED:** Heather Ballash

14
15 **ACTION:** Motion passed unanimously.

16
17 **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

18 None.

19
20 Meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.