Special Board Meeting (Field Tour) – November 7, 2017
Camas Center for Community Wellness, 1821 North LeClerc Road, Cusick, WA

Please note: The field tour provides the opportunity for Board members to learn about ongoing and future topics including the permanent water typing system rule, pesticide applications, tribal cultural resources and fire salvage. The field tour will not be recorded. No public comment will be taken and no Board action will occur during the tour.

Notice to Public: Members of the public who wish to attend the field tour are encouraged to make a reservation by calling Patricia Anderson at 360-902-1413 by November 3, 2017.

Since a limited number of vehicles can be accommodated on the narrow forest roads, carpools and driving appropriate vehicles for terrain are encouraged. Public attendees are responsible for their own transportation, lunch, hard hat and safety vest. A hard hat and safety vest will be required to walk through the forested environment. Tour maps will be available on the morning of the tour. Breakfast and lunch will be available to purchase at the Camas Center for Community Wellness.

AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Welcome and Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Welcome from the Kalispel Tribe – Curt Holmes, Tribal Council Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Stop #1 - Tribal Cultural Resources – Kevin Lyons and Ray Entz, Kalispel Tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stop #2 - Water Typing – Joe Maroney, Kalispel Tribe and Hans Berge, DNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 p.m. – 1:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Stop #3 – Pesticides – JD Marshall, Hancock Forest Management, Kelly McLain, Department of Agriculture and Ray Entz, Kalispel Tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 p.m. – 2:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Lunch - Kalispel Community Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Stop #4 - Small Forest Landowner Issues – Patti Playfair, Washington Farm Forestry Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(time permitting) Stop #5 Water Typing – Joe Maroney, Kalispel Tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(time permitting) Stop #6 Pesticides on Kalispel Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 p.m.</td>
<td>End of Field Tour (Those carpooling from the Camas Center for Community Wellness will need to return there to pick up vehicles.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future FPB Meetings
Next Meeting: February 7, 2018
Special Meeting: TBD
Check the FPB Web site for latest information: http://www.dnr.wa.gov/
E-Mail Address: forest.practicesboard@dnr.wa.gov
Contact: Patricia Anderson at 360.902.1413
**DRAFT AGENDA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8:30 a.m. – 8:40 a.m. | Welcome and Introductions  
Saftey Briefing – Patricia Anderson, Department of Natural Resources (DNR) |
| 8:40 a.m. – 9:05 a.m.     | Public Comment on Field Tour                           |
| 9:05 a.m. – 9:35 a.m.     | Recap of Field Tour – Forest Practices Board           |
| 9:35 a.m. – 9:45 a.m.     | Approval of Minutes  
*Action: Approval of August 9, 2017, meeting minutes.* |
| 9:45 a.m. – 9:55 a.m.     | Report from Chair                                      |
| 9:55 a.m. – 10:20 a.m.    | Public Comment – This time is for public comment on general Board topics.  
Comments on Board action items will occur prior to each action taken. |
| 10:20 a.m. – 10:35 a.m.   | Break                                                  |
| 10:35 a.m. – 10:45 a.m.   | Northern Spotted Owl Conservation Advisory Group – Marc Engel, DNR |
| 10:45 a.m. – 10:55 a.m.   | Public Comment on Conservation Advisory Group          |
| 10:55 a.m. – 11:05 a.m.   | Northern Spotted Owl Conservation Advisory Group – Marc Engel, DNR  
*Action: Consider retaining NSO Conservation Advisory Group* |
| 11:05 a.m. – 11:15 a.m.   | Public Records Fee Schedule Rule Making – Marc Ratcliff, DNR |
| 11:15 a.m. – 11:25 a.m.   | Public Comment on Public Records Fee Schedule Rule Making |
| 11:25 a.m. – 11:35 a.m.   | Public Records Fee Schedule Rule Making – Marc Ratcliff, DNR  
*Action: Consider initiating rule making by filing a CR-102 Proposed Rule Making.* |
| 11:35 min – 12:35 p.m.    | Lunch                                                  |
| 12:35 p.m. – 12:55 p.m.   | Public Comment – This time is for public comment on general Board topics  
for those that were not able to be at the earlier public comment period. |
| 12:55 p.m. – 2:25 p.m.    | Potential Habitat Break Update – Hans Berge, Adaptive Management Program Administrator |
| 2:25 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.     | Board Subcommittee Update on Efficiency and Effectiveness  
Improvements for the Adaptive Management Program – Lisa Janicki,  
Board Subcommittee Chair and Hans Berge, AMPA |
| 3:00 p.m. – 3:15 p.m.     | Break                                                  |
| 3:15 p.m. – 3:50 p.m.     | Clean Water Act Assurances Annual Report - Mark Hicks, Department of Ecology |
| 3:50 p.m. – 4:05 p.m. | **Staff Reports**  
A. *Adaptive Management Update* – Hans Berge, AMPA  
B. *Board Manual Update* – Marc Ratcliff, DNR  
C. *Compliance Monitoring* – Garren Andrews, DNR  
E. *Northern Spotted Owl Implementation Team Update on a Safe Harbor Agreement* – Lauren Burnes, DNR  
F. *Rule Making Activity* – Marc Engel, DNR  
G. *Small Forest Landowner Advisory Committee and Small Forest Landowner Office Update* – Tami Miketa, DNR  
H. *TFW Policy Committee Priorities* – Ray Entz and Scott Swanson, TFW Policy Committee Co-Chairs  
I. *Upland Wildlife Update* – Gary Bell, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife |
|----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4:05 p.m. – 4:35 p.m. | **2018 Work Planning and 2017 Work Plan Review** - Marc Engel, DNR  
*Action: Approve the 2018 work plan.* |
| 4:35 p.m. – 5:10 p.m. | **Executive Session**  
To discuss anticipated litigation, pending litigation, or any other matter suitable for Executive Session under RCW 42.30.110. |
Members Present
Stephen Bernath, Chair, Department of Natural Resources
Bob Guenther, General Public Member/Small Forest Landowner
Brent Davies, General Public Member
Carmen Smith, General Public Member/Independent Logging Contractor
Dave Herrera, General Public Member
Heather Ballash, Designee for Director, Department of Commerce
Joe Stohr, Designee for Director, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Noel Willet, Timber Products Union Representative
Patrick Capper, Designee for Director, Department of Agriculture
Paula Swedeen, General Public Member
Rich Doenges, Designee for Director, Department of Ecology
Tom Nelson, General Public Member

Members Absent
Lisa Janicki, Elected County Official

Staff
Joe Shramek, Forest Practices Division Manager
Marc Engel, Forest Practices Assistant Division Manager
Patricia Anderson, Rules Coordinator
Phil Ferester, Senior Counsel

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
Stephen Bernath called the Forest Practices Board (Board) meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
MOTION: Bob Guenther moved the Forest Practices Board approve the May 9 & 10, 2017 meeting minutes as amended.
SECONDED: Noel Willet
Discussion:
Noel Willet and Tom Nelson noted that the May 10 meeting minutes listed their predecessor as present for the day.
ACTION: Motion to accept minutes as amended passed unanimously.
PUBLIC COMMENT
Ray Entz, Kalispel Tribe, invited the Board to eastern Washington for a field tour. He said he would commit to working with DNR staff and the Kalispel Tribe to ensure that the field tour focuses on eastside issues.

REPORT FROM CHAIR
Stephen Bernath reported on the following:
• Forest Practices program operating budget passed by the Legislature on June 30;
• Adaptive Management Program budget passed by the Legislature with requested funds for this biennium;
• Legislature’s failure to pass the State Capital budget ends funding for the Forestry Riparian Easement Program, Family Forest Fish Passage Program and Rivers and Habitat Open Space Program;
• Passage of HB 1595 amending the Public Records Act will require rule making; and
• A leadership letter is being prepared to re-engage the discussion on tribal cultural resources.

WATER TYPING SYSTEM, SCIENCE/TECHNICAL EXPERT GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS
Bernath provided a brief summary on the Board’s decision to convene an expert scientific panel (Panel) to develop and present recommendations for potential habitat breaks (PHB) for inclusion in the fish habitat assessment method (FHAM). He reminded Board members that the Panel was convened by the Adaptive Management Program Administrator (AMPA) and tasked with providing a report on PHB criteria for consideration at this meeting. The recommendations also included the development of a study plan for validation of the recommended PHB criteria.

Hans Berge, AMPA, provided a PowerPoint that outlined the process used to form the Panel, the work done to gather data, and the analysis done to evaluate the various data sets. He explained how time was provided for stakeholders to provide feedback about the Panel’s recommendations. He reminded the Board that it approved the FHAM framework in May 2017, and that the Panel’s task was to recommend appropriate PHB criteria for inclusion in the FHAM.

Dr. Phil Roni, Panel member, reiterated the Panel’s mission and listed the members assigned to the Panel. The areas of focus for PHB criteria consideration included a review of current literature, an evaluation of approved Water Type Modification Forms (WTMF) data sets, and professional field experience. From their assessment, they concluded the three key components needed to gain useful, repeatable and sound outcomes are changes in stream gradient changes, decreases in bankfull width and a determination of what are permanent barriers.

Roni outlined the different data sets provided by various caucuses and the process used to evaluate the data. He said the data sets were collected for various purposes and not all data sets met the purpose for the Panel’s analysis. Approximately 1,500 points provided the needed data and were adequate for analysis. All the data analyzed was from western Washington. He said there was no data available for eastside analysis.

Roni described how the report, specifically Table 3, showed performance results for the tested metrics applied to the data. He explained how they looked for WTMFs containing a high...
percentage of Type F/N Water breaks where the end of fish habitat was extended past the last
detected fish consistent with the modeled end of fish habitat point and a low percentage of those
containing errors where the WTMF point was consistent with the last detected fish point.

Roni outlined the Panel’s recommended criteria for PHBs as: a change in average upstream
gradient of greater than or equal to 5%; a reduction in upstream channel width, measured at
bankfull width, to less than or equal to 70% of the downstream width; and a fish barrier as a
stream gradient greater than or equal to 20% with an elevation gain through the length of the
barrier greater than or equal to the bankfull width above the barrier. Roni stated these PHB
metrics captured 92% of the end of fish points.

Roni further explained the Panel’s assessment of channel width and described how a proportion
change in channel width supported changes in fish use, rather than how a simple width metric
alone does not indicate high probability of a lack of fish use. He described how a change in
bankfull width usually indicates other geomorphic changes that can limit fish use. He also said
that their barrier evaluation indicated that a gradient of 20% prevents most fish from moving
upstream and that elevation change is generally related to channel width. To conclude, he
outlined the Panel’s recommendations that any one of the following elements would be a PHB:
- A change in gradient greater than or equal to 5%
- A reduction in bankfull width greater than or equal to 30%
- A stream gradient greater than or equal to 20% with an elevation change over barrier length
  which is greater than the upstream bankfull width

Berge described how one might apply the FHAM in a typical stream segment using the
recommended criteria. He said the starting point would begin above the upper most point of
known fish or at the modeled Type F/N break, not in the stream’s lowest reaches. He also said
the Panel believes that a follow up validation study is needed for continued assessment and
effectiveness for the PHBs.

Bernath invited Joe Maroney, Panel member and Kalispel Tribe Director of Fishery and Water
Resources, to provide his perspective on the availability of eastside data. Maroney expressed
concern regarding the lack of data available on the availability of eastside data. Maroney expressed
certainty that a lack of data available for evaluating the PHB criteria. He said WTMF data
does exist, but it does not meet the intent of the study design. He mentioned the Panel recognized
the lack of available data and given the time constraints to establish PHB criteria, the Panel was
restricted to only using data provided by the landowners. He suggested that with more time, a
study design could be developed to use additional data from different eco-regions to validate
potential PHBs.

Several Board members acknowledged the lack of data representing other geographical locations
and asked how additional data could be used to inform PHB recommendations. Roni said that
data from other geographical locations could be analyzed if it was provided in the same format.
The time constraint prevented the group from gathering data from other sources and locations.
PUBLIC COMMENT ON PHB REPORT

Scott Anderson, National Marine Fisheries Service and representing US Fish and Wildlife Service, recommended the Board adopt a system that does not rely on fish presence but uses fish habitat. He said the Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan addresses fish habitat.

Kevin Godbout, Weyerhaeuser Company, recommended the Board act with urgency to establish a permanent water typing rule for the 2018 field season to avoid inconsistencies in the field. He said an updated board manual could alleviate some uncertainty.

Scott Swanson, Washington State Association of Counties (WSAC), said he supports using best available science and urged the Board to accept the Panel’s recommendations outlined in their report.

Jim Peters, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, said the western Washington tribes request the Board to adopt option #9 in the PHB report and suggested an opportunity for tribal scientists to discuss the recommendations with Panel members.

Adrian Miller, Pope Resources, encouraged the Board to use the tools available to them within CMER that would address the data issues before them. He also echoed Godbout’s comments on the need for consistency in the application of the existing rule.

Marc Gauthier, Upper Columbia United Tribes, cautioned that the use of a simple 5% increase in stream gradient or a 30% reduction in stream width as PHBs does not address all situations that prevent fish from moving upstream.

Jamie Glasgow, Conservation Caucus, said he is concerned about the limitations of data available for use in the Panel’s recommendations. He recommended the Board defer action until November and if the Board did make a decision, they would support an option for PHBs with more stringent criteria.

Chris Mendoza, Conservation Caucus, said best available science needs to be included in the PHB evaluation, which requires an inclusion of data from all eco-regions. He suggested that a random sample from each eco-region would eliminate bias.

Peter Goldman, Washington Forest Law Center, urged the Board to delay adoption of the Panel’s PHB recommendations. He advised the Board to adopt a rule that addresses fish habitat in order to avoid an environmental impact statement when the draft rule is evaluated under the State Environmental Policy Act. He requested the Board implement an action to review more data sets for evaluating PHB criteria.

Steve Barnowe-Meyer, Washington Farm Forestry Association (WFFA), recounted the process Policy used to bring consensus recommendations to the Board and the Board’s decision to direct the AMPA to assemble the Panel to develop PHB recommendations. He said WFFA supports the Panel’s recommendations including a follow-up validation study element.
Ken Miller, WFFA, asked the Board to ensure that the Small Business Economic Impact Statement address the disproportionate economic impacts on small forest landowners. He asked the Board to provide technical assistance for small forest landowners resulting from the final rule, and requested the Board not include drainage ditches as natural waters in the water typing rule. He concluded by asking the Board to approve the WFFA-supported small forest landowner low impact riparian template.

Karen Terwilleger, Washington Forest Protection Association (WFPA), cautioned the Board to make decisions consistent with the tenets of Forests and Fish. She said WFPA supports the recommendations in the PHB report. She said a section of the Forest Practices Board Manual cannot be updated before a rule is developed.

On the Board Chair’s request, Terwilleger described how contributing landowners collected and submitted their data to the Panel for review. She stated it was a difficult task to provide the data within the extremely tight timeline given by the Board. She said that the request for data was not specific, nor were any data standards provided. It was also costly for landowners to assemble: it cost landowners approximately $25,000. She concluded by stating that the WTMF data was collected in the short time made available and in a manner requested even though they had little influence on the process established by the Board.

**BOARD DIRECTION FOR PHBs AND NEXT STEPS FOR THE WATER TYPING SYSTEM RULES AND GUIDANCE**

Bernath acknowledged the extremely tight timelines placed on the Panel to review the data and establish PHB recommendations, the AMPA and Panel’s good work, and WFPA’s assistance to provide their data. He said more time could provide the Panel the ability to explain the nuances with the data and augment the existing data to include other eco-regions. He also said a delay in accepting the Panel’s recommendations would not prevent continued work on draft rule and board manual, nor prevent the Panel from developing a study design for validation.

**MOTION:** Stephen Bernath moved the Forest Practices Board delay approval of Potential Habitat Break (PHB) recommendations until the February 2018 Board meeting. This action will provide time to gather and analyze eastern Washington data, provide transparency by daylighting the data and QA/QC used to provide data to the science Panel and to build understanding around the PHB report.

He further moved that the Forest Practices Board direct the AMPA to work with the Washington Forest Protection Association to provide documentation of how data was selected and provided to the science Panel by September 20, 2017. The AMPA will work with the science Panel to add an addendum that includes the documentation from WFPA and others who provided data and publish the data used in the analyses to determine the recommendation for PHBs.

**SECONDED:** Paula Swedeen
Discussion:
Board Members expressing support for the motion were Paula Swedeen, Heather Ballash, Joe Stohr, Patrick Capper, Brent Davies and Rich Doenges.

Board Members expressing opposition for the motion were Tom Nelson, Noel Willet, Bob Guenther, Carmen Smith, and Dave Herrera.

Nelson stated he felt that the Board had an obligation to move forward with the recommendations because the Panel had produced recommendations as directed by the Board. He said the Panel had met the Board’s goal by using best available science and he felt the recommended PHB criteria proved better than the default physical criteria.

Paula Swedeen expressed concern about the completeness of the WTMF data suggesting the unrepresented geographic or spatial location of the data points showed a systematic data bias and does not represent best available science because it is only a partial data set.

Noel Willet said he supports the PHB recommendations contained in the Panel’s report. He added his concern with the Panel’s analysis to determine PHB based on potential differences between eastern and western Washington stream characteristics.

Joe Stohr said the motion did not include any clarity for input from field staff by the Panel in the analysis of the data. He also questioned whether the establishment of PHBs would cause a SEPA determination of significance and therefore potentially delay rule adoption until the 2019 protocol survey season.

Carmen Smith said she is does not support a delay to a Board decision to approve PHBs and suggested there may be the need for two water typing system rules—one for eastern and one for the western Washington.

Dave Herrera said he could not support any motions, and suggested a delay is needed due to outstanding unanswered questions regarding the current WTMF data. He concurred with the Federal Service’s concerns voiced during public comments that the current WTMF data focuses on fish presence. He indicated a need to focus on fish habitat, and expressed concern regarding whether the Federal Services would approve of a rule based on data collected to establish fish presence.

Nelson again stated he prefers to start the process to establish PHBs based on science followed by a validation study. He said the validation study might reveal new science and at that point, the Board could update the rules and/or guidance accordingly.

Swedeen was concerned with adopting a rule based on a partial data set. She added that through analyzing additional data sets and performing QA/QC, the Board will have produced a product that most folks will be more comfortable with.

After discussion Bernath and Swedeen agreed to revise the motion as follows:
MOTION: Stephen Bernath moved the Forest Practices Board delay approval of Potential Habitat Break (PHB) recommendations until the February 2018 Board meeting. This action will provide time to gather and analyze eastern Washington data, provide transparency by daylighting the data and QA/QC used to provide data to the science panel and to build understanding around the PHB report.

He further move that the Forest Practices Board direct the AMPA to work with the Washington Forest Protection Association to provide documentation of how data was selected and provided to the science panel by September 20, 2017. The AMPA will work with the science panel to add an addendum that includes the documentation from WFPA and others who provided data and publish the data used in the analyses to determine the recommendation for PHBs.

Discussion:
Swedeen clarified her intention that this amendment to the original motion will allow for different ways to consider, describe and collect additional data.

Bob Guenther proposed an amendment to the motion. Guenther’s proposed motion language included Nelson’s language regarding the validation study. The motion’s effect was to propose a replacement of the original motion with a new, different motion.

Guenther and Nelson moved to amend the motion as follows:
MOTION: Bob Guenther moved the Forest Practices Board strike the original motion and approve the Potential Habitat Break (PHB) recommendations presented to the Board this morning. A potential habitat break will be identified at a point along a stream channel where one or more of these changes in stream character is identified:
• A gradient increase > 5 %
• Bankfull channel width decrease > 30 %
• A potential fish passage barrier = an abrupt step in the stream channel with at least 20% slope and minimum elevation change greater than or equal to 1 upstream channel width.

Tom Nelson further moved the Board direct the AMPA/Science Panel to develop a study plan for validation, to be presented at the February 2018 meeting. This study plan shall be designed to:
1. Validate the effectiveness of the proposed changes from data included in the science Panel report;
2. Augment and validate new data from geographical areas not represented in current data.

SECONDED: Carmen Smith
Discussion:
Several Board members questioned whether the friendly amendments were congruent with the original motion.

Phil Ferester explained that the Guenther/Nelson amendment was basically like a “striker” amendment in the legislature, and that a vote passing the amendment would supersede the original motion and a “no pass” vote would return discussion to the original motion.

Guenther stated that in order for the process to move forward he supported the motion. He said there is no way landowners are trying to impede the survival of fish.

Nelson said that forest industry assembled a science team to respond to the request for data because the Board projected a need for urgency and to delay would send the wrong message.

Swedeen quoted a statement from page 14 of the PHB report:

We cannot emphasize enough that the data are not perfect and have a number of limitations including having only small number of points from eastern Washington and were collected largely by landowners on their lands, and should be used with caution.

She said this does not seem adequate enough for the Board to move forward.

Herrera said the Board needs to have the right rule to protect fish. He said the tribes still have concerns that the water typing recommendations still do not do enough to protect fish, the resources, or the property of the tribes. By delaying the Board’s decision on PHBs, an analysis process using best available science can be used to fill in the gaps.

Smith quoted a statement from page 14 of the PHB report that followed the paragraph quoted by Swedeen:

However, they do represent the only high quality data available at the time of our analysis and have largely been reviewed and accepted through a regulatory concurrence process. These data indicate that the proposed criteria perform better than the current interim criteria of 2-ft. bankfull width and 20% gradient (Table 3). The proposed criteria also appear to out-perform other combinations of criteria we examined. Fourth, these criteria, a difference in gradient of 5% and a 30% reduction in channel width, were originally recommended by the Timber, Fish and Wildlife Water Typing Committee in 1999 and were successfully applied in a research study. Thus, the proposed interim criteria appear to be implementable.

Nelson said he believes the Board is not being fair to those companies who put forth the data used in the PHB analysis. He asked if DNR was willing and able to put forth the effort to evaluate additional WTMFs, and if the data collection and analysis could be completed and a new Panel PHB report prepared for the Board’s February 2018 meeting.

Joe Shramek, DNR, responded yes, if the Board chooses this path, DNR will commit staff resources to provide the data. Whether it can be completed by February would depend on how many data points were required and from what source. Bernath said the data will be collected in a manner similar to the way the data was provided by the landowners.
Herrera said he never questioned the validity of the data but whether it was robust enough. He expressed concern that the motions being discussed would establish the PHB based on the preferred and recommended PHB from the Panel. He stated the tribes would prefer option #9 in the PHB report and, as such, proposed an amendment to the motion.

MOTION: Dave Herrera moved to amend the amended motion by replacing “a gradient increase > 5%” with “a gradient increase of > 10%” and “bankfull channel width decrease > 30 %” with “bankfull channel width decrease > 70 %.”

SECONDED: Brent Davies

Discussion:
None.

Bernath clarified that voting would start with the last proposed amendment to the original motion. To be clear, he said Herrera’s amendment replaces the use of the Panel recommended PHB criteria in option #7 in the PHB report with option #9 listed in the PHB report and includes the validation study language offered in Guenther’s motion. A vote for Herrera’s amendment is a vote for option #9.

ACTION ON HERERRA’S AMENDMENT TO AMENDMENT: Amendment to Gunther and Nelson’s motion failed. 5 Support (Davies, Guenther, Smith, Stohr, Herrera) / 6 Oppose (Bernath, Swedeen, Capper, Doenges, Willet, Nelson) / 1 Abstention (Ballash)

ACTION ON GUNTHER AND NELSON’S AMENDMENT: Amended motion failed. 4 Support (Guenther, Smith, Nelson, Willet) / 8 Oppose (Herrera, Capper, Davies, Bernath, Swedeen, Stohr, Doenges, Ballash)

ACTION ON ORIGINAL MOTION: Motion passed. 8 Support (Herrera, Capper, Davies, Bernath, Swedeen, Stohr, Doenges, Ballash) / 4 Oppose (Smith, Nelson, Willet, Guenther)

MOTION: Stephen Bernath moved the Forest Practices Board direct the AMPA to facilitate the gathering of data for eastern Washington and in those areas of western Washington not represented currently and work with the Science/Technical Expert Panel to incorporate this data into their analyses to determine PHBs. The AMPA must work with the Panel to identify the QA/QC criteria for the data and coordinate the compilation of the data from a random sample of existing approved WTMFs. All stakeholders are invited to participate in the collation of the data. AMPA and or science Panel will report progress on collecting the data for eastern Washington and those parts in western Washington that need augmenting at the November 2017 meeting.

SECONDED: Heather Ballash
Discussion:
Swedeen requested a friendly amendment to the motion adding “or other appropriate sources of data”, which would amend the second sentence to read, “The AMPA must work with the Panel to identify the QA/QC criteria for the data and coordinate the compilation of the data from a random sample of existing approved WTMFs or other appropriate sources of data.”

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Stephen Bernath moved the Forest Practices Board direct the AMPA to validate the original analyses that resulted in the recommendations included in the PHB report to the Board. The AMPA will facilitate the gathering of a random sample of approved western Washington WTMFs and work with the Science/Technical Expert Panel to analyze the data, and compare the results to those of the original analyses. This work is to be completed for inclusion in the PHB recommendations to the Board at the February 2018 meeting.

SECONDED: Brent Davies

Discussion:
Bernath said the purpose of this motion is to acknowledge the work completed to date, and to set up quality control criteria for a better random sample.

Nelson said he felt the motion created oversight on the work completed by industry to provide data to the science Panel and did not feel this was the Board’s role.

Berge said it will be difficult to find some magical data set that would change the answer, but acknowledged that validating and supplementing the current data would be a useful analysis.

ACTION: Motion passed. 8 Support (Swedeen, Davies, Stohr, Bernath, Herrera, Capper, Ballash, Doenges / 4 Oppose (Smith, Nelson, Guenther, Willet)

The Board agreed that the AMPA will work with the Panel to have additional meetings with the stakeholder technical group to invite input and to hear an operational perspective on the analyses and results as the Panel prepares recommendations for the Board.

MOTION: Stephen Bernath moved the Forest Practices Board direct the AMPA to work with the Science/Technical Panel to develop a validation study design and complete ISPR review of the study design to be completed by the February 2018 meeting. The study will be completed within two field seasons and reported to the Board prior to the next field season.

SECONDED: Heather Ballash

Discussion:
Rich Doenges asked about the cost estimates associated with a study design and questioned subsequent adjustments to the Adaptive Management Program budget as a result.
Berge mentioned that costs and adjustment are uncertain at this time, but that any related cost projections could be provided at the Board’s February 2018 meeting.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously. (Davies not available for vote.)

MOTION: Stephen Bernath moved the Forest Practices Board direct Board staff to present all Board approved elements without PHB metrics of a water typing system rule and supporting board manual guidance at the February 2018 meeting.

SECONDED: Heather Ballash

Discussion:
Nelson questioned the ability to move forward with staff work without specific PHB metrics.

Engel acknowledged that the Board’s approved elements for rule, guidance and the FHAM framework could be presented by staff, but that the cost benefit analysis, small business economic impact statement and SEPA analysis could not be done until the Board approved the final PHB metrics. Bernath clarified that when the metrics are approved by the Board, they would be incorporated into proposed rule.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously. (Davies and Stohr not available for vote.)

BOARD SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE ON EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Hans Berge, AMPA, presented the subcommittee’s recommendations on Adaptive Management Program (AMP) improvements. Recommendations included:

• Begin the process to hire a facilitator for principles meetings through a Request for Proposal;
• Use up to $150,000 from the AMP contingency fund for the contract;
• Request both the TFW Policy Committee (Policy) and the Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER) document roles and expectations for members and co-Chairs, as well as document the budget process; and
• Form a small group to discuss how to secure and maintain potential sites for conducting future field studies.

Bernath proposed that these items be discussed and completed by November.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Ray Entz, Kalispel Tribe, said he did not believe Policy could successfully write and document the roles and expectations for its own members and develop an AMP budget process. As co-Chair, he said he would give it his best effort.

Scott Swanson, Washington Association of Counties, said he supports the subcommittee’s efforts and recommendations.
BOARD DIRECTION ON NEXT STEPS FOR THE ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

MOTION: Stephen Bernath moved the Forest Practices Board authorize the use of the AMPA budget line item for contingencies up to $150,000 to use in hiring a facilitator to bring together at least three principals meeting(s).

He further moved the Board accept the recommendations from the sub-committee for the draft scope of work for a facilitator and authorize Board staff to move forward with Request for Proposal and the contract process for hiring a facilitator.

He further moved the Board direct Policy/CMER to:

- Identify in writing roles and expectations of participants in the CMER/Policy process including co-chairs (where it does not already exist);
- Document the budget process and expectations for Policy/CMER;
- Identify what updates are necessary for the PSM and timelines to update;
- Identify a process and incentives and/or commitments to work with landowners on future CMER projects for site selection and certainty of retaining those sites during the length of a CMER study; and
- Present the documentation/processes to the Board at the November 2017 meeting.

SECONDED: Heather Ballash

Discussion:
Berge said he is confident with how the AMP funding will be spent over the biennium and that the budget will not allow for contingency funding to be spent for other projects.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously. (Davies and Stohr not available for vote.)

ELECTRONIC SIGNATURE RULE MAKING

Patricia Anderson and Marc Ratcliff, DNR, requested the Board initiate rulemaking to create in rule the authority to accept electronic submissions of forest practices applications, signatures, and payment once DNR has developed the means to conduct electronic business.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON ELECTRONIC SIGNATURE RULE MAKING
None.

ELECTRONIC SIGNATURE RULE MAKING

MOTION: Stephen Bernath moved the Forest Practices Board approve the draft electronic business rule language and direct staff to initiate rule making by filing a CR-102 with the Office of the Code Reviser.

SECONDED: Bob Guenther
Discussion:
None.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously. (Davies and Stohr not available for vote.)

PUBLIC RECORDS FEE SCHEDULE RULE MAKING
Bernath stated that the legislature passed HB 1595, which amended the Public Records Act. He said that the bill changed how agencies collect fees associated with public record requests. There are two options for fee collection, and staff recommended the Board adopt the statutory fee method. He said this is the same option DNR intends to adopt as an agency, and would allow use of the default fee schedule set in RCW 42.56.120 for public record requests pertaining to the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON PUBLIC RECORDS FEE SCHEDULE RULE MAKING
None.

PUBLIC RECORDS FEE SCHEDULE RULE MAKING
Marc Ratcliff, DNR, asked the Board to direct staff to file a CR-101 to notify the public of the Board consideration of rulemaking.

MOTION: Stephen Bernath moved the Forest Practices Board direct staff to file a CR-101 Preproposal Statement of Inquiry indicating the Board’s intent to consider rule making relating to the collection of fees associated with public record requests.

SECONDED: Noel Willet

Discussion:
None.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously. (Davies and Stohr not available for vote.)

TFW POLICY COMMITTEE PRIORITIES
Scott Swanson, co-Chair, said Policy’s priorities are flexible and change frequently. He said they will update their priorities for the November Board meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT (PM)
Steve Barnowe-Meyer, WFFA, provided a written comment regarding compliance monitoring and said he will provide his comment again at the November meeting.

2017 WORK PLAN
Marc Engel, DNR, reviewed changes to the work plan as a result of the meeting’s decisions which included the initiation of rulemaking on public records fee schedule, changes to the timeline for the Panel’s completion of PHB recommendations to the Board, presentation of the compliance monitoring report to the Board, and a Washington Geologic Survey presentation on a newly developed publicly accessible portal to view LiDAR.
MOTION: Carmen Smith moved to accept the changes to the 2017 work plan.

SECONDED: Patrick Capper

Discussion: None.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously. (Davies not available for vote.)

NEW BUSINESS
Stephen Bernath suggested the November meeting be a 2-day meeting, held on the eastside of the state, featuring a one-day field tour followed the next day by the regular meeting. Board members agreed; however, a few members would not be available in November.

COMPLIANCE MONITORING 2014-2015 BIENNIAL REPORT (W/ISPR REVIEW)
Due to time constraints this report was delayed to November 2017.

STAFF REPORTS
Due to the length of today’s meeting no time was added to the agenda to highlight key points or answer questions regarding the following staff reports:
• Adaptive Management Update
• Board Manual Update
• Compliance Monitoring (including 2016 Annual Report)
• Northern Spotted Owl Implementation Team Update on a Safe Harbor Agreement
• Rule Making Activity
• Small Forest Landowner Advisory Committee and Small Forest Landowner Office Update
• Upland Wildlife Update
• Review of the Implementation of Board Manual Section 16

EXECUTIVE SESSION
None.

Meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Forest Practices Board

FROM: Marc Engel, Assistant Division Manager, Policy and Services
Forest Practices

SUBJECT: Spotted Owl Conservation Advisory Group Update

Each year, per WAC 222-16-010, the Board evaluates the need to maintain the Spotted Owl Conservation Advisory Group. This group is convened when needed to evaluate the need, based on available habitat, to maintain spotted owl site centers while the Board completes its evaluation of rules affecting the owl.

The group would be convened to conduct evaluations when the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) approves surveys demonstrating the absence of spotted owls within the suitable habitat supporting an owl site center.

Within the last year there were no northern spotted owl surveys submitted for review and approval to WDFW; as such, the group did not meet.

At your November meeting, I will request you confirm the Board’s support of the Spotted Owl Conservation Advisory Group.

Should you have any questions please feel free to contact me at 360-902-1309 or marc.engel@dnr.wa.gov.

ME
MEMORANDUM

October 18, 2017

TO: Forest Practices Board

FROM: Patricia Anderson, Rules Coordinator

SUBJECT: Rule Making on Public Records Fee Schedule

At your November meeting, staff will request your approval to file a CR-102 Notice of Rule Making with the enclosed draft language. This will initiate public review of the proposed amendments to chapter 222-08 WAC that incorporates the fee scheduled outlined in the Public Records Act. This rule making is a result of legislation passed amending the Public Records Act.

The amendments to the Public Records Act set forth two methods agencies could use when collecting fees during public records requests – charge actual costs or use the rates provided in statute. The Board selected the default fee schedule as outlined in the statute. Not only is this option cost effective, it also is consistent with DNR’s practice. As you will see from the draft language, all other provisions for requesting records and responding to requests remain the same.

This rule making does not trigger the “significant legislative rules” described in RCW 34.05.328 of the Administrative Procedure Act, therefore a cost benefit analysis and small business economic impact statement are not required. These rules are also exempt from SEPA, as they do not affect the environment.

The anticipated timeline for the rule making is:
• January 2018: Conduct public hearing
• February 2018: Staff request for adoption of rules
• March 2018: Rules become effective

If you have any questions, please let me know at patricia.anderson@dnr.wa.gov or 360.902.1413.

PA
Enclosure (1)
WAC 222-08-025  Definitions.

(5) "Public record" as defined in RCW 42.56.010(23), means any writing containing information relating to the conduct of government or the performance of any governmental or proprietary function prepared, owned, used, or retained by any state or local agency regardless of physical form or characteristics.

(6) "Writing" as defined in RCW 42.56.010(34), means handwriting, typewriting, printing, photographing, including, but not limited to, letters, words, pictures, sounds, and all papers, maps, magnetic or paper tapes, photographic films and prints, video recordings, diskettes, sound recordings, and other documents including existing data compilations from which information may be obtained or translated.

WAC 222-08-032  Function, organization, and office.

(6) Staff support is provided to the board as provided in RCW 76.09.030(65). Staff shall perform the following duties under the general authority and supervision of the board:

(a) Act as administrative arm of the board;
(b) Act as records officer to the board;
(c) Coordinate the policies and activities of the board; and
(d) Act as liaison between the board and other public agencies and stakeholders.

WAC 222-08-040  Operations and procedures.

(1) The board holds quarterly scheduled meetings on the second Wednesday of February, May, August, and November, at such times and places as deemed necessary to conduct board business. At regularly scheduled board meetings, agenda time is allotted for public comment on rule proposals and board activities, unless the board has already set public hearings on the rule proposals. Special and emergency meetings may be called anytime by the chair of the board or by a majority of the board members. Notice of special and emergency meetings will be provided in accordance with RCW 42.30.070 and 42.30.080. All meetings are conducted in accordance with chapter 42.30 RCW and RCW 76.09.030(43). A schedule of meetings shall be published in the Washington State Register in January of each year. Minutes shall be taken at all meetings.

(2) Each member of the board is allowed one vote on any action before the board; pursuant to RCW 42.30.060(2), secret voting is not allowed. All actions shall be decided by majority vote. A majority of the board shall constitute a quorum for making decisions and promulgating rules necessary for the conduct of its powers and duties. When there is a quorum and a vote is taken, a majority vote is based upon the number of members participating. The chair, designee, or majority of the board may hold hearings and receive public comment on specific issues such as rule making that the board will consider in its actions.

(3) Rules marked with an asterisk (*) pertain to water quality and are adopted or amended with agreement from the department of ecology. See WAC 222-12-010.
(4) The chair or majority of board members shall set the meeting agenda. Public requests for topics to be included in the board’s quarterly public meeting agenda must include the name of the requester, and be received at the office at least fourteen days before the scheduled meeting. Topics requested may be added to the meeting agenda at the chair’s discretion or by a majority vote of the board members. Pursuant to RCW 42.30.077 agendas of each regular meeting will be available online no later than twenty-four hours in advance of the published start time of the meeting.

(5) Written materials for the board which are not provided in advance of the meeting date will not be distributed during the meeting unless fifteen copies are provided to staff.

WAC 222-08-050  Public records--Availability.
The board’s public records are available for inspection and copying except as otherwise exempted under RCW 42.56.210 through 42.56.480470, any other law, and this chapter.

WAC 222-08-090  Disclosure of public records.
Public records may be inspected or copies of such records obtained, upon compliance with the following procedure:

(1) A request shall be made in writing, by fax or electronic mail, to the public records officer or designee. The request shall include the following information:
   (a) The name of the person requesting the record;
   (b) The calendar date of the request; and
   (c) A description of the record(s) requested.

(2) Within five business days of receiving a public records request, as required by RCW 42.56.520, the office shall respond by:
   (a) Providing the record; or
   (b) Acknowledging that the office has received the request and providing a reasonable estimate of time required to respond; or
   (c) Denying the request.

(3) The office may request additional time to provide the records based upon the need to:
   (a) Clarify the intent of the request;
   (b) Locate and assemble the information requested;
   (c) Notify third persons or agencies who may be affected by the request; or
   (d) Determine whether any of the information requested is exempt and that a denial should be made for all or part of the request.

(4) The public records officer may, if it deems the request is unclear, ask the requester to clarify the information the requester is seeking. If the requester fails to clarify the request, the office need not respond to it.

(5) Public records shall be available for inspection in the office from 9:00 a.m. to noon and from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays and during board meetings.

(6) No fee shall be charged for the inspection of public records. For printed, typed and written public records of a maximum size of 8 1/2" by 14", the board shall charge twenty-five cents per page to reimburse the board for the actual costs of providing the copies and the use of copying equipment. Copies of maps, photos, films, recordings, and other nonstandard public records shall be furnished at the board’s actual costs. The board shall charge the
current rate for tax and shipping on all disclosure copying requests. The board’s charges for producing public records shall follow the fee schedule established in RCW 42.56.120, because calculating the actual costs associated with records production would be unduly burdensome. The public records officer may waive the fees when the expense of processing the payment exceeds the cost of providing the copies for de minimus requests. Before releasing the copies, the public records officer may require a deposit not to exceed 10 percent of the estimated cost.

(7) The public records officer may determine that all or a portion of a public record is exempt under the provisions of chapter 42.56 RCW. Pursuant to RCW 42.56.070(1) and 42.56.210(1), the public records officer may delete redact portions of public records. The public records officer will explain the reasons for such deletion redaction in writing, including the exemption that applies.

(8) Any denial of a request for public records shall be in writing, specifying the reason for the denial, including the specific exemption authorizing the nondisclosure of the record, and a brief explanation of how the exemption applies to the records withheld.

(9) Any person who objects to a denial of a request for a public record may request review of such decision by submitting a written request to the public records officer. The written request shall specifically refer to the written statement by the public records officer or designee which constituted or accompanied the denial.

(10) Immediately after receiving a written request for review of a decision denying disclosure of a public record, the public records officer or designee denying the request shall refer it to the chair of the board. The chair shall consider the matter and either affirm or reverse such denial.

(11) Administrative remedies shall not be considered exhausted until the chair of the board or designee has returned the request for review with a decision or until the close of the second business day following receipt of the written request for review of the denial of the public record, whichever occurs first.
Memorandum

October 24, 2017

TO: Forest Practices Board

FROM: Mark Hicks, Ecology Forest Practices Lead

SUBJECT: Clean Water Act Milestone Update

The Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) committed to provide the Forest Practices Board (Board) with periodic updates on the progress being made to meet milestones established for retaining the Clean Water Act 303(d) Assurances (Assurances) for the forest practices rules and associated programs. Our last update to the Board occurred at your August 2016 Board meeting.

Under Washington state law (Chapter 90.48 RCW and 76.09.040 RCW) forest practices rules are to be developed so as to achieve compliance with the state water quality standards and the federal Clean Water Act (CWA). The Assurances establish that the state’s forest practices rules and programs, as updated through a formal adaptive management program (AMP), will be used as the primary mechanism for bringing and maintaining forested watersheds in compliance with the state water quality standards. The Assurances were originally granted in 1999 as part of the Forests and Fish Report (FFR) and spell out the terms and conditions of how Section 303(d) will be applied to lands subject to the FFR. Those original Assurances were to last for only a ten year period. After conducting a review of the program and hearing from stakeholders that they were committed to making the program work, Ecology conditionally extended the assurances for another ten years. This extension was based on the expectation that the program meet a list of process improvements and performance objectives. These are the milestones reported on in this update.

The 2009 milestones were established to create a path of steady improvement in gathering information critical for assessing the effectiveness of the rules in protecting water quality as mandated by state law. Equally important, was the intent to encourage process changes that would lead to cooperators working more productively together to create a more effective research program to test and adjust the rules long-term.
Enclosed are two tables showing the milestones and summarizing their current status. The first table shows the non-CMER project milestones. These milestones are implemented outside of the Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research (CMER) program and are largely within the control of the Forest Practices Operations Section of the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) or the Timber Fish and Wildlife Policy Committee (Policy). Changes in status since our last briefing and points of note are highlighted in red font.

Since the Board’s August 2016 meeting, the TFW Policy Committee has restarted work to develop guidance for identifying the uppermost point of perennial flows in Type Np (perennial non-fish-bearing) waters, and DNR is taking steps to arrange independent fiscal and performance audits for the AMP and has established a biennial sampling program to assess compliance with the unstable slopes rules. Within the CMER research program, work has begun to scope a landscape scale mass wasting study, scoping completed and a study design sent to Independent Scientific Peer Review (ISPR) for a study examining the effectiveness of the (Rule Identified Landforms (RILs) in identifying slopes at risk of mass wasting, scoping completed and a draft study design underway on a forested wetlands effectiveness monitoring study. Ecology is particularly pleased to see the Type N Hard Rock study through ISPR and approved by CMER, and its companion study in soft rock lithology expected to be completed in 2018. These milestones were high priorities for our agency.

While progress is being made on other projects important to the Assurances, some such as the eastside Type Np effectiveness monitoring study continue to be delayed and off schedule. The CWA research milestones were initially set to distribute the effort and costs across Science Advisory Groups (SAGs) and across time in order to make attainment of the milestones feasible. This initial schedule was reflected in the approved CMER budget and work plan. The continued and often long-term delay in advancing the milestone projects has contributed to a situation where remaining milestones need to be completed during a period of time when projected expenditures exceed revenues. Policy has assembled two budget subcommittees to suggest options to reduce future budget deficits and prioritize the projects on the Master Project Schedule (MPS). Ecology has and will continue to work with its TFW partners to consider changes to the CWA milestones based on new understandings of the relative ability of a specific research project to effectively inform rules set to protect water quality. However, a budget shortfall, which is in part due to not being able to prioritize and complete the planned projects on schedule, will not be viewed by Ecology as a sound basis alone for changing or removing milestones.

Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns (360) 407-6477.

Enclosure
**Summary of CWA Assurances Milestones and current status:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-CMER Project Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summarized Description of Milestone</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2009: CMER budget and work plan will reflect CWA priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2009: Identify a strategy to secure stable, adequate, long-term funding for the AMP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2009: Complete Charter for the Compliance Monitoring Stakeholder Guidance Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2009: Initiate a process for flagging CMER projects that are having trouble with their design or implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The product developed that met this milestone is complicated and not being used. The Adaptive Management Program Administrator has stated his intention to refine the process. Any remedy that ensures problems are identified and resolved efficiently would continue to satisfy this milestone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2009: Compliance Monitoring Program to develop plans and timelines for assessing compliance with rule elements such as water typing, shade, wetlands, haul roads and channel migration zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2009: Evaluate the existing process for resolving field disputes and identify improvements that can be made within existing statutory authorities and review times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2009: Complete training sessions on the AMP protocols and standards for CMER, and Policy and offer to provide this training to the Board. Identify and implement changes to improve performance or clarity at the soonest practical time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2010: Ensure opportunities during regional RMAP annual reviews to obtain input from Ecology, WDFW, and tribes on road work priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarized Description of Milestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| February 2010: Develop a prioritization strategy for water type modification review. | Completed  
March 2013 |
| March 2010: Establish online guidance that clarifies existing policies and procedures pertaining to water typing. | Completed  
March 2013 |
| June 2010: Review existing procedures and recommended any improvements needed to effectively track compliance at the individual landowner level. | Completed  
November 2010 |
| June 2010: Establish a framework for certification and refresher courses for all participants responsible for regulatory or CMP assessments. | Completed  
September 2013 |
| July 2010: Assess primary issues associated with riparian noncompliance (using the CMP data) and formulate a program of training, guidance, and enforcement believed capable of substantially increasing the compliance rate. | Completed  
August 2012 |
| July 2010: Ecology in Partnership with DNR and in Consultation with the SFL advisory committee will develop a plan for evaluating the risk posed by SFL roads for the delivery of sediment to waters of the state. | Off Track  
Described below for 2013 report stage. |
| July 2010: Develop a strategy to examine the effectiveness of the Type N rules in protecting water quality at the soonest possible time that includes: a) Rank and fund Type N studies as highest priorities for research, b) Resolve issue with identifying the uppermost point of perennial flow by July 2012, and c) Complete a comprehensive literature review examining effect of buffering headwater streams by September 2012. | Underway  
TFW Policy has reactivated work to complete this milestone. After reaching a tentative agreement on how to handle identification of the Upper Most Point of Perennial Flow during the wet season, Policy agreed to recommend the Board direct DNR to establish a technical work group to resume development of Board Manual 23. |
| October 2010: Conduct an initial assessment of trends in compliance and enforcement actions taken at the individual landowner level. | Completed  
November 2010 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-CMER Project Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summarized Description of Milestone</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| October 2010: Design a sampling plan to gather baseline information sufficient to reasonably assess the success of alternate plan process. | Completed  
  December 2014  
  DNR satisfied this milestone by releasing an Alternate Plan Guidance memo (12-10-14) designed to strengthen the overall process for issuing alternate plans.  
  Efforts remain pending for DNR to conduct a review of the Informal Conference Notes associated with Alternate Plan Forest Practices Applications over the last year to assess whether the guidance is being effectively used. |
| December 2010: Initiate process of obtaining an independent review of the Adaptive Management Program. | Underway  
  DNR has begun working with the state auditor’s office and will meet in the fall about conducting a performance audit. |
| December 2011: Complete an evaluation of the relative success of the water type change review strategy. | Completed  
  March 2013  
  DNR rechecked the current status of the review process used in the regional offices. They found differences in the extent the original processes had been maintained. No assessment was made of whether this affected cooperators ability to contribute to an effective review. |
| December 2011: Provide more complete summary information on progress of industrial landowner RMAPs. | Completed  
  September 2011 |
| October 2012: Reassess if the procedures being used to track enforcement actions at the individual land owner level provides sufficient information to potentially remove assurances or otherwise take corrective action. | Completed  
  June 2012 |
| Initiate a program to assess compliance with the Unstable Slopes rules. | Completed  
  October 2017  
  The DNR Compliance Monitoring Program has begun biennial field |
## Non-CMER Project Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summarized Description of Milestone</th>
<th>Status as of October 2017¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2013</strong> November 2013: Prepare a summary report that assesses the progress of SFLs in bringing their roads into compliance with road best management practices, and any general risk to water quality posed by relying on the checklist RMAP process for SFLs.</td>
<td><strong>Off Track</strong> DNR's efforts to satisfy this milestone have been unsuccessful. This is due to low participation by SFLs and a lack of authority to otherwise enter onto their properties to conduct a survey. Satisfying this milestone no longer seems feasible, and the ability to rely on checklist Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plans to ensure small forest landowner roads are not creating a water quality problem remains uncertain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CMER Research Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Milestone</th>
<th>Status as of October 2017¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009</strong> Complete: Hardwood Conversion – Temperature Case Study (Completed as data report)</td>
<td><strong>Completed</strong> June 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Design: Wetland Mitigation Effectiveness</td>
<td><strong>Completed</strong> October 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010</strong> Study Design: Type N Experimental in Incompetent Lithology</td>
<td><strong>Completed</strong> August 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete: Mass Wasting Prescription-Scale Monitoring</td>
<td><strong>Completed</strong> June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope: Mass Wasting Landscape-Scale Effectiveness</td>
<td><strong>Underway</strong> A CMER staff member and Project Manager have been assigned to lead scoping efforts for this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope: Eastside Type N Effectiveness</td>
<td><strong>Completed</strong> November 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011</strong> Complete: Solar Radiation/Effective Shade</td>
<td><strong>Completed</strong> June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Milestone</td>
<td>Status as of October 2017¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete: Bull Trout Overlay Temperature</td>
<td>Completed May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement: Type N Experimental in Incompetent Lithology</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Design: Mass Wasting Landscape-Scale Effectiveness</td>
<td>Earlier Stage Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Complete: Buffer Integrity-Shade Effectiveness</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Synthesis: Forested Wetlands Literature Synthesis</td>
<td>Completed January 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping: Examine the effectiveness of the RILs in representing slopes at risk of mass wasting</td>
<td>Completed April 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The report went through two rounds of ISPR review, and must get their approval on the current revised draft before it can go to CMER for final approval.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Milestone</th>
<th>Status as of October 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Design: Eastside Type N Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td><strong>Underway</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed supplemental field work in 2014 to help in developing a study design. TWIG submitted two draft study designs for CMER consideration. Issues of concern were raised in 2015-2016 over what is being measured and the prescriptions proposed for testing. A formal dispute was ended without substantive resolution at the June 28, 2016 CMER meeting. Further disagreements over technical elements may have been resolved at a special meeting held on July 12. CMER agreed at their July 26 meeting to send the study design to ISPR. ISPR was not willing to support the study design until they knew more about the study sites. The Technical Writing and Implementation Group (TWIG) then conducted data collection to facilitate a follow-up review meeting with ISPR. That meeting has not occurred.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **2013** | **Scoping: Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Study** | **Completed** |
| **December 2016** |

| **Wetlands Program Research Strategy** | **Completed** |
| **January 2015** |

| **Scope: Road Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring** | **Completed** |
| **March 2016** |

| **Study Design: Examine the effectiveness of the RILs in representing slopes at risk of mass wasting.** | **Underway** |
| **Draft study design in CMER review.** |

| **Implement: Eastside Type N Effectiveness** | **Earlier Stage Underway** |
| **Discussed above for 2012 study design.** |

<p>| <strong>2014</strong> | <strong>Complete: Type N Experimental in Basalt Lithology</strong> | <strong>Underway</strong> |
| <strong>Findings report is being drafted for CMER approval for delivery to Policy.</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Milestone</th>
<th>Status as of October 2017¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study Design: Road Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Back from ISPR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope: Type F Experimental Buffer Treatment</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation: Examine the effectiveness of the RILs in representing slopes at risk of mass wasting</td>
<td>Earlier Stage Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussed above for 2013 study design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Design: Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Study</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected to CMER in November 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Complete: First Cycle of Extensive Temperature Monitoring</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergoing final post ISPR revision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope: Watershed Scale Assess. of Cumulative Effects</td>
<td>Off Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This project was intended to follow and be built on the lessons learned from other effectiveness monitoring studies which remain behind schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope: Amphibians in Intermittent Streams (Phase III)</td>
<td>Not Progressing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project milestone exists only if needed to fill research gaps left from Type Np Experimental in Basalt Lithology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Type Np Basalt study is expected to be completed in 2018, so Policy established 2019 as a date to begin this study; if questions were not addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Study design: Watershed Scale Assess. of Cumulative Effects</td>
<td>Off Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussed above for 2016 Scoping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Design: Amphibians in Intermittent Streams (Phase III)</td>
<td>Not Progressing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussed above for 2015 scoping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Complete: Roads Sub-basin Effectiveness</td>
<td>Earlier Stage Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement: Watershed Scale Assess. of Cumulative Effects</td>
<td>Off Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussed above for 2016 Scoping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete: Type N Experimental in Incompetent Lithology</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# CMER Research Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Milestone</th>
<th>Status as of October 2017¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete: Eastside Type N Effectiveness</td>
<td>Earlier Stage Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Discussed above for 2012 study design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status terminology:**

“**Completed**” - milestone has been satisfied (includes those both on schedule and late).

“**On Track**” - work is occurring that appears likely to satisfy milestone on schedule.

“**Underway**” - work towards milestone is actively proceeding, but likely off schedule.

“**Earlier Stage Underway**” – project initiated, but is at an earlier stage (off schedule) then the listed milestone.

“**Not Progressing**” - no work has begun, or work initiated has effectively stopped.

“**Off Track**” - 1) No work has begun and inadequate time remains, 2) key stakeholders are not interested in completing the milestone, or 3) attempt at solution was inadequate and no further effort at developing an acceptable solution is planned.
October 3, 2017

TO: Forest Practices Board
FROM: Marc Ratcliff
Forest Practices Policy Section

SUBJECT: Board Manual Development Update

This memo provides information on anticipated development of the Forest Practices Board Manual.

Section 23, Guidelines for Field Protocol to Locate Mapped Division Between Stream Types and Perennial Stream Identification. At the August 2017 Board meeting, the Board delayed acceptance of potential habitat break (PHB) recommendations until the scientific panel could conduct more analysis and perform QA/QC on additional data. The Board directed staff to present draft Board Manual concepts at the February 2018 meeting by incorporating Board approved elements to date, but without the guidance related to PHBs. That work is currently being done and includes the Policy-approved and Board-accepted fish habitat assessment methodology (otherwise known as FHAM) framework and improved practices for conducting electrofishing protocol surveys as outlined in the electrofishing technical group’s report.

Focused development of Section 23 (Part 1, guidance for locating the division between Type F and N waters) will occur once the Board accepts the final PHB criteria. Final approval will coincide with the adoption of the permanent water typing rule.

MR
MEMORANDUM

TO: Forest Practices Board

FROM: Garren Andrews, Compliance Monitoring Program Manager

SUBJECT: Current status of the Compliance Monitoring Program

Fall 2017 Standard field data collection commenced September 2017.

Unstable Slopes prescription data collection commenced September 2017.


If you have any questions please contact me at (360) 902-1366 or garren.andrews@dnr.wa.gov

GA/
October 4, 2017

TO: Forest Practices Board
FROM: Marc Engel
Forest Practices Assistant Division Manager, Policy and Services

SUBJECT: Rule Making Activity

Permanent Water Typing
At the August 2017 meeting, the Board chose not to accept the scientific panel’s recommendations on potential habitat break (PHB) criteria needed for the permanent water typing rule. The result delayed Board approval of the PHB’s until the February 2018. Also at the February meeting the Board has asked staff to prepare an outline of the draft water typing rule based on previously Board-approved elements at their May 2017 meeting.

It is anticipated the Board will receive the draft permanent water typing rule and associated draft cost-benefit analysis/small business economic impact statement and SEPA for review and decision to initiate formal rulemaking.

Electronic Signature and Payment
The Board approved draft rule language for the electronic business rulemaking at the August 2017 meeting. Staff filed the CR-102 Proposed Rule Making in September. This rule provides prospective applicants notification that electronic signature and payments will be an accepted method once the Forest Practices Program launches the new electronic business system.

Public Records
Legislation passed this July amended the Public Records Act, providing agencies two options for collecting fees for public record requests. The amended rule will adopt the fee schedule outlined in statute, resulting in amendments to WAC 222-08-090.

At the August meeting, the Board requested staff file a CR-101 Preproposal Statement of Inquiry to notify the public the Board’s intention of rule making. Staff has drafted rule language and will request your approval to initiate rule making at the November 2017 meeting.

I look forward to answering any questions you may have on November 8.

ME
October 5, 2017

TO: Forest Practices Board

FROM: Tami Miketa, Manager, Small Forest Landowner Office – Forest Practices

SUBJECT: Small Forest Landowner Office and Advisory Committee

Small Forest Landowner Office Advisory Committee (SFLOAC)
Since my last report, the Small Forest Landowner Office Advisory Committee held meetings on July 26, and September 20, 2017. Discussions focused on the following topics:

- Review of FPA/N Application and Instruction Forms
- Summary of FREP and FFFPP accomplishments for FY15-17
- Discussion regarding a SFLOAC report of activities to the Forest Practices Board
- Update of SFLOAC Action Plan

New Committee Member
John Henrickson has accepted an appointment to the SFLOAC by Commissioner of Public Lands Hilary Franz. As a small forest landowner and resident of southwest Washington, John has been a very active participant in the Washington Farm Forestry Association and the Washington Tree Farm Program (former Chair). Please join me in thanking Tammie Perreault for her years of service on the committee and welcoming John Henrickson to his new role representing WFFA.

SFLO Technical Assistance Forester
Our Technical Assistance Forester, Josh Meek, ended his SFLO service on October 13, 2017, to pursue an opportunity in the private sector. Since Josh started in July 2016, he provided assistance regarding the Forest Practices Application process to over 200 small forest landowners in western Washington. Although his departure will create a large gap in the SFLO’s ability to provide technical, consultative services to small forest landowners, we celebrate the opportunity for Josh to expand his expertise in natural resource management.

Forestry Riparian Easement Program (FREP), Family Forest Fish Passage Program (FFPP), and Rivers and Habitat Open Space Program (RHOSP)
As you are aware, the legislature adjourned earlier this year without providing for a Capital Budget, which historically has funded the FREP, FFFPP, and the RHOSP programs. This shortfall has impacted employees of the SFLO. Fortunately, the agency has identified certain positions within the agency for these valuable staff members to be reassigned until the Capital Budget is finalized and funding is allotted.
Long Term Applications (LTA)
There are now a total of 245 approved long term applications, which is an increase of 3 approved applications since the end of the last reporting period (07/06/2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTA Applications</th>
<th>LTA Phase 1</th>
<th>LTA Phase 2</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upcoming Landowner Events
Hands-on Chainsaw Safety and Maintenance Workshop
November 15, 2017
9:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.
Chelan County Fire District #3
228 Chumstick Hwy, Leavenworth, WA 98826

26th Annual Family Foresters Workshop
Friday, January 19, 2018
8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Coeur d’Alene Inn (Best Western Plus)
Intersection of I-90 & Hwy 95
Coeur d’Alene, Idaho

5th Forest Owners Winter School
Jan. 27 or Feb. 10, 2018 (TBD)
Community Colleges of Spokane
985 S Elm St, Colville, WA 99114

Forest Stewardship Coached Planning –
WSU’s flagship class teaches landowners how to assess their trees, avoid insect and disease problems, attract wildlife, and take practical steps to keep their forest on track to provide enjoyment and even income for years to come. In this class landowners will develop their own Forest Stewardship Plan, which brings state recognition as a Stewardship Forest and eligibility for cost-share assistance, and may also qualify them for significant property tax reductions. For more information on these courses go to http://forestry.wsu.edu/

The following are scheduled Forest Stewardship Coached Planning courses:
- Enumclaw, Mondays, March 19 – May 7, 2018. Enumclaw Ranger Station
- Stevens County, location and date to be announced, Fall of 2017
Washington State University is recruiting a Southwest WA Forest Stewardship Educator whose area includes Thurston, Lewis, Pacific, Cowlitz, Mason, Jefferson, Grays Harbor, and Wahkiakum Counties with a focus on the Chehalis River Basin Lowlands. This is a full-time, 12-month, temporary Administrative Professional position, within WSU Extension Agriculture and Natural Resources Unit (ANR) in the College of Agricultural, Human and Natural Resource Sciences (CAHNRS). The position is headquartered at the WSU Lewis County Extension Office in Chehalis, Washington but serving surrounding counties that are a part of the Chehalis River Basin.

Please contact me at (360) 902-1415 or tamara.miketa@dnr.wa.gov if you have questions.

TM/
TO: Forest Practices Board  
FROM: Ray Entz, Co-Chair  
Scott Swanson, Co-Chair  
SUBJECT: Policy Committee Update

The Timber, Fish, & Wildlife Policy Committee (Policy) continues to manage a workload driven by internal process deadlines and priorities directed by the Forest Practices Board. The major topics are summarized below.

**Existing Priorities**

*Permanent Water Typing Rule*
Policy continues to monitor the Adaptive Management Program Administrator’s (AMPA) work group convened to gather additional data from water type modification forms for determining potential habitat breaks (PHB). This effort is the remaining technical effort and will be included in the conceptual fish habitat assessment method framework (FHAM). It is anticipated that the group’s recommendations will be shared with Policy and provided the Board in February.

*Small Forest Landowners’ Alternate Template*
Policy has reconvened the subcommittee on the SFL Alternate Plan template proposal. This subcommittee has worked with a contractor on a literature synthesis and is considering questions submitted this month by the Westside Tribes on potential prescriptions. The subcommittee continues to report monthly to Policy and a recommendation should be forthcoming during the beginning of 2018.

**CMER**

*Type N Hard Rock*
Policy was given presentations of the majority of chapters on the Type N Hard Rock study during its October 2017 meeting. Questions from the different caucuses were developed and given to the AMPA, Project Manager, and the study authors. These questions are being answered under the existing CMER process and will be brought back to Policy. The Findings Report and 6 Questions on
the entire study is being developed and should be brought to CMER during the next couple of months before being presented to Policy. The Westside Tribes also requested a separate Findings Report and 6 Questions covering Chapter 7. Policy and CMER co-chairs continue working with the AMPA on how best to facilitate both the flow of technical information and the Policy response timeframe.

New Priorities

A Policy subcommittee continues to meet and discuss criteria necessary to prioritize Policy’s future work in relation to the Master Project Schedule. These priorities will also help Policy develop future AMP budget recommendations.

At the same time, Policy began a parallel effort to the Board’s AMP Improvement Subcommittee efforts, capturing the ‘low hanging fruit’ improvements under discussion. Giving just one example, the co-chairs and AMPA have proposed a group exercise during the December Policy meeting to embrace and enhance ways towards future collaboration.

- Type N – In conjunction with the initial presentations of the chapters on the Hard Rock CMER study, Policy conducted a field tour visiting several Type Np/Ns regulatory water type break sites on landowner property in western Washington on October 6. Also, a consensus by Policy occurred as follows:
  - Policy recommends to the Board resolution of the Type Np/Ns regulatory break methodology, through the DNR’s stakeholder process, for development of the Board Manual 23 to determine in-field method(s) and remote method(s) for locating the uppermost point of perennial flow.

- Policy Handbook – At the Board’s request, a Policy Handbook was completed by compiling existing rules, regulations, and procedures that govern its processes. Each caucus member, as well as the Board, will be given a Handbook. This is a living document and will be revised on a continuous basis.

Budget Review

Policy continues to support the work of the existing budget subgroup as they review the expenses of the AMP, with the AMPA, as an ongoing process throughout the biennium. If necessary, budget updates will be brought to the Board by their May 2018 meeting.
November 8, 2017

MEMORANDUM

To: Forest Practices Board

From: Gary Bell, Wildlife Biologist, Forest Habitats Section

Subject: Upland Wildlife Update

The following provides a brief status update for ongoing or pending actions pertaining to priority wildlife species in forested habitats.

Marbled Murrelet
1992: Federally listed as Threatened
1993: State listed as Threatened
1996: Federal critical habitat designated by USFWS
1997: FPB enacted State Forest Practices Rules
2017: State up-listed to Endangered

The up-listing of the Marbled Murrelet from state threatened to endangered became effective on February 4, 2017. With an observed 4.4% annual population decline since 2001 the status of the Marbled Murrelet in Washington has worsened since state listing in 1993. Without strategies to address threats to the species it is likely the Marbled Murrelet could become functionally extirpated in Washington within the next several decades. WDNR, in consultation with WDFW, recommended that the Forest Practices Board (Board) support WDFW’s initiation of a Marbled Murrelet rule assessment involving a diverse group of stakeholders, which will be convened in early 2018. The group will evaluate rule effectiveness in protecting Murrelet habitat, identify weaknesses in rule language and/or on-the-ground implementation, consider potential habitat conservation incentives, and strive to bring consensus recommendations to the Board.

WDFW continues working with partners to conduct at-sea monitoring surveys and pursuing other critical research regarding sea diet. USFWS and WDFW are also revisiting the Federal Recovery Plan and considering possible recovery actions for protection of the Murrelet.

Canada Lynx
1993: State listed as Threatened
1994: FPB enacted voluntary management approach
2000: Federally listed as Threatened
2017: State up-listed to Endangered
Future Updates to the Board
The forest practices rules require that when a species is listed by the Washington Fish and Wildlife Commission and/or the U.S. Secretary of the Interior or Commerce, DNR consults with WDFW and makes a recommendation to the Forest Practices Board as to whether protection is needed under the Critical Habitat (State) rule (WAC 222-16-080). WDFW and DNR continue to coordinate in order to anticipate federal actions and/or state action in response to changes in the status of any given species.

cc: Hannah Anderson
    Penny Becker
    Stacy Polkowske
    Marc Engel
    Sherri Felix
    Joe Shramek
October 24, 2017

TO: Forest Practices Board

FROM: Marc Engel, Assistant Division Manager, Policy and Services

SUBJECT: 2018 Work Plan

At your November 8 meeting, I will present the staff recommended priorities for the Board’s 2018 Work Plan (attached). The Work Plan incorporates TFW Policy Committee priorities, recommendations from the Adaptive Management Program, and recommendations for rule making and board manual development. The Work Plan also includes standing agenda items and/or tasks of the Board. Upon your approval, this Work Plan will establish the Board’s priorities for completion of work by the Adaptive Management Program and Board staff in calendar year 2018.

The meeting dates for 2018 are February 14, May 9, August 8, and November 14, which occur on the 2nd Wednesday of those months. It is anticipated the February meeting may be a two-day meeting. Once these dates are scheduled, staff will notify the Office of the Code Reviser for publication in the Washington State Register.

Also attached for your review is the work accomplished this past year.

I look forward to discussing the 2018 priorities at the upcoming meeting. If you have questions please do not hesitate to contact me at (360) 902-1390 or marc.engel@dnr.wa.gov.

ME
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>COMPLETION DATE/STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adaptive Management Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Small Forest Landowner Western Washington Low Impact Template:</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Review Process &amp; Timeline*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Buffer/Shade Effectiveness Study (amphibian response)</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CMER Master Project Schedule Progress*</td>
<td>February-Completed &amp; November - 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hardwood Conversion Study</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2017-2019 CMER Master Project Schedule Review*</td>
<td>May - Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Final 2017-2019 CMER Master Project Schedule Approval*</td>
<td>August-Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of OCH, physicals recommendations*</td>
<td>May-Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TFW Policy Committee’s funding decisions*</td>
<td>February- On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PHB recommendation from science/technical experts</td>
<td>February 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Reports</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clean Water Act Assurances</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compliance Monitoring 2014-2015 Biennial Report (w/ISPR Review)</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compliance Monitoring 2016 Annual Report</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Northern Spotted Owl Conservation Advisory Group</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Taylor’s Checkerspot Butterfly Report</td>
<td>May-Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TFW Cultural Resources Roundtable including WAC 222-20-120</td>
<td>August-No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TFW Policy Committee Priorities*</td>
<td>August-Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Western Gray Squirrel</td>
<td>May-Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 303D Listing Update</td>
<td>February-Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Manual Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Section 23 Field Protocol to Locate Mapped Divisions Between Stream</td>
<td>August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types and Perennial Stream Identification*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CMER Membership</strong></td>
<td>As needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Habitat</strong></td>
<td>As needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- State/federal species listings and critical habitat designations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field Tour</strong></td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forest Chemicals</strong></td>
<td>February-Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Washington Geologic Survey Presentation</strong></td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rule Making</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water typing System</td>
<td>August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Electronic FPA/N, Signature and Payment</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public Records Fee Schedule</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcommittee Recommendations on AMP Improvements</strong></td>
<td>On going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TFW Cultural Resources Roundtable Recommendations</strong></td>
<td>No action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on Cultural Resources Protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Resources</strong></td>
<td>No action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>COMPLETION DATE/STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upland Wildlife - Northern Spotted Owl</strong></td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarterly Reports</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adaptive Management Program*</td>
<td>Each regular meeting-Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Board Manual Development</td>
<td>Each regular meeting-Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compliance Monitoring</td>
<td>Each regular meeting-Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clean Water Act Assurances</td>
<td>February-Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Legislative Activity</td>
<td>February &amp; May-Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NSO Implementation Team</td>
<td>Each regular meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rule Making Activities</td>
<td>Each regular meeting-Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Small Forest Landowner Advisory Committee &amp; Office</td>
<td>Each regular meeting-Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TFW Cultural Resources Roundtable</td>
<td>Each regular meeting-No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TFW Policy Committee Work Plan Accomplishments &amp; Priorities*</td>
<td>Each regular meeting-Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TFW Policy Committee Progress Report on Unstable Slopes Recommendations, (Board approved through Proposal Initiation)</td>
<td>On-going as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Upland Wildlife Working Group</td>
<td>Each regular meeting-Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Planning for 2018</strong></td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics = proposed changes

**= TFW Policy Committee

*Updated November 2017*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>COMPLETION DATE/STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Management Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Buffer/Shade Effectiveness Study (amphibian response)</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CMER Master Project Schedule Review*</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CMER Master Project Schedule Compliance Review*</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hardwood Conversion Study</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PHB recommendation from science/technical experts</td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TFW Policy Committee Progress Report on Unstable Slopes Recommendations from the Board approved Proposal Initiation</td>
<td>As needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Small Forest Landowner Western Washington Low Impact Template: TFW Policy Recommended Review Process &amp; Timeline*</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WAC 222-08-160 Continuing review of FP rules (Annual Evaluations), by tradition the Board has received an annual evaluation of the implementation of cultural resources protections</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clean Water Act Assurances</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compliance Monitoring 2014-2015 Biennial Report (w/ISPR Review)</td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compliance Monitoring 2016-2017 Biennial Report</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Northern Spotted Owl Conservation Advisory Group</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Taylor’s Checkerspot Butterfly Report</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TFW Policy Committee Priorities*</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Western Gray Squirrel</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Manual Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Section 12 Forest Chemicals</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Section 23 (Part 1) Field Protocol to Locate Mapped Divisions Between Stream Types*</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Section 23 (Part 2) Perennial Stream Identification*</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Habitat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- State/federal species listings and critical habitat designations</td>
<td>As needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMER Membership</td>
<td>As needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Tour</td>
<td>To be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Geologic Survey Presentation</td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule Making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water typing System</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Electronic FPA/N, Signature and Payment</td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public Records Fee Schedule</td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittee Recommendations on AMP Improvements</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources Recommendations from Facilitated Process (progress reports)</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adaptive Management Program*</td>
<td>Each regular meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Board Manual Development</td>
<td>Each regular meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compliance Monitoring</td>
<td>Each regular meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clean Water Act Assurances</td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics = proposed changes
**= TFW Policy Committee

Updated May 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>COMPLETION DATE/STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Activity</td>
<td>February &amp; May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSO Implementation Team</td>
<td>Each regular meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule Making Activities</td>
<td>Each regular meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Forest Landowner Advisory Committee &amp; Office</td>
<td>Each regular meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFW Cultural Resources Roundtable</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFW Policy Committee Work Plan Accomplishments &amp; Priorities*</td>
<td>Each regular meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland Wildlife Working Group</td>
<td>Each regular meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work Planning for 2019**

November

*Italics = proposed changes

* = TFW Policy Committee

Updated May 2017