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Carmen Smith, General Public Member/Independent Logging Contractor

Staff
Chris Hanlon-Meyer, Forest Practices Division Manager
Marc Engel, Forest Practices Assistant Division Manager
Patricia Anderson, Rules Coordinator
Phil Ferester, Senior Counsel

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
Aaron Everett called the Forest Practices Board (FPB or Board) meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
MOTION: Tom Laurie moved the Forest Practices Board approve the July 8, 2014 meeting minutes.
SECONDED: Court Stanley
ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Rob Kavanaugh said the Carlton Fire was extensive. He encouraged rapid reforestation effort on state land, noted the county’s economy is hurting, and thanked everyone for their personal interest in the situation.

Karen Terwilleger, Washington Forest Protection Association, said a critical piece of the Clean Water Act assurances is to stabilize funding for CMER. She encouraged everyone to put in place a lobbying effort to do just that.
STAFF REPORTS

Adaptive Management

Chris Hanlon-Meyer, DNR, said the Adaptive Management Program Administrator position is still vacant and asked for Board and TFW Policy Committee (Policy) assistance to get the word out. He reported on the piloted LEAN project, various projects in process, and the 2014 development of three reports.

Tom Laurie asked whether the LEAN process increased efficiency of the program. Hanlon-Meyer said yes but it also resulted in more work. The challenge is finding more scientists and improving communication between CMER and Policy.

Northern Spotted Owl Implementation Team

Paula Swedeen asked if there have been discussions on Safe Harbor Agreements with the federal government. Burnes responded that there have been none at this time.

Tom Laurie asked how funds are being split for the two programs. Marc Engel, DNR, answered $500,000 this fiscal year is for NSO habitat work.

Aaron Everett noted a pool of money was being developed for the projects. Paula Swedeen said increased funding in general is also a goal. A legislative request is being submitted for five millions dollars to continue critical habitat work including NSO critical habitat.

Small Forest Landowner Advisory Committee and Small Forest Landowner Office

Tom Laurie asked about Stewardship funding. Miketa answered cost share money for thinning was obtained. Aaron Everett said the 12 million dollars over the last four years averages to three million dollars per year. The money is matched with a landowner’s money and thousands of landowners are involved. Federal and State monies are matched at 50% each, cash or labor.

Tom Laurie asked about the DNR’s small forest landowner survey. Miketa answered the survey covered small forest landowner interests, status of their property, and demographic information. The survey results showed aesthetics, wildlife and recreation are some of the main interests.

Court Stanley asked about the Forest Riparian Easement Program (FREP). Marc Engel, DNR, replied the program is not fully funded. It would take 58 million dollars to fully fund the 600 landowners on the current waiting list and there are an average of 20 applications each month.

Upland Wildlife Working Group

Aaron Everett asked about the fisher. Jackson answered the fisher has been listed by the state since 1998 and is a federal candidate species. She said that a federal proposed listing is due late September and reintroduction of the species is planned. To prepare for possible federal listing, she said that WDFW is working with USFWS on a Candidate Conservation Agreement with Assurances which will not have additional limitations imposed for landowners who commit to the conservation measure.

Paula Swedeen asked whether there is a pre-listing Safe Harbor Agreement. Penny Becker, WDFW replied yes, and noted the fisher was trapped out and lack of habitat is not an issue.
No further discussion on the following staff reports:
- Board Manual Development
- Rule Making Activity & 2014 Work Plan
- TFW Cultural Resources Roundtable

TAYLOR’S CHECKERSPOT BUTTERFLY ANNUAL REPORT
Sherri Felix, DNR, gave a brief history of the Board’s voluntary cooperative protection approach for the Taylor’s checkerspot butterfly, which the Board began in 2007. In the 2013 calendar year, there were 11 forest practices applications within one mile of WDFW’s Taylor’s checkerspot occupied sites and no applications were in those habitats. The forest practices activities were timber harvests and salvage, road construction, pesticide application, and a culvert replacement. None of these activities were determined by WDFW to pose a risk to the species and therefore none were conditioned by DNR with protective measures. Felix also said there has been on average 11-12 applications per year in the six years of reporting to the Board, with no applications in habitat and none posing a risk to the species.

Terry Jackson, WDFW, updated the Board on WDFW-landowner protection plans and survey efforts for the Taylor’s checkerspot butterfly. Two changes in land ownership occurred in 2013 resulted in 1) the number of large forest landowners is now three with each having an approved TCB management plan, and 2) one forested parcel is now owned by a conservation organization. WDFW will address small landowners forest practices if they may pose a risk to the butterfly. In total, 12 population of Taylor’s checkerspot are known to persist in the state. WDFW and other partners are working together to restore and enhance TCB prairie habitats in North and South Puget Sound regions, as well as to re-establish populations through captive rearing programs in the South Puget Sound region.

Felix noted annual reports starting next year will include the USFWS’ newly designated critical habitat for the species now listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act.

WESTERN GRAY SQUIRREL REPORT
Penny Becker, WDFW, noted the western gray squirrel is a ground forager who makes stick nests in trees. Population distribution includes Joint Base Lewis McChord, Pierce and Klickitat counties, and the northern Cascade Mountains. The squirrel is a federal species of concern and is state listed as threatened. Starting May 2015, WDFW’s periodic status reviews for the species will address distribution and abundance and WSFW will need lots of help from landowners and scientists.

Donelle Mahan, DNR, stated that the 2013 rule making petition led to screening of forest practice applications in western gray squirrel habitat. DNR acknowledges on the application decision page there is habitat in the vicinity of the forest practices activity, not as a condition but as information sharing.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON PETITION FOR RULE MAKING FOR THE CONSERVATION OF THE WESTERN GRAY SQUIRREL
Kara Whitaker, Washington Forest Law Center, said there are good efforts but ongoing issues. She stated concerns with implementation and inadequate management plans. She said the voluntary approach is insufficient and called for codifying the 2010 guidelines.

Rob Kavanaugh said a newsletter on the squirrel will be mailed monthly to the Board to keep them updated on the issue. There has been serious habitat loss due to fire, bark beetles, and unmanaged
logging and development. He said that landscape management is the key to success and scientists are available to help. He encouraged the Board to use its existing authorities to protect the species, noting RCW 76.09.010 and WAC 222-16-080.

Tim McBride, Hancock Forest Management, said Hancock owns 70 thousand acres in Klickitat County. In 2007, Hancock met with WDFW regarding western gray squirrel plans. His own interest in voluntary planning led to his PhD in 2011 on the species. He said the petition claims are unjustified, and collaborative research has been happening over the last 15 years.

PETITIONS FOR RULE MAKING ON WESTERN GRAY SQUIRREL CONSERVATION MEASURES

Marc Engel, DNR, said this petition asks WDFW to write rules and asks the Forest Practices Board to amend WAC 222-16-080 to add western gray squirrel guidelines.

Penny Becker, WDFW, said the level of impact from fires on the species is unknown. A citizen and WDFW science group will be researching this issue next year.

Bob Guenther said he appreciates the large landowners work on western gray squirrel.

David Herrera asked how long the assessment would take. Becker answered work would be in the spring and fall.

Paula Swedeen said a status review including demographics and habitat will importantly inform rule making. She appreciates citizen involvement in this issue. There’s an enormous amount of work being done right now and it’s premature for a rule at this time. She requested Bob Guenther assist in communication and outreach to small forest landowners.

Aaron Everett said outreach in Klickitat County could be conducted by DNR’s Small Forest Landowner Office. Educational efforts with WDFW and DNR could be scoped.

Tom Laurie said he appreciated the report on voluntary efforts and believes the Board is on the right track and a rule is not necessary at this time. He would rather see a voluntary approach. He noted inadequate management plans is concerning. The Board needs to know if the voluntary plans are working to know whether we are on track.

Court Stanley said we know voluntary management plans can be successful. The Board needs to know whether or not the current management plans are adequate. We are on the right path at this time.

MOTION: Court Stanley moved the Forest Practices Board deny the petition for rule making dated July 25, 2014.

SECONDED: Bob Guenther

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.
MOTION: Aaron Everett moved to treat Mr. Kavanaugh’s July 23, 2014 letter as two rule making petitions – one involving slope stability rules, and one involving Western Gray Squirrels.

He further moved that the Board consider Mr. Kavanaugh’s Western Gray Squirrel petition at today’s meeting, and that the Board deny this petition. As noted this morning in Board discussion, WDFW is currently conducting a status review and it is premature to begin a rule making effort at this time.

SECONDED: Bill Little

MOTION TO AMEND: Court Stanley moved to delete the last sentence in the 2nd paragraph as follows:

He further moved that the Board consider Mr. Kavanaugh’s Western Gray Squirrel petition at today’s meeting, and that the Board deny this petition. As noted this morning in Board discussion, WDFW is currently conducting a status review and it is premature to begin a rule making effort at this time.

SECONDED: Kirk Cook

ACTION ON AMENDMENT: Motion passed unanimously.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

CLEAN WATER ACT ASSURANCES ANNUAL REPORT
Mark Hicks, Department of Ecology, provided background on CWA assurances. The CWA corrective milestones were created to prioritize and strengthen the process so Ecology can maintain its reliance on Forest and Fish rules to protect water quality on Forest Practices HCP lands. Lots of time and effort has gone into this which Ecology supports. CWA assurances must be a priority to complete.

Aaron Everett acknowledged the people capacity challenge. Hicks said small group focus may help, assisted by the new Adaptive Management Program Manager.

Tom Laurie asked how research in other states compare to ours. Hicks said some of our work sets the standard for good research.

Paula Swedeen asked about the CMER schedule. Hicks said the benefit is the level of engagement in Policy Committee to get it right, i.e. establishing the questions and linkages between studies.

Bob Guenther noted Ecology’s involvement in biosolids distribution on the ground.

TFW POLICY COMMITTEE’S 2014 ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND 2015 PRIORITIES
Stephen Bernath and Adrian Miller, TFW Policy Committee co-chairs, noted that work needs to be completed on the uppermost point of perennial flow of Type N waters and the Type F waters.
plan is in place but on hold due to work directed by the Board in May associated with the Oso landslide. They went over CMER’s list of priorities.

Aaron Everett referred to tomorrow’s agenda topic “Further Direction to the Adaptive Management Program, TFW Policy Committee 2015 Priorities and Board Staff”. Miller said when we re-engage on Type F and N, we will have plans in place with rule mandated timelines.

Paula Swedeen said the Board may need to rethink how to get this work done not necessarily within the confines of the Policy Committee and CMER.

TFW CULTURAL RESOURCES ROUNDTABLE ANNUAL REPORT
Karen Terwilleger, co-chair, presented the Roundtable’s annual report. Accomplishments include rewriting the FPA instructions for the cultural resources question on applications to better educate landowners that don’t often harvest. The Roundtable also worked on a description of the landowner-Tribe meeting process, and the draft guidance documents to better separate voluntary verses mandatory related information in an effort to develop better web and paper based documents. The Roundtable’s annual survey was not completed this year because of two issues: a technical glitch in distribution of the survey and a new issue regarding DNR conditioning authority for cultural resources.

Terwilleger said a member of the Roundtable brought concerns to the Roundtable regarding DNR conditioning forest practices application for cultural resources. She relayed her understanding of the issue. In the early 1990s, DNR used “blanket” conditioning for landowner-Tribe agreed upon protection plans, such as “follow the plan”. The practice was not necessarily widespread throughout the state. In the early 2000s, there were a series of forest practices appeals regarding conditioning for wildlife, etc., not cultural resources. Overtime, DNR regions moved away from “blanket” conditioning to more specific conditions. She said she doesn’t believe there was a lot of conversation about this with landowners and Tribes. Recently, DNR refused to “blanket” condition an application for a landowner-tribe agreed upon protection plan. Some view “blanket” conditioning OK, DNR says conditions must be specific and within their authority. Terwilleger said there’s a communication issue and a conditioning authority issue and cannot underestimate the amount of concern by some Tribal members. She suggested the Roundtable gain more understanding of DNR authority and then see if there’s a problem with conditioning for landowner-tribe plans.

Tom Laurie asked for clarification on what plans are agreed to by the landowner and Tribes. Terwilleger said the question is whether or not an agreed upon plan that is not part of the application can or should be a condition of the application. DNR may not have authority to enforce every part of a plan.

David Herrera suggested the Roundtable and DNR staff meet to get a resolution. Terwilleger said the Roundtable has already met with forest practices and plans to again, needs to also meet with the Assistant Attorneys General and others, then look at how a plan works when it is not submitted with the application. The Roundtable is hoping for a fairly short timeframe but needs a clear understanding of how the Roundtable can fulfill the forest practices system.

Court Stanley asked how conditioning works on sensitive sites. Terwilleger said if the plan is attached, the confidential information can be redacted. Also, landowners can map the location as a
bounded out area, not an identified cultural resources site. For a plan that is agreed to after the
application is submitted to DNR, conditions are important and need to be enforceable.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Chris Mendoza said the LEAN process for CMER was a good exercise. The Policy Committee does a
good job of getting to CMER projects but the bottleneck in the system is on other issues. A similar
process as LEAN is needed for the Policy Committee.

COMPLIANCE MONITORING BIENNIAL REPORT
Walt Obermeyer, DNR, went over the biennial sampling and results. The full biennium of sampling
included approximately 8100 forest practices applications. Results were similar to other biennium
which showed riparian and water typing issues. Improvements will include a larger sample size and
using individual rule sections rather than the whole rule, which will result in better identification of
trends and specific parts of rules that are most difficult for landowners to get right.

Tom Laurie asked whether future reports would include regional variances, a break down by region.
Mahan replied they will look into it.

Dave Somers said it is importance to compare what we have been measuring over time. Obermeyer
replied an application is not an analysis level, so we will go to individual rule sections such as the
outer zone within the riparian management zone.

Paula Swedeen asked whether they could review the connections between compliance monitoring
and CMER research. Mahan answered shade and Type N would be two to look at.

Aaron Everett noted page 30 of the compliance monitoring report regarding population size of the
prescription across the state and said a pattern could be looked at via CMER.

Executive Session
None.

Meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.
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WELCOME
Aaron Everett called the Forest Practices Board (FPB or Board) meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Rob Kavanaugh said the Commissioner of Public Lands has done everything possible regarding the unstable slopes tragedy. He wanted the Board to know he has asked the U.S. Attorney General for an investigation.

Karen Terwilleger, Washington Forest Protection Association (WFPA), asked the Board to be mindful of the legal requirements in the Forest Practices rules. There is a broad array of tools available to identify and delineate landslide areas. With the preliminary work done, it is time to be more inclusive of other stakeholders as Timber, Fish and Wildlife (TFW)’s strength is to bring together highly qualified people. She noted WFPA has encouraged its members to participate in LiDAR sharing and the LiDAR consortium, and is asking the Governor’s Office, DNR and the counties to work on a budget request to obtain funding for LiDAR.
TFW POLICY COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO UNSTABLE SLOPES

Adrian Miller, co-chair, reported on Forest Practices Application process review related to potential threats to public safety. This subgroup has been meeting separate from Policy Committee meetings. The Mass Wasting Effectiveness Study has been completed and documented on the flow chart, the required new FPA form is a great screening tool for landowners and agencies, and the gap analysis list is with the board manual group for discussion. Delineation of groundwater recharge areas and deliverability need to be addressed, and the Policy Committee needs to talk about the board manual and rules.

Isabelle Sahriken, DNR, reported on Identification of potential gaps in information about the location of deep-seated landslides and measures to close gaps. Referring to the screening tools list handout, she noted there are tools inaccessible by the public and LiDAR is lacking for State coverage. She recommended better access to photos and a single layer for glacial deep seated landslides.

Tom Laurie asked if the public has access to the data. Sahriken replied she would check and get back to the Board.

Dave Somers asked whether the public has access to maps and whether U.S. Geologic Society and Washington State Department of Transportation are part of the conversation. Sahriken replied maps are accessible through the Puget Sound LiDAR consortium. Miller added there are many pieces of LiDAR not part of the Puget Sound LiDAR Consortium and not easily found so, an aggregated location is needed.

Paula Swedeen asked whether there is DNR state coverage via tools other than LiDAR, and do landowners have their own sets of LiDAR. Sahriken replied DNR has broad coverage with many tools and landowners can purchase maps and photos from DNR.

Curt Veldhuisen, Skagit River Coop, reported on Evaluation of existing mitigation measures under current rule pertaining to ground water recharge areas associated with glacial deep-seated landslides. Powerpoint presentation. He said the glacial deep-seated landslide technical workgroup’s goal is looking back at watershed analysis prescriptions. Prescriptions were site specific, few addressed glacial deep-seated landslides, and all focused on controlling water input. Generally, prescriptions required no roads or harvests on active landslides and required road drainage diversions. The technical workgroup will review forest practices applications and geotechnical reports, and attempt to categorize the information by mitigation strategy, potential resource impacts, etc.

Paula Swedeen asked if these measures had been effective. Veldhuisen replied there was no documentation but effectiveness could be incorporated into the research strategies.

Tom Laurie said the Board’s motion reads “assess” which will need to be interpreted.

Dave Somers said how the tools were handled with the uncertainties would be helpful in understating the chosen mitigation.

Kirk Cook said understanding how deep-seated landslides and groundwater recharge areas are delineated is critical information.
Veldhuisen reported on review of the existing mass wasting research strategy, including potential threats to public safety and the glacial deep-seated landslide program. He said groundwater recharge areas are the up-gradient lands that contribute to subsurface water. Harvest linkage is very difficult to determine and requires a case by case evaluation. Many questions remain. The 2014 CMER research strategies are a follow-up to the 2007 UPSAG scoping project which included modeling and refinement of recharge areas and landslide classifications. The technical subgroup has developed critical questions and potential projects including literature review, deep-seated landslide mapping and classification, and the sensitivity of landslide classifications.

Bob Guenther asked how much is already being addressed in Class IV and Class III forest practices. Veldhuisen replied the value in the literature search is broader scientific certainty. Miller added the project is a multi-pronged approach to determine how to refine the current process with more certainty, and Class IV-special is a SEPA level assessment that looks at public safety.

PROGRESS ON ADDITIONAL UNSTABLE SLOPE ACTION TAKEN AT THE MAY 2014 MEETING

Marc Engel, DNR, reported on rule making to clarify DNR’s authority to require additional information needed to review, classify FPA’s where the presence of a potentially unstable slope may threaten public safety. Although not required, the rule making will include an economic analysis, an SBEIS, and a public meeting.

Court Stanley asked whether this could be an expedited rule making. Engel replied yes in that DNR will provide rule language for stakeholders to review rather than holding rule development meetings. The rule language will be available for review in November.

Marc Ratcliff, DNR, reported on development of board manual guidance, in consultation with qualified experts with expertise in groundwater recharge on glacial deep-seated landslides, to amend the guidance specific to the identification and delineation of groundwater recharge areas. He said DNR sought out groundwater recharge area expertise from state agencies, and experts in Oregon. Phase one work is reorganization and inclusion of guidance specific to the identification and delineation of groundwater recharge areas and glacial deep-seated landslides with three new sections: office and field review and risk analysis. Engel added phase two work will add the mechanisms for delivery and run-out, for which he will request reconvening qualified experts and put together guidance for the board manual team.

Dave Somers asked whether risk assessment comes out of the board manual. Ratcliff and Engel replied the risk is addressed by providing elements for user’s to consider and the forest practices geologists will go look at the work submitted.

Paula Swedeen asked whether there will be a requirement to describe the uncertainties in delineation. Ratcliff replied geotechnical reports will need to address the uncertainty factors for DNR to assess the report findings. Engel added the board manual experts group will provide the current methodologies employed in the field.

Aaron Everett said the question we will have to take up later when we’ve given more thought to the implications for the board manual. Engel replied draft manual phase one will be provided for the November Board meeting then an immediate step to phase two qualified experts work to address delivery potential.
Engel reported on Attorney General’s Moratorium Opinion. He said DNR has not received an answer to the Commissioner of Public Lands question to the state’s Attorney General regarding the Board’s authority to adopt a moratorium. The Office of the Attorney General says the opinion will be published in the state register with a comment due date.

Engel reported on Availability of Bare Earth Coverage Data from forest landowners and Puget Sound LiDAR Consortium. He said the quality of data varies, deep-seated landslides tend to show on all LiDAR, and shallow rapid landslides tend to show less or not at all depending on quality of the data.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Tom Nelson, Sierra Pacific Industry, supports funding for LiDAR and would be happy to share their LiDAR coverage with others. He strongly suggested searching the internet so this tool is not developed in a vacuum. He added the board manual sounds like a major rewrite which may be stepping over into rule.

IMPLEMENTATION OF DNR STEPS TO APPLY ADDITIONAL SCRUTINY OF UNSTABLE SLOPES APPLICATIONS
Chris Hanlon-Meyer, DNR, reported that the new forms are in use for classing forest practices applications regarding potentially unstable slopes and requiring qualified expert reports.

Jack Shambo, DNR, described the application review process. Screening tools include soils maps, SLPSTAB model (shallow rapid landslide potential), landslide hazard zonation maps, landslide inventories, topographic and geologic maps, aerial photos, and on site review. A key component is the forest practices forester and geologist teamwork and their familiarity with the areas.

Trevor Contreras, said the licensed geologists in forest practices are consultants to the forest practices foresters, both on site and in evaluating the geotechnical reports submitted with the application. On site visits are to evaluate the proposed activities in relation to any of the rule identified landforms.

Dave Somers asked if applications are still screened if the landowner answered “no” to the unstable slopes questions, and who makes the final determination on the application. Shambo responded yes, all screening tools are still applied, and the forest practices forester makes the final call. He mentioned that the forester will work with the landowner to provide additional information and the landowner can withdraw the FPA and re-submit with the new information or the forester can disapprove the application.

Paula Swedeen asked how new foresters are trained, whether the new form has resulted in any classification changes to an application, and how the qualified expert knows the delineation is accurate. Shambo replied new forest practice foresters are paired with their neighboring forester and may not approve Class IV-special applications on their own for about for six months, and classification changes based on further review have resulted in both higher and lower classifications. Contreras replied the qualified expert field verifies the delineation.

Tom Laurie asked about questions 11 and 12, and if that includes groundwater recharge areas. Hanlon-Meyer said the intent is that the form represents rule-identified landforms.
Seth Barnes, DNR, added that foresters are looking at the areas around the proposal, not just the proposal itself. He clarified an earlier question about the review changing the classification. Seth said the review has resulted in both, the review can result in changing the classification to make it a Class IV–Special or confirming the initial classing of a Class III.

Dave Somers asked if the risk level is useful. Contreras replied infrastructure and public safety are looked at as well as potential delivery to a public resource. Hanlon-Meyer added a rigorous review is applied to determine whether we have enough information.

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON FURTHER DIRECTION TO THE ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM, TFW POLICY COMMITTEE 2015 PRIORITIES AND BOARD STAFF**

Mary Scurlock, Conservation Caucus, commented the overall caucus goal is a precautionary approach. The caucus strongly supports an expedited board manual process with updates presented in November, is ready to participate in the stakeholder process, and concurs LiDAR is a top priority. Improving documentation of how DNR makes its determination would increase transparency and trust.

Karen Terwilleger, WFPA, commented there is an extensive process in place to identify and mitigate for unstable slopes. She said TFW is a collaborative process, WFPA is very concerned about whether process is done right, and she asked the Board to direct staff to release rule language and board manual drafts as soon as possible. The scope of the board manual is more than WFPA envisioned so it is critical stakeholders have time to review.

Kevin Godbout, Weyerhaeuser, commented the broad board manual effort seems beyond the Board’s direction. We need to see the amendments to be informed and provide feedback on changes. There needs to be a TFW conversation.

**FURTHER DIRECTION TO THE ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM, TFW POLICY COMMITTEE 2015 PRIORITIES AND BOARD STAFF**

Aaron Everett initiated time for the Board to discuss further action to Policy and Board staff. He encouraged staff to begin work on items discussed in the morning relating to mapping projects and literature review.

Court Stanley said if stakeholders have concerns on the board manual then separate that Board motion from the rest of the work on glacial deep-seated landslides.

Dave Somers said the materials should be released to the stakeholders.

Tom Laurie said he is interested in looking at the whole package, and the sooner the better.

Paula Swedeen thanked the qualified experts for their work. She said she wants to see the whole package.

Aaron Everett asked whether the glacial deep-seated landslide part of the board manual can be separated from the rest of the work if need be. Engel replied the board manual meetings were open to anyone who wanted to attend and listen and two caucuses did. DNR is attempting to do phase one in eight meetings on a very complicated subject. There is a true need to add other parts to the manual.
Bob Guenther said he would hate to see this come apart without a path forward to come to agreement.

Aaron Everett said the Board desires a complete board manual product at the November meeting with options for segregation identified in the product. Engel said a summary of caucus concerns would be attached. Everett so ordered it and said the Board will give further direction to Policy on uncertainties at the November meeting.

Aaron Everett asked the Board to consider the mapping verses literature review issue. He said the allocation is only $50 thousand dollars.

Brent Davies said the mapping project is very important for the Board and the public.

Tom Laurie said he is okay with the Adaptive Management Program Manager making the call.

Court Stanley said mapping will always be a work in progress.

Paula Swedeen asked why there would be a trade off in one verses the other.

Bernath said literature review is on the table as part of the board manual work however, it’s not possible given the board manual timeline so Policy Committee picked it up. He suggested Policy Committee bring a plan to the Board to identify gaps before doing mapping. The Chair so ordered without objection, stating the plan must be within the existing budget.

Bernath stated Policy Committee recognized the overlaps within the Board’s motions. Policy’s process plan is done except for evaluating DNR’s product within the existing scope of the Board’s motion.

Paula Swedeen said the Board needs to look for policy issues, especially the uncertainty issue, when reviewing the board manual. She clarified the Board’s motion does not cover the uncertainty issue. Uncertainties will exist. The level of uncertainty and how we will decrease it and eliminate the risk is what we are trying to get to.

Dave Somers said uncertainty falls outside the board manual. The question is what the management strategy is to decide what to do about the uncertainty. The management call needs to fit in like in watershed analysis. Bernath replied the high bar is set in SEPA rules and the goal is to not accelerate those processes via human causes.

Aaron Everett said that is not what we assigned at the May meeting. Without going through the steps, Policy Committee cannot make a recommendation on uncertainties. Bernath suggested we could ask in the board manual to provide information on their uncertainties.

Aaron Everett said if the steps being taken now do not address the uncertainties issue, the Board expects Policy to “take up these questions”.

Aaron Everett will update the Board at the November meeting on the status of DNR’s progress to obtain LiDAR including development of a budget request.
PUBLIC COMMENT ON PETITION FOR RULE MAKING TO IMPROVE PUBLIC
SAFETY NEAR UNSTABLE SLOPES
None.

PETITION FOR RULE MAKING ON UNSTABLE SLOPES
Marc Engel, DNR, reviewed the petition for rulemaking on unstable slopes with the Board.

Dave Herrera said it is premature to start rulemaking as the Board will hear new information at the
November meeting. Kirk Cook and Dave Somers agreed.

Court Stanley said great progress so far and rulemaking is premature. Tom Laurie, Bill Little, Bob
Guenther, Paula Swedeen, and Heather Ballash agreed.

MOTION: Heather Ballash moved the Forest Practices Board deny the petition for rule making

SECONDED: Kirk Cook

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

EXECUTIVE SESSION
None.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.