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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 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 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, Swedeen, Stohr, Herrera) / 6 Oppose (Bernath, Smith, 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.