

1 **FOREST PRACTICES BOARD**
2 **Regular Board Meeting – August 14, 2019**
3 Natural Resources Building, Room 172, Olympia, WA
4
5

6 Meeting materials and subject presentations are available on Forest Practices Board’s website.
7 <https://www.dnr.wa.gov/about/boards-and-councils/forest-practices-board>
8

9 **Members Present**

10 Stephen Bernath, Chair, Department of Natural Resources
11 Ben Serr, Designee for Director, Department of Commerce
12 Bob Guenther, General Public Member/Small Forest Landowner
13 Brent Davies, General Public Member
14 Carmen Smith, General Public Member/Independent Logging Contractor
15 Dave Herrera, General Public Member
16 Jeff Davis, Designee for Director, Department of Fish and Wildlife
17 Maia Bellon/Rich Doenges, Department of Ecology
18 Noel Willet, Timber Products Union Representative
19 Patrick Capper, Designee for Director, Department of Agriculture
20 Paula Swedeen, General Public Member
21 Tom Nelson, General Public Member
22

23 **Staff**

24 Joe Shramek, Forest Practices Division Manager
25 Marc Engel, Forest Practices Assistant Division Manager
26 Patricia Anderson, Rules Coordinator
27 Phil Ferester, Senior Counsel
28

29 **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

30 Chair Bernath called the Forest Practices Board (Board) meeting to order at 9 a.m. Introductions of
31 Board members and staff were made.
32

33 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

34 **MOTION:** Noel Willet moved the Forest Practices Board approve the May 8-9 and June 4, 2019
35 meeting minutes.
36

37 **SECONDED:** Bob Guenther
38

39 Board Discussion:
40 None.
41

42 **ACTION:** Motion passed (11 Support / 1 Abstention (Bellon))
43

44 **TFW RECOMMITMENT UPDATE**

45 Chair Bernath said that Francine Madden, Center for Conservation Peacebuilding, was hired to
46 facilitate and assist in a collaboration building workshop with leadership from the Timber, Fish and
47 Wildlife (TFW) Policy caucuses. The workshop occurred June 12-17, 2019, and was the beginning

1 of a process for the TFW community to learn how to effectively deal with conflict, re-build
2 relationships and to ultimately recommit to the TFW collaborative model.

3
4 The following reflections were shared by some of the participants. Ray Entz, Kalispel Tribe; Elaine
5 Oneil, Washington Farm Forestry Association, (WFFA); Kevin Godbout, Weyerhaeuser; Lisa
6 Remlinger, Washington Environmental Council; Paul Jewel, Washington State Association of
7 Counties; and Jim Peters, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission (NWIFC):

- 8 • Appreciation for the visionary approach for renewed collaboration;
- 9 • Appreciation for the encouragement to help solve other's problems;
- 10 • Recognition of the tendency to revert to old patterns if significant efforts are not being made to
11 participate in a more collaborative manner;
- 12 • No improvements have been seen and not much progress has been made since the meeting;
- 13 • A need to support the effort and the leadership to recommit to a more collaborative approach;
- 14 • Acknowledged the workshop as an educational opportunity;
- 15 • Impressed with the engagement of all attendees;
- 16 • Acknowledgment that cultural change takes time;
- 17 • Learned some new techniques to resolve problems; and
- 18 • The workshop highlighted the need to hold a true TFW principals meeting – not all principals
19 were present at the workshop.

20
21 Board Member Bellon said she learned a lot about the TFW process and appreciates the
22 perspectives of everyone in attendance. She said she fully supports the recommitment effort.

23
24 Board Member Herrera said he appreciated getting to know those in attendance better.

25
26 Board Member Swedeen said she believes a good foundation was set and that more time and work
27 still needs to be accomplished to get to a place that works for everyone.

28
29 Board Member Davis said he agrees with everyone's comments and is hopeful that change will
30 come about in a more respectful and collaborative manner.

31
32 Chair Bernath thanked Commissioner Franz for making the workshop happen. He also shared the
33 commitment to focus on collaboration moving forward and to continue working with Francine
34 Madden.

35 **REPORT FROM CHAIR**

36
37 Chair Bernath reported on the following:

- 38 • Introduced Mark Hicks as the new Adaptive Management Program Administrator;
- 39 • Announced that DNR will be contacting caucus leads to discuss possible proposed agency
40 legislation and to problem solve several issues with the state budget;
- 41 • Informed that the tribal cultural resources facilitation effort was completed in July 2019. As a
42 result, DNR has committed to implement three initiatives: (1) change the forest practices
43 application, specifically around how cultural resources are addressed by landowners who
44 contact tribes before submittal of applications; (2) coordinate regional tribal cultural resources
45 trainings; and (3) facilitate several application pilot projects with willing tribes and landowners
46 for identification and protection of cultural resources;

- 1 • Announced that DNR’s Lenny Young will lead the efforts to complete a programmatic Safe
- 2 Harbor Agreement for the northern spotted owl;
- 3 • Outlined the workgroup’s efforts (establishing through Senate Bill 5597) to address concerns
- 4 regarding the aerial application of herbicides;
- 5 • Announced that DNR has contracted with the internal auditor of the Department of Revenue to
- 6 complete a financial audit of the contracts for the Adaptive Management Program (AMP); and
- 7 • Announced that the State Auditor’s office will be starting an AMP performance audit.

8
9 Chair Bernath thanked Tom Laurie and Lisa Janicki for their service on the Board. Tom has been on
10 the Board for 18 years and Lisa for 3 years.

11
12 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

13 Vic Musselman, WFFA, said WFFA supports the work of the Board committee, but noted more
14 work needed by the committee and it should not be rushed. He said the identification of PHBs and
15 an anadromous fish floor should be done accurately in order to have an accurate cost/benefit
16 analysis.

17
18 Ken Miller, WFFA, provided WFFA’s table showing the relative effectiveness of their western
19 Washington Small Forest Landowner Alternate Plan Template proposal compared to the forest
20 practices rules. He also shared a table showing a comparison of riparian functions from each of the
21 proposal prescriptions. He said that he believes the TFW Policy Committee (Policy) workgroup is
22 making significant progress but additional work is needed. He anticipates Policy can provide
23 recommendations to the Board by August 2020.

24
25 Ray Entz, Kalispel Tribe, encouraged the Board to provide leadership for maintaining an
26 independent science focused Adaptive Management Program Administrator (AMPA). He asked the
27 Board to evaluate how the AMPA is positioned within DNR to increase independence. He
28 encouraged the Board to ensure that the review of the AMP is consistent with TFW agreements. He
29 asked the Board to fund the potential habitat break (PHB) validation study and the default physical
30 stream characteristics study.

31
32 Jim Peters, NWIFC, encouraged everyone to work together to help maintain the tribal way of life by
33 ensuring fish availability and protection of natural resources in general. He informed the Board of
34 an opportunity to testify at an upcoming hearing regarding the clean water standards and
35 encouraged Board members to attend on September 25, 2019.

36
37 **SMALL FOREST LANDOWNER DEMOGRAPHIC AND FOREST PRACTICES DATA**
38 **PRESENTATION**

39 Tami Miketa and Marc Engel, DNR provided a presentation on the demographics of Washington’s
40 small forest landowners (SFL), a general understanding of their harvest preferences, legislative
41 actions pertaining to SFLs and SFL Program accomplishments.

42
43 There are approximately 178,400 SFLs in Washington (owning two acres of forest land or greater),
44 with about 72% of the total occurring in western Washington. Miketa said the best information on
45 how and why they manage their land comes from the USDA Forest Service’s National Woodland
46 Owners Survey. A 2013 survey showed that 92% of the landowners owned their land for other
47 reasons besides timber production. A similar survey by the Washington State University Extension

1 Forestry Program found that SFLs rated ownership for privacy, aesthetics, a place of residence and
2 wildlife habitat quite high, whereas owning land for timber management scored low.

3
4 Engel said that the legislature passed several statutes to address the economic effects of the rules.
5 These statutes established the Small Forest Landowner Office as a resource for landowners and
6 established an advisory committee to assist the office in developing policy and recommendations
7 for rules or guidance. He said the Board has adopted rules for long-term applications, alternate plan
8 options and approved guidance for conducting alternate plans.

9
10 Engel said the legislature passed, and the Board adopted, the 20-acre exempt riparian buffer rule in
11 recognition of potential disproportionate impact to SFLs owning 20 acre parcels. This rule provides
12 narrower riparian buffers for small forest landowners who own 80 acres or less of forestland, and
13 are harvesting timber on parcels 20 acres or less in size. Roughly 70% of SFLs are eligible to use
14 the 20-acre exempt rule.

15
16 Miketa said DNR recently conducted an analysis to better understand SFL harvest choices.
17 She said from 9,211 SFL FPAs approved between 2010 and 2015, a total of 533 landowners opted
18 for an alternate plan. The majority of those plans utilized one of the two templates described in
19 Board Manual Section 21, with the fixed width buffer template being applied 56% of the time.
20 Regular, non-template alternate plans were used approximately 27% of the time. This equates to
21 about 6% of the total SFL FPAs (9,211) contained alternate plans.

22
23 Miketa summarized the fiscal year 2017-2019 program accomplishments. For this biennium, the
24 Forestry Riparian Easement Program purchased 34 conservation easements (231 acres) and since its
25 inception, approximately 6,100 acres have been covered. The Family Forest Fish Passage Program
26 eliminated 29 fish passage barriers (60 miles of stream habitat) and since its inception, the program
27 has eliminated 397 barriers and opened up approximately 934 miles of habitat.

28 29 **TFW POLICY COMMITTEE RESPONSE TO THE BOARD'S JUNE MOTION**

30 Terra Rentz and Curt Veldhuisen, Policy co-chairs, reported on Policy's response to the Board's
31 June meeting motion. Rentz reminded the Board that they had asked Policy to provide
32 recommendations as to whether an anadromous fish floor (AFF) and rule language for water
33 crossing structures should be included in the water typing rule. The Board requested Policy make a
34 formal yes or no vote and report back as soon as possible on each item.

35
36 Rentz said Policy, at their July meeting, recognized that each of the three proposed PHB options
37 included an AFF element and as a result, voted to recommend the Board committee consider an
38 anadromous floor as a component for the water typing rule.

39
40 Rentz said Policy felt the existing rule provides adequate water crossing management provisions.
41 As a result, Policy voted to not include new language regarding water crossing structures. Policy
42 recommends that an evaluation of potentially affected water crossing structures be considered in the
43 future, but is not a priority at this time.

44
45 Rentz said the votes taken by Policy closes the loop for the adaptive management process. She said
46 Policy felt some discomfort with the Board's request. Policy did not consider the requested review
47 as a proposal initiation and as such did not form a workgroup to prepare formal recommendations.
48 She said Policy simply adhered to the Board's request to vote on whether an AFF or language for

1 water crossing structures should be included in rule. She added that Policy did not evaluate the legal
2 bounds of this question.

3
4 Chair Bernath acknowledged that an AFF was already part of the draft water typing rule and that the
5 recommendation confirms an AFF should be considered for inclusion in the rule. He acknowledged
6 that Policy's task was to make a recommendation to the Board committee.

7
8 Board member Guenther agreed that the Board committee can discuss this further and said he is
9 clear on the recommendations from Policy.

10 11 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

12 Darin Cramer, Washington Forest Protection Association (WFPA), said their caucus believes the
13 AFF and water crossing rule concepts have not gone through a formal adaptive management
14 process. He said considerable amount of technical and policy work is needed on both the PHB
15 options and the AFF in order to move either forward. He said all three criteria contained in the
16 PHBs need to be fully analyzed and excluding one criteria is improper and may prove to be an
17 inaccurate analysis. He said he is unaware if a detailed discussion has occurred on what the rule is
18 attempting to achieve and encouraged the Board to have this discussion.

19
20 Steve Barnowe-Meyer, WFFA, shared his experience at the TFW collaboration building workshop
21 and reminded those involved to focus on the interim steps for success: caucus members should talk
22 with, not at each other; commitment of leadership is needed from all caucuses; commitment to
23 shared problem solving; develop short and long term goals; and focus on relationship building
24 within the AMP. He implored the Board to encourage all who attended the workshop to take these
25 steps seriously and find opportunities for collective wins that solve shared problems.

26 27 **CMER MEMBERSHIP**

28 Mark Hicks, AMPA, presented Patrick Lizon as Department of Ecology's Cooperative Monitoring,
29 Evaluation, and Research Committee (CMER) nominee. Hicks briefly shared Lizon's current role in
30 Clean Water Act Section 303(d) and nonpoint pollution programs at Ecology and highlighted his
31 past accomplishment in implementing clean water policies at other natural resource agencies.

32 33 **PUBLIC COMMENT ON CMER MEMBERSHIP**

34 None.

35 36 **CMER MEMBERSHIP**

37 **MOTION:** Maia Bellon moved the Forest Practices Board accept Department of Ecology's
38 nominee, Patrick Lizon as a voting member of CMER.

39
40 **SECONDED:** Jeff Davis

41
42 Board Discussion:

43 None.

44
45 **ACTION:** Motion passed unanimously.
46
47

1 **WATER TYPING SYSTEM BOARD COMMITTEE STATUS REPORT**

2 Bob Guenther, committee chair, described the topics presented and points discussed during the four
3 committee meetings held in July. Presentations to help clarify the width PHB in option C and the
4 AFF criteria and analysis were given by DNR staff, the industrial forest landowners, with support
5 from small forest landowners, counties, and the western Washington tribes.
6

7 The committee discussed various options specific to width-based PHBs including: whether and how
8 tributaries function as habitat breaks; the science team’s recommendations regarding tributary
9 streams as reported in the PHB report; the accuracy of the various width-based PHBs; the need to
10 amend the current draft rule language for PHB option C; and options for removing width-based
11 PHBs from the proposals or amending the PHBs altogether.
12

13 The committee also discussed the western Washington tribal and landowner’s AFF proposals, both
14 the current work being conducted and proposed analysis strategies. In regards to the tribal proposal,
15 the committee recommended that the western Washington tribes continue to facilitate the AFF
16 technical workgroup discussions to develop a charter and to present it to the Board committee.
17

18 Board member Swedeen acknowledged that the committee gained clarification regarding the
19 landowner’s PHB proposal, but said that some committee members are struggling with how to
20 address tributary streams given the recommendations in the science team’s PHB report pertaining to
21 width-based PHBs and tributaries. She recognizes that dropping the width-based PHB from the
22 current proposals might influence the accuracy of the spatial analyses.
23

24 Board member Nelson said that the committee and the Board are struggling with a path forward
25 because not only were the objectives of the rule unclear, the objectives for the PHB options and the
26 AFF options are different. He felt that the Board should remand the development of the water
27 typing rule back to the AMP in order for technical folks to arrive at the best possible outcome. He
28 said the Board should secure funding to hire contractors to help provide additional clarification.
29

30 Board member Davis expressed concerns about giving it back to a fish habitat technical group. He
31 said the committee is struggling with analyzing the three PHB options systematically. He said that
32 he hoped folks could overcome their defensiveness about specific proposals.
33

34 Board member Herrera acknowledged that despite issue complexity, other elements from the
35 Board’s June 4 motion were being completed by the committee. He said that the AFF contains a
36 stream gradient, not necessarily a floor, but arrives at the place below which one would not apply
37 electrofishing. The AFF addresses the objective of reducing electrofishing as recommended in the
38 Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan. He said the tribe’s analysis used the results from a
39 watershed to assess a gradient for the AFF and invited other technical folks to collaborate and
40 further refine that work.
41

42 Board member Swedeen said that she believed most Board members agree on the major goals of
43 this rule, specifically delineating Type F waters based on fish habitat and minimizing the use of
44 electrofishing. She expressed hope that the Board could move forward with a rule and to fine-tune
45 the PHB criteria through the completion of a validation study.
46
47

1 Chair Bernath summarized his understanding of the discussion:

- 2 • The Board supports continuation of the Board committee;
- 3 • Acknowledgement that the fish habitat assessment method seeks to reduce electrofishing;
- 4 • The Board supports DNR staff to look for options to secure funding to contract with the science
- 5 team in order for them to provide clarification on the recommendations in their PHB report; and
- 6 • The Board envisions that the AFF workgroup will be accountable to the committee

7
8 Board member Davies suggested that one way to avoid confusion is for the Board to emphasize
9 using the default physical stream criteria in the rule instead of using the three PHB proposals.

10
11 Board member Swedeen suggested that the committee have the authors of the PHB report and Brian
12 Fransen collectively provide clarification about how and whether they intended tributary stream
13 junctions to function as potential fish habitat breaks.

14
15 Chair Bernath expanded his understanding of the discussion:

- 16 • The Board requests the AFF workgroup finalize its charter and present it to the Board
- 17 committee; and
- 18 • The Board supports having the science team provide clarity to the Board committee regarding
- 19 how tributary junctions should be addressed.

20
21 Chair Bernath clarified that Policy’s recommendation is to consider inclusion of an AFF in the
22 water typing rule and not include rule language for water crossing structures at this time. The Board
23 agreed that formal action was not needed.

24 25 **WATER TYPING SYSTEM RULE MATERIALS STAFF STATUS REPORT**

26 Marc Engel, DNR, said staff was continuing to develop the guidance for the water typing system
27 rule and envisioned that it may take up to four months to complete a draft of Board Manual Section
28 23. He acknowledged that the Board committee would continue facilitating discussions with
29 stakeholders on outstanding rule concerns.

30
31 Engel said DNR continued to work with the economic advisory workgroup to discuss the elements
32 and the methods used in the draft cost benefit analysis (CBA). In addition, a meeting will be
33 scheduled with Industrial Economics, Incorporated (IEc) to address how the preliminary CBA
34 calculated the expected change in fish populations for each PHB option. He said that additional
35 work was needed by the economic advisory committee to determine how the qualitative analysis
36 would be completed. He added that IEc may need to recalculate the benefits to fish and will need to
37 calculate qualitative values to incorporate into the CBA.

38
39 Engel said the primary goals of the rule are to fulfill the four goals identified in the Forests and Fish
40 Report. He said that any significant rule making by the Board must include the goals and objectives
41 of the new rule. He stated that stakeholder requests at past Board meetings and the recent
42 discussions at the Board committee meetings show a need for staff to articulate the goals and
43 objectives for the rulemaking. He presented a draft goals and objectives statement for the Board to
44 consider:

1 *This rulemaking was initiated through the Adaptive Management Program in January, 2013 when*
2 *the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, NOAA-Fisheries Service, the Washington Department of Fish*
3 *and Wildlife, and the Conservation Caucus raised concerns about continuing the electrofishing*
4 *practices under the interim water typing system.*

5
6 *This rulemaking seeks to better address the Forests and Fish Report foundational goal to protect*
7 *accessible fish habitat. Additionally, the rulemaking aims to develop a field applied method of*
8 *reliably identifying accessible fish habitat in an objective and repeatable manner. By maintaining*
9 *all essential elements of the methodology in rule, this rulemaking will also convert any key long-*
10 *standing Board guidance into rules where appropriate. See, RCW 34.05.230(1)*

11
12 *A sound water typing system ensures that riparian buffers are properly placed at each stream,*
13 *protecting aquatic resources and their respective habitats. These goals support the statutory*
14 *objectives endorsed in the Forests and Fish Report and Forest Practices Habitat Conservation*
15 *Plan.*

16
17 Chair Bernath said the draft goals and objectives is being shared so that the general public and the
18 Board can see how DNR is likely to frame the concise explanatory statement.

19
20 Board member Nelson expressed concern with the term ‘accessible’ in the presented goals and
21 objectives.

22
23 Board member Guenther said the committee can include a discussion about the goals and objectives
24 at their next meeting.

25
26 Board member Swedeen asked what the timeline for filing the rule proposal (CR-102) might be if
27 the GIS spatial analysis associated with the CBA needed to be redone.

28
29 Engel replied that a contract would first need to be initiated if the Board chose to re-analyze the
30 three rule proposals. He said that late November 2019 would be a probable starting point for re-
31 drafting the economic and environmental analyses.

32
33 **ADJUSTED ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM BUDGET AND CMER WORK**
34 **PLAN**

35 Mark Hicks, AMPA, Curt Veldhuisen and Terra Rentz, Policy co-chairs, presented the adjusted
36 AMP budget. Hicks said that Policy had made several changes to the budget per the Board’s request
37 and found available money to allocate into the water typing line items.

38
39 Rentz reminded the Board that they had asked Policy to consider four changes: (1) update revenue
40 to reflect the final legislative budget; (2) correct the estimate for the DNR indirect costs for the
41 Forests and Fish Support Account; (3) create a new line item of \$150,000 for the AMP workshops
42 facilitated by the Center for Conservation Peacebuilding; and (4) move any remaining funds into the
43 Board’s water typing rule strategy funding line item. She said that further adjustments would be
44 made later when the job classification for the new administrative assistant was determined.

45
46 Hicks said that the position description for the eastside CMER scientist was almost finalized. The
47 next step would be to secure an office space for the position in Spokane.

1 Rentz said the funding (\$35,000) for the deep-seated landslide research project was moved from this
2 biennium to the first of the next biennium. She said that the contingency fund was tapped to move
3 funds into the water typing strategy which resulted in an increase from \$40,000 to \$68,000 for the
4 first year of the biennium and an increase from \$450,000 to \$552,000 for the second year of the
5 biennium. This was done to ensure funds would be available for the first two years should the Board
6 need additional funding to complete water typing rule projects.

7
8 Board member Swedeen suggested that the Board find a way to fund an adequate validation study.

9
10 Rentz encouraged the Board to review the CMER work plan and Master Project Schedule to help
11 clarify and provide feedback to Policy. She said that Policy was aware that project priorities often
12 change and the sooner the Board could determine their plans for water typing, the sooner Policy
13 could make decisions about how to best use the remaining contingency fund.

14
15 Hicks said that the ‘use it or lose it’ concept creates problems for budgetary planning. He added that
16 this was particularly true of projects agreed to at the end of the biennium to use excess funds before
17 they are moved into the fund balance. He said that by the time a decision is made to allocate such
18 funds, there is high risk of not completing projects as planned. This results in projects commonly
19 needing to be finished in the following biennium requiring additional money to be allocated from
20 the next year’s funds. He said this happened with last year’s surplus fund projects and resulted in
21 reducing this year’s contingency balance to approximately \$9,000.

22
23 Hicks said that accurate budgets with realistic time frames are needed to avoid large under-
24 expenditures at the end of a biennium. He urged the Board to use discretion when considering
25 decisions to allocate funding in the near-term spending plan for studies that have not been scoped.

26
27 Board member Bellon suggested for easier tracking that Policy consider providing a budget with
28 two columns showing the prior and new budget values to more clearly show where important
29 adjustments were made.

30
31 Rentz confirmed that the revised budget is a consensus budget and requested that the Board accept
32 the revised budget as presented. She also mentioned that all Clean Water Act assurances projects
33 are included in the Master Project Schedule.

34
35 **PUBLIC COMMENT ON ADJUSTED ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM BUDGET**
36 **AND CMER WORK PLAN**

37 None.

38
39 **ADJUSTED ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM BUDGET AND CMER WORK**
40 **PLAN**

41 **MOTION:** Patrick Capper moved the Forest Practices Board approve the adjusted biennial
42 2019-2021 Adaptive Management Program budget.

43
44 **SECONDED:** Tom Nelson

45
46 Board Discussion:

47 None.

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

3 **TFW POLICY COMMITTEE UPDATE OF TYPE NP WORKGROUP**

4 Curt Veldhuisen and Terra Rentz, Policy co-chairs, provided an update on the Type Np workgroup.
5 Veldhuisen said that the workgroup effort was a result of the Type N Experimental Buffer
6 Treatment Project in Hard Rock Lithologies (hard rock study). He said that Policy had approved a
7 charter to address not only the hard rock study, but also additional Type Np studies that would be
8 forth coming.

9
10 Veldhuisen said that the main objective of the charter is to have a technical workgroup develop and
11 recommend potential Np riparian management zone prescriptions. Policy envisioned that the
12 workgroup would be comprised of folks with stream morphology, biology, silvicultural and forestry
13 experience. He said the AMPA would be reaching out to the workgroup to clarify expectations and
14 ensure that they will be committed to the process.

15
16 Board member Bellon mentioned that the Clean Water Act assurances expire at the end of 2019.
17 She said the Department of Ecology may consider a short term extension of the assurances given
18 the charter's important work and anticipated schedule. She asked Curt if Ecology can rely on the
19 timelines within the charter.

20
21 Veldhuisen said that he believed the timelines within the charter are realistic, but emphasized that
22 they are not in control of the final delivery dates for when the other Type N studies would be
23 coming to Policy and subsequently to the technical team. Reviewing and acting on the other studies
24 might require adjustments to the overall timeline. He said they are committed to keeping the Board
25 up to date on the progress.

26
27 **TFW POLICY COMMITTEE PRIORITIES FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2020**

28 Curt Veldhuisen and Terra Rentz, Policy co-chairs, updated the Board on Policy's priorities for
29 2020. Veldhuisen said that the highest priorities would be the Type N studies. Other priorities
30 include the master project schedule, annual budgeting, staffing, small forest landowner westside
31 riparian template, a potential audit, hardwood conversion study and the bull trout overlay study. He
32 anticipates a very busy year and said that Policy must work very efficiently and be very careful
33 about taking on new things.

34
35 Rentz reminded the Board of the review period for accepting, reviewing and approving studies. She
36 noted the relatively small group of people involved in all the work done by Policy.

37
38 Board member Swedeen expressed concern about completing the PHB validation study in light of
39 all the other work.

40
41 Rentz agreed that Policy and various workgroup members are stretched thin. She said they have
42 built in necessary safe guards when establishing timelines to address all the work.

43
44 Chair Bernath acknowledge that as the new AMPA gets up to speed, he will be able to assess the
45 status of these studies and recommend refinements as needed.

1 **WESTERN GRAY SQUIRREL ANNUAL REPORT**

2 Gary Bell, WDFW, and Teresa-Ann Ciapusci, DNR, provided a status report about the state-
3 threatened western grey squirrel. The update included the current voluntary protection process that
4 takes places between WDFW and forest landowners and a description of the current threats to the
5 squirrel. Bell noted that there were 112 FPAs with a possible nexus to the squirrel in 2018, and that
6 nearly all were in Klickitat County. WDFW’s periodic status review for the western grey squirrel is
7 due in 2021.

8
9 Board member Willet asked about the lack of information on any changes to the squirrel population.

10
11 Bell replied that it is an ongoing challenge for WDFW to determine population changes because
12 there is no dedicated funding for research for the 183 species on the periodic status review list.

13
14 Board member Swedeen asked what it would take to know if current management actions are
15 making positive steps for the squirrel.

16
17 Bell said a dedicated full time position could perform pre-harvest, post-harvest and habitat
18 restoration work to assess how the current process is working.

19
20 Board member Davis asked what it would take to incentivize landowners to grow squirrel habitat.

21
22 Bell said WDFW is looking into ways to obtain monies for effectiveness and compliance
23 monitoring, small forest landowner incentives and large landowner conservation opportunities.

24
25 **STAFF REPORTS**

26 There were no questions on the following reports.

- 27 • Adaptive Management Quarterly Report
28 • Compliance Monitoring
29 • Small Forest Landowner Office Update
30 • Upland Wildlife Update

31
32 **2019 WORK PLAN**

33 Marc Engel, DNR, presented changes to the work plan since the May meeting. Adjustments were
34 also made as a result of today’s meeting.

35
36 **MOTION:** Patrick Capper moved the Forest Practices Board approve the work plan as amended.

37
38 **SECONDED:** Carmen Smith

39
40 Board Discussion:

41 None.

42
43 **ACTION:** Motion passed unanimously (Davies absent for vote)

44
45 **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

46 None.

47
48 Meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.