

1 **FOREST PRACTICES BOARD**

2 **MEETING MINUTES**

3 February 13, 2008

4 Office Building 2, Auditorium

5 Olympia, Washington

6
7 **Members Present:**

8 Vicki Christiansen, Chair Designee of the Board

9 Ann Wick, Designee for Director, Department of Agriculture

10 Bob Kelly, General Public Member

11 Brent Bahrenburg, Designee for Director, Community, Trade and Economic Development

12 Bridget Moran, Designee for Director, Department of Fish and Wildlife

13 Carolyn Dobbs, General Public Member

14 David Hagiwara, General Public Member

15 Doug Stinson, General Public Member/Small Forest Landowner

16 Norm Schaaf, General Public Member

17 Sherry Fox, General Public Member/Independent Logging Contractor

18 Tom Laurie, Designee for Director, Department of Ecology

19 Dave Somers, Snohomish County Commissioner

20 **Staff:**

21 Chuck Turley, Forest Practices Assistant Division Manager

22 Danielle Sayers, Board Support

23 Lenny Young, Forest Practices Division Manager

24 Neil Wise, Assistant Attorney General

25 Patricia Anderson, Rules Coordinator

26
27 **WELCOME**

28 Vicki Christiansen called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

29
30 **INTRODUCTIONS**

31 Danielle Sayers, Department of Natural Resources (DNR), provided an emergency safety briefing.

32
33 Christiansen announced that Commissioner Doug Sutherland would give an introduction to the
34 meeting.

35
36 **OPENING REMARKS, PURPOSE OF THE MEETING**

37 Doug Sutherland, Commissioner of Public Lands, thanked the Forest Practices Board (FPB or
38 Board) for being flexible regarding the meeting agenda. He expressed the importance of the Board
39 looking at the data from the extraordinary 500-year storm event that took place in December. He
40 explained the objective of the day's presentations is to determine whether the storm was an anomaly
41 or an event that should be planned for, and to make necessary recommendations on steps to be
42 taken. He asked the Board to request that CMER study and analyze what was unusual about the
43 storm, the chances of this type of event occurring in the future, the impacts of the storm to public
44 resources, and if current forest practices are adequate.

45
46 Christiansen thanked the Commissioner and provided a quick overview of the day's agenda. She
47 said she agreed it is imperative that the Board be responsive and deliberate as they consider the
48 effects of the storm and any future actions.

1 **DESCRIPTION OF THE STORM**

2 Greg Sinnett, DNR, provided a Power Point presentation to show the meteorological events that
3 produced the storm. He compared it to storms such as Hurricane Katrina and explained that the
4 December storm offered nearly every winter season hazard: Snow, strong winds, heavy rainfall,
5 major flooding, landslides, avalanches, high coastal surf, and coastal flooding.
6

7 **OVERVIEW OF THE STORM'S AFFECTS**

8 Eric Schroff, DNR, provided a Power Point presentation showing storm impacts in the Pacific
9 Cascade Region. Heavy precipitation and high winds caused a significant amount of damage to
10 approximately 19,000 acres of forest land impacting creeks, roads and farming communities. He
11 explained the Region's assessment process for developing rehabilitation solutions.
12

13 Christiansen added there is a geological survey being performed by the DNR Geology and Earth
14 Resources Division. She asked Dave Norman to give a brief overview of what the inventory has
15 shown.
16

17 **POST-STORM RECONNAISSANCE**

18 Dave Norman, DNR, provided a Power Point presentation. He explained that as soon as possible
19 after an event such as the December storm the Division gathers landslide information and data. He
20 said most of the landslides occurred in the areas of highest rainfall such as Stillman Creek and the
21 Chehalis Basin. One thousand landslides were mapped primarily from a fixed-wing aircraft with
22 some on ground verification. Most of the slides were free-flow and translational, occurring on a
23 slide plane of impenetrable bedrock.
24

25 Dave Somers commented that the presentation listed slide statistics using an upper end tree age
26 class of 15-50 which is an unusually wide range of ages. He asked if there is a finer range of data in
27 terms of breaking out landslides by stand age. Norman answered there is data available to show
28 slides by narrower age classes, but this was an observational inventory done primarily from a fixed-
29 wing aircraft.
30

31 Somers asked if they looked at possible associations between slides and roads and other factors.
32

33 Norman answered that to some extent roads are slide initiation points, but slides were also observed
34 initiating at mid-slope with no roads present. Norman felt that slides occurred when the amount of
35 water coming into the system was sufficient to lubricate the slide plane.
36

37 Dave Hagiwara asked if there is a state map showing the GIS inventory of underlying rock
38 including impervious rock such as basalt that may promote slides.
39

40 Norman replied yes, there is a statewide 1:100,000 digital statewide map; it and others can be found
41 at the DNR Geology and Earth Resources Division website.
42

43 Sherry Fox asked how many more landslides the Division plans to study from the December storm.
44 Norman answered probably not many more, due to budget issues and other priority projects that are
45 due.
46

47 Chuck Turley, DNR, added there will be some additional inventory through the forest health group
48 within Resource Protection Division. They are going to perform a grid flight of the coast to about
49 20 miles inland where most of the wind damage occurred. While they are collecting wind damage

1 information they will also touch bases with the Geology Division to gather additional information
2 about slides that have occurred.

3
4 Norm Schaaf asked Schroff what he expected will happen in the next year or two in the storm
5 damaged areas, with respect to forest health and fire danger.

6
7 Schroff replied that the 19,000 acres of forest land damaged by wind is not contiguous; it is
8 scattered across the landscape and broken up by standing timber. It is an extensive area with lots of
9 wood on the ground, and it also happens to be one of the worst markets for timber in years. But
10 there is every indication that the landowners who are affected are moving forward to salvage the
11 fallen timber as quickly as possible, with a vast majority expected to be done within the next 12 to
12 16 months. Within the forest that blew down there will be deterioration, concerns of insect
13 infestations, and concerns about fire. The salvage of storm damaged timber will probably be 15 to
14 20 percent of the volume that is normally harvested in western Washington on a given year. DNR
15 will be very diligent in enforcing fire shut downs and fire tool inspections this summer.

16
17 Carolyn Dobbs asked Norman if there will be an opportunity or data sets available to look at a
18 comparison between managed lands and more protected lands such as national parks.

19
20 Norman answered yes, everything that is being done is in a GIS database that can be looked at and
21 compared to anything else desired.

22 23 **STRUCTURE OF THE STATE'S STORM RESPONSE AND RECOVERY EFFORTS**

24 John Mankowski, Office of the Governor, spoke about the task group that Governor Gregoire
25 created shortly after the December storm. The intention of this group is to coordinate various
26 branches of local governments and others to provide relief to those affected by the floods, and to
27 work on recovery and prevention. The recovery task group meets once a week. It is chaired by the
28 Chief of Staff, Cindy Zender, and is attended by all the agency directors, the Departments of
29 Military, and others. The members report on accomplishments made and future needs regarding
30 recovery. The task force reports, develops, and coordinates work in four areas: Human services,
31 repairing public systems, financial recovery, and natural resources. The highest priority for the
32 natural resource group is to remove woody debris from agricultural fields to be ready for the
33 upcoming planting season. The main focuses are worker safety, sediment and animal carcass
34 removal, and disposal of household goods.

35 36 **LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES TO DATE**

37 Commissioner Doug Sutherland said DNR has done a lot of storm-related work with very little
38 legislative direction. He said agencies are determining what areas need to be clarified in the
39 declaration of emergency, especially the responsibilities of the agency and how to minimize
40 response times. He explained that the Director of the Department of Agriculture asked him for help
41 in removing the huge amounts of woody debris from the fields so crops could be planted in the
42 Spring. With no real direction on authority, DNR created a plan to accomplish this work.

43
44 The Commissioner stated there will probably be reimbursement funding coming out of the
45 supplemental budget request of the 2009-2011 biennium, much like how the fire budget is done.
46 Most of the Legislature agrees to forget about the details and get to work, so DNR has been
47 proceeding on that.

1 **QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION**

2 Christiansen asked Mankowski how he sees other policy questions on the greater watershed
3 regarding information gathering or science, and how it relates to the Board's responsibility.
4

5 Mankowski replied that it is the primary role of the Board to look at the forest practice issues, but
6 since many of the issues are linked together it is best for the Board to be educated and cooperative.
7

8 Moran asked if there were any immediate studies done after the flood that could help coordinate
9 with other agency studies.
10

11 Mankowski replied that he would find out and answer at a later date.
12

13 Ann Wick asked if the Governor's Office has taken into consideration the watershed funding
14 activity groups that have been set up.
15

16 Mankowski answered that the Chehalis Basin task group has a key role in the current Senate
17 legislation.
18

19 **OUTREACH AND LANDOWNER ASSISTANCE**

20 Sue Trettevik, DNR, gave a Power Point presentation regarding the main actions being taken to
21 provide outreach, landowner assistance, and coordination with other state agencies:

- 22 • Working with industrial forest landowners and family forest landowners to ensure broad
23 outreach.
- 24 • Identifying the most critical questions by utilizing the information networks already in place.
- 25 • Making information accessible to all.
- 26 • Facilitating internal and interagency discussions to help ensure consistent processing and review
27 of forest practices applications.
- 28 • Identifying ways to expedite processes while staying within the Forest Practices rules.
29

30 **EXPEDITED PROCESSING OF FPAs**

31 Kirk Willis, DNR, provided a Power Point presentation. He explained the reasons to expedite the
32 processing of forest practices applications are to address landowner needs, recovery, and
33 restoration, and to aid in prioritizing workloads. He explained how the rules are expedited. All
34 Forest Practices rules are still in place; this has been emphasized at Timber/Fish/Wildlife (TFW)
35 meetings and the continuation of addressing protection of public resources. He explained the steps
36 for achieving these goals: Applicants are provided outreach and education, and applications
37 identified with the words "Storm Damage" are placed on the top of the stack so field foresters can
38 prioritize reviews. The process has been successful – 46 of the total storm applications were
39 approved, with 70% of those within 15 days.
40

41 **ALTERNATE PLAN CONSIDERATIONS**

42 Stephen Bernath, Department of Ecology (DOE) and David Whipple, Department of Fish and
43 Wildlife (DFW), provided a Power Point presentation that addressed the challenges of alternate
44 plans submitted after the storm. Most of these alternate plans are for salvage harvesting of wind
45 thrown trees where riparian function has to be addressed. Statewide riparian function training has
46 been given but an assessment is taking place to determine both the positive and negative effects of
47 these proposed alternate plans for both the short term as well as the long term. Safety is one key
48 element that is being addressed for these alternate plans.

1 **WOODY DEBRIS CLEAN-UP**

2 Gary Graves, DNR, provided a Power Point presentation showing the clean-up issues for the Debris
3 Task Force. The issues include public structures/facilities, sediment in homes, hazardous wastes,
4 and woody debris. He also listed the steps being taken which include individual landowner
5 contracts, wood removal contracts, contract timelines, and the removal of river and channel debris.
6

7 **QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION**

8 Christiansen said most of the presentations were operational in nature but it was important for the
9 Board to get an understanding of the context and activities that have occurred and were still
10 occurring after the extreme December storm event.
11

12 Tom Laurie asked Graves about the debris removal budget. Graves said there was no budget for the
13 woody debris clean-up but it will be funded similarly to how fires are funded. Money will be
14 generated by selling as much product as possible and the removal costs will be presented to the
15 Legislature as a supplemental budget request.
16

17 Laurie asked if any landowner in need of this assistance can receive it at this point. Graves
18 answered yes, if the assistance request is a result of flooding from the December storm.
19

20 Christiansen added there are some jurisdictional things to take into consideration.
21

22 Graves said that both the Chehalis and Willapa Basins have been assessed for debris removal. Dave
23 Hagiwara asked what is not getting done from an operations perspective with this heightened
24 activity. Graves replied from a forest practices standpoint there is going to be minimal impact.
25 Operations will deal with regulatory permits. The fortunate thing for forest practices is that most of
26 the activity is on farm land which does not require a forest practices application.
27

28 Tom Laurie asked Dave Whipple the same question from DFW's perspective.
29

30 Whipple said there was not an immediate answer to that question. The Habitat Program is assisting
31 with the Hydraulic Project Approval workloads, the regions are involved with the woody debris
32 removal, and the Assistant Director of the Habitat Program, Greg Hueckel, is involved in
33 determining where efforts are focused.
34

35 Ann Wick said that running a lot of heavy equipment on agricultural lands is not good for the soil.
36 She asked Graves if something much more expensive will have to be done, if it will affect the
37 budget to compensate for it, and what the plans are.
38

39 Graves answered that many farm owners have addressed that concern. DNR will wait to enter the
40 land until the landowner tells them it is ready. There may be some heavy clay areas that can be
41 compacted and the landowner will not be able to farm on it for a long time. To minimize the impact
42 DNR will lay chips down to drive the equipment on. If the farmer believes the soil is being
43 compacted, they have the ability to ask DNR to wait a while to let it dry, and DNR will do so.
44

45 Christiansen added that the debris removal project is one of the advantages to managing on a project
46 basis. This project will allow multiple landowners to use innovations such as laying down wood
47 chips to protect their resources while getting back in business.
48

49 Schaaf thanked DNR on behalf of the Board, Merrill & Ring, and as an industrial landowner. He
50 related to storm victims as well as to DNR, DFW, and DOE. He stated that as an industrial

1 landowner the impact of the storm on his property was devastating and he was still seeking ways to
2 recover functions. He then commended DNR on the quick turn around application processing and
3 responses.

4
5 Sherry Fox requested that the Board put some thought into the consequences when landowners do
6 not have options to the standard rules, especially in the restoration of a riparian management zone
7 (RMZ). Small forest landowners feel they only have one option, the current rules, because they do
8 not have the money or the technical expertise to do an alternate plan. When standard rules are
9 applied, removing competing vegetation within the riparian zone will have to be hand brushed,
10 creating higher fire danger. She said her biggest concern is the Board's approach in restoration of
11 RMZs within the windstorm area.

12
13 Doug Stinson asked about creating salvage harvest alternatives for landowners to apply in storm
14 damaged RMZs. Bridget Moran asked Whipple, Graves, and Bernath how riparian functions will be
15 evaluated in storm damaged RMZs to get them back on a recovery trajectory for alternate plans that
16 will be submitted. She also asked if they felt like their three agencies are working together to
17 provide the necessary guidance, and if they have the tools they need to do that. Graves answered
18 that DFW, DOE, and DNR have had a lot of discussion about alternatives for salvage within an
19 RMZ.

20 21 **UNSTABLE LANDFORMS, EFFECTS OF FOREST PRACTICES ON SLOPE STABILITY**

22 Venice Goetz, DNR, provided a Power Point presentation about landforms relevant to slope
23 instability, and how slope geometry affects water runoff, infiltration, and groundwater flow. Using
24 Board Manual Section 16, Guidelines for Evaluating Potentially Unstable Slopes and Landforms as
25 a reference, she explained the significance of bedrock hollows, convergent headwalls, inner gorges,
26 toes of deep-seated landslides, ground water recharge areas of glacial deep-seated landslides, and
27 outer edges of meander bends.

28
29 Nancy Sturhan, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, provided a Power Point presentation on
30 the five elements of slope stability: How tree removal affects shallow landslides, how roads affect
31 shallow landslides, the Slope Stability Continuum concept, and how tree removal and roads affect
32 deep-seated landslides.

33 34 **FOREST PRACTICES RULES PROTECTING UNSTABLE SLOPES**

35 Chuck Turley, DNR, provided a Power Point presentation to give a general overview of the forest
36 practices rules protecting unstable slopes: Class IV–special WAC 222-16-050 (1)(d), SEPA
37 policies for potentially unstable slopes and landforms in WAC 222-10-030 including applicants'
38 qualified expert reports, SEPA threshold determinations, DNR decision, and the Class IV-special
39 exception for forest practices within a Watershed Analysis.

40 41 **WATERSHED ANALYSIS AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO FOREST PRACTICES** 42 **APPLICATIONS**

43 Gary Graves, DNR, provided a Power Point presentation on the interaction of watershed analysis
44 (chapter 222-22 WAC) with forest practice application. He explained that when a forest practice
45 application (FPA) is submitted, the region determines if it is located within a Watershed
46 Administrative Unit where the watershed assessment and prescriptions have been completed. If so
47 they review the proposal to determine if it is located within mapped "area of resources sensitivity"
48 such as an RMZ, unstable slopes, surface erosion, hill slope erosion, hydrology and public
49 works. When the proposal is located within an area of resource sensitivity the applicant needs to
50 ensure they are following any site-specific prescriptions developed as part of the completed

1 watershed analysis for those areas. DNR staff also verifies the use of prescriptions is correct. When
2 the FPA proposal is located within an area of resource sensitivity and it does not follow the
3 identified prescriptions, or the prescriptions are not site specific, the application is classed as Class
4 IV-special and processed for SEPA review.

6 **STILLMAN CREEK LANDSLIDE**

7 Lenny Young, DNR, provided a Power Point presentation that addressed the specifics regarding
8 Forest Practice Application # 2910347 (Stillman Creek). He explained the application review and
9 approval process including the reconnaissance done by Weyerhaeuser geologists. He stated that
10 most of the slope failures were associated with roads and that the application was correctly
11 classified and processed by DNR according to the Forest Practices rules.

13 **FOREST PRACTICES FIELD AUDITS**

14 Lenny Young, DNR, provided a Power Point presentation explaining the purpose of the Forest
15 Practices Field Audits. He said the goals for the four audits cycles are:

- 16 • Operations
- 17 • External Relations
- 18 • Program Leadership within the Region
- 19 • Forest Practices Division Support

20
21 Young described cycle one, Operation: The approach used, key questions asked, the makeup and
22 responsibilities of the audit team, and the status and findings of the audit. He also explained the
23 status of cycle two, External Relations.

25 **QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION**

26 Norm Schaaf asked Young if there was an assessment of whether or not the harvest operations of
27 the Stillman Creek forest practices application actually followed all of the conditions of the
28 application.

29
30 Young replied yes, the application was carried out with the way it was approved.

31
32 Doug Stinson asked Young if there was any indication of old growth timber in the Stillman Creek
33 area.

34
35 Young replied that when the geologist did the reconnaissance of the area he witnessed the presence
36 of old growth stumps, possibly up to 200 years old.

37
38 Graves said when the watershed analysis was prepared for that area, it was found that most of the
39 slumps were a legacy of road construction and logging practices in the late 1940s.

41 **STRUCTURE OF THE FOREST PRACTICES ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM**

42 Darin Cramer, DNR, provided a brief overview to provide context for the unstable slopes research
43 project. He explained that Schedule L-1 of the Forests and Fish Report (1999) and Appendix N of
44 the Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan (2005) established the key questions, overall
45 performance goals, resource objectives and performance targets for the Adaptive Management
46 Program.

47
48 The program employs three types of research and monitoring activities to answer the key questions,
49 and one to facilitate rule implementation. There are 20 active projects at this time.

1 **OVERVIEW OF PROJECTS IN THE UNSTABLE SLOPES RULE GROUP**

2 Laura Vaugeois, DNR, provided a Power Point presentation explaining that developing rule tools
3 was key to identifying where unstable slopes are. She then explained the screening tools that are
4 used: Soils, WSA Mass Wasting Module, the comparison of models, modeled slope stability,
5 regional landform identification, and the Landslide Hazard Zonation (LHZ) project. She then added
6 that the purpose of these products is to assist foresters and land managers in identifying unstable
7 slopes and their triggering mechanisms.
8

9 **LANDSLIDE HAZARD ZONATION**

10 Vaugeois provided a second Power Point presentation explaining the Forests and Fish LHZ project
11 and its goal to prevent or avoid an increase or acceleration of the naturally occurring rate of
12 landslides due to forest practices. She explained the LHZ project goals: Describe and map
13 potentially unstable slopes in priority watersheds, improve screening tools, eliminate errors or
14 omissions, use existing data where appropriate, follow standardized established mapping protocols,
15 and to have LHZ data completed and available to the public as soon as possible.
16

17 **MASS WASTING PRESCRIPTION-SCALE EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING**

18 Julie Dieu, Rayonier, provided a Power Point presentation explaining the Mass Wasting
19 Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project, commonly referred to as the “post-mortem”
20 study. This project was designed to determine if the Forest Practices rules for harvests on
21 potentially unstable slopes, road construction, road maintenance, and road maintenance and
22 abandonment plans are effective at limiting landslides from forest practices. It is designed to
23 evaluate effectiveness at the “prescription scale” or site scale, which might consist of a single
24 harvest unit, unstable landform, or culvert. The study design calls for implementation as soon as
25 possible after a significant storm event that has generated a sufficient population of landslides for
26 statistical analysis.
27

28 **TRIBAL PERSPECTIVE**

29 Guy McMinds, Quinault Indian Nation, explained he was involved in negotiating the TFW
30 Agreement in the 1980s. To show how important it was, people like Bill Wilkerson were talking
31 directly to Norm Dicks, and it shows what can happen when you get money and influential people
32 behind it. TFW was the basis for the science you see today and the development of the regulations
33 to implement the adaptive management process. Research is happening, and the Board is going to
34 have to make determinations of where to go with the research.
35

36 **INDUSTRY PERSPECTIVE**

37 Marc Doumit, Washington Forest Protection Association (WFPA), said WFPA believes in adaptive
38 management and the science-based approach. He said he believes the Board is on the right track and
39 when you have natural disasters it is beyond our ability to plan. He said WFPA would like to see
40 people helping people, and good science to make adaptive management work.
41

42 **CONSERVATION CAUCUS PERSPECTIVE**

43 Peter Goldman, Washington Forest Law Center, said he questioned whether the rules pertaining to
44 slope stability contain the right SEPA triggers or the right polices to require DNR to determine if
45 the slope will slide into a stream or river. This places an unreasonably high burden on DNR, an
46 agency that is already hard pressed to review thousands of permits each year. In addition there is a
47 Watershed Analysis loophole which grandfathers in old watershed analyses whose prescriptions
48 exempt site-specific geological review of slope stability. This was the case in Stillman Creek. The
49 Conservation Caucus is very much in favor of studying the relationship between landslides and

1 flooding. It is tragic that it took a disastrous flood to prompt the Board's attention to improve the
2 forest practices rules regarding logging on steep and unstable slopes.

3 4 **SMALL FOREST LANDOWNER PERSPECTIVE**

5 Don Theo, Washington Farm Forestry Association, said he represents approximately 1500
6 members. A significant number of small forest landowners were impacted by the December storm,
7 especially from the wind storm in Pacific and Grays Harbor counties. He requested the Board enact
8 some exceptions to the current rules to allow emergency use of the forest practices staff to help
9 show small landowners how to handle this type of disaster. Many do not have a consulting forester
10 and are often dealing with loggers who may or may not be following the rules, they need help.

11 12 **LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROSPECTIVE**

13 Eric Johnson, Washington State Association of Counties, stated that storm recovery is ongoing. The
14 first responders did a phenomenal job reacting to this disaster. In Lewis County alone there were
15 168 air lifts, plus two deaths not directly related to the flood event. The recovery efforts continue by
16 working with local, state and federal agencies, residents, volunteers, and non profit organizations.
17 Agriculture, timber, and mining are of phenomenal importance to Washington's economy. The
18 Growth Management Act says we must continue to protect working rural landscapes. He extended
19 appreciation to the Board and DNR for their responsive considerations, not only for the recovery
20 effort, but the ongoing effort to streamline and expedite the application process. He mentioned the
21 importance of the Adaptive Management Program and asked the Board to take the leadership role to
22 make sure that the forest practices program reacts in a timely manner. At times that may mean
23 additional resources, and at other times going back to the Legislature to ask for additional resources.
24 He asked the Board to respond judiciously to policy changes, expect and demand performance from
25 CMER, and to keep in mind that science guides public policy; science does not set public policy.

26 27 **QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION**

28 Schaaf asked Doumit what he heard from his members about what happened and what did not
29 happen.

30
31 Doumit answered there were ten counties that had natural disaster delegations. Some companies lost
32 a year or more of their productive inventory; some of the sawmill landowners lost an entire rotation
33 of their crops. One notable observation is the success of the RMAPs program. As shown in a slide
34 presented earlier, a large culvert had a lot of wood go through it but it remained functional. Since
35 RMAPs, we have seen a dramatic reduction in road failures. This is not to say there were no
36 problems, but on a whole the damage from this storm could have been a lot worse without the work
37 that has been done over the last ten years as a result of the RMAPs program.

38
39 Carolyn Dobbs asked Goldman how he would change the direction to CMER to bring in
40 independent research and supplement what is done with CMER generated research.

41
42 Goldman answered there is precedence for the Board to form subcommittees to address pertinent
43 issues; it happened six or seven years ago on the recreation and aesthetics question. This would
44 enable the Board to invite panels to present science from CMER and other scientists to address
45 scientific questions and issues. The problem is that everyone wants to present their positions, their
46 processes, their studies, when it is really important to look at other external ideas. He envisioned the
47 Board being informed by CMER, but in a mini hearing forum for the technical issues. He felt that
48 there are numerous independent scientists who would participate in these forums.

49
50 Dobbs asked Goldman how he would go about fast tracking this process.

1
2 Goldman answered more time is needed to study what we do not know.

3
4 Christiansen asked Johnson how he sees the policy body prioritizing their work in regards to the
5 greater watershed, keeping focus, and setting tasks.

6
7 Johnson replied that counties have been looking at adaptive management associated with
8 performance outcomes. He stated that unfortunately there is a system that allows for silent decision
9 making and he is not sure county commissioners are going to give up their authorities for
10 regulations any more than the Board wants to give up its authorities. From the counties' perspective,
11 this Board has the primary responsibility to look at forest management impacts on the landscape and
12 to try to reduce the amount of human caused impacts on the forested landscape. At the same time
13 the Board must keep a viable forest products industry. We should recognize that landslides have
14 happened throughout history and will happen again; it is part of the geology in this state. So we
15 need to mitigate for forest practices and make sure that the studies do not go too far afield in trying
16 to point a finger. We are all willing to adapt, but at the same time we recognize landslides are part
17 of the dynamics in the Pacific Northwest. CMER has designed a study that will help us evaluate the
18 impacts of management practices.

19
20 Goldman added identifying the most sensitive and slide-prone landscape areas that should be
21 buffered or left alone. The Conservation Caucus does not want to see the Mass Wasting
22 Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring and LHZ projects going into a black hole in the
23 adaptive management process where we are going to be slugging out the issues for the next ten
24 years. We cannot do that with the way the climate is changing.

25
26 Christiansen asked Goldman how he perceives the LHZ project as being different from being
27 precise and surgical.

28
29 Goldman replied that Mendoza would be discussing that during the public comment period.

30
31 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

32 Miguel Perez Gibson, Forests and Fish Conservation Caucus, recommended that the Board begin a
33 discussion about whether the current forest practices application-by-application system makes sense
34 with today's understanding of ecosystem processes.

35
36 Chris Mendoza mentioned he has an eight year history on this subject matter and as an RSAG co-
37 chair. He said the nature of the CMER process is slow; the research needed can be done but it takes
38 time, funding, and staffing. The desired future condition project is an example of how slow the
39 process can be. After nine years nothing has happened. Past performance has proven that if you
40 want anything done expeditiously, go elsewhere. There is a lack of devotion to the issues from
41 Policy. We need to look to Policy and the Board for help, not just to CMER.

42
43 Goldman said he is disappointed in the adaptive management process. It involves years of study,
44 political maneuvering, and inaction. He said the public deserves better, particularly those affected
45 by the Lewis County floods. They need answers that are based on science and they need them
46 quickly. The bottom line is that the Conservation Caucus does not have a lot of confidence that the
47 Mass Wasting Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring project will move and be handled
48 expeditiously.

1 Kevin Godbout, Weyerhaeuser, thanked the Board for adjusting its schedule and devoting a whole
2 day to this topic. He said he has heard people express the need for action focused on recovery and
3 informed decision making. These outcomes do take time and money. He then listed the steps that
4 Weyerhaeuser has taken since the December storm:

- 5 • Conducting a detailed assessment of the storm
- 6 • Working with many stakeholders by proposing several alternative plans to address the blown
7 down timber and the maintenance of riparian functions.
- 8 • Assessing the effectiveness of our geological review process.
- 9 • Conducting a comprehensive inventory of the landslides in the Stillman basin.

10
11 He added these activities are moving forward but it takes time.

12
13 Joseph Murray, Merrill & Ring, said he's seen 28 floods take place but the one in December was
14 the highest one he has ever seen, and notably it was at low tide. There was 11 inches of rain in 36
15 hours, and winds at 80 mph. When it was safe to go into the forest they sent patrols out to inspect
16 culverts and crossings and assess the damage. They found that RMAPs was working well with few
17 problems. They also found significant blow down scattered all over their 30,000 acres. We need to
18 learn from this storm and develop a better understanding of the impacts and our response to these
19 impacts. The adaptive management process is poised to help us to develop an understanding and to
20 make changes or not in the rules. It is important to remember that it is no small chore to separate the
21 natural and human influences after such an event, especially with surgical precision.

22
23 Jay Gordon, sixth generation dairy farmer in Elma, said his family homesteaded their place in 1872.
24 The December flood was 6 inches over the 1996 flood on his farm, 18 inches over anything his
25 family has ever seen. He thanked DNR and Commissioner Sutherland on their quick response with
26 the debris removal program. He said in his capacity as Executive Director of the Washington State
27 Dairy Federation, he's had the opportunity to work with the Commissioner and the Director of
28 Agriculture to try and get the debris out of the upper Chehalis valley, and it is going very well. He
29 provided a handout reflecting the trends observed at the United States Geological Survey River
30 Station about a quarter mile above his farm. He said investments are based on historical knowledge
31 of where the floods come from; normal floods are survivable, but the peak flows are increasing and
32 are higher in frequency. Solutions will come in many forms. He asked what percentage of the
33 watershed is logged and permitted to be logged, and why is it different in the last 130 years? He
34 asked the Board to look at brush control, and requested that the Board use science to make their
35 decisions, and to make the decisions quickly and holistically.

36
37 Heath Packard, Audubon Washington, said there are some important issues that need to be taken
38 into context as the Board establishes its leadership and direction in evaluating the situation. He said
39 preparation and adaptation is the theme. He provided a report that was done by Environment
40 Washington that identifies these trends of increased frequency of major storm events with major
41 storm water. This is tracking with the predictions made by climatologists with regards to climate
42 change, greenhouse gases, and global warming. So we have a climate destabilization issue
43 increasing the frequency of these storm events. He said the Board should be asking the question
44 whether we should be testing the assumptions on which the current forest practices rules are based
45 with regards to rainfall and 500 year storms. He urged the Board on behalf of Audubon Washington
46 to expeditiously direct reviews of the issues.

47
48 Karl Forsgard, Washington Forest Law Center, said the Board should work towards reviewing the
49 rules and how they're enforced, and to have an independent review quickly.

1 **DISCUSSION AND ACTION**

2 Darin Cramer, DNR, requested the Board’s approval of the Mass Wasting Prescription-Scale
3 Effectiveness Monitoring project and to move the \$400,000 from Tier II to Tier I to allow CMER to
4 begin the first two phases.

5
6 Fox stated that Laura Vaugeois’ presentation gave her some hope that we are ahead of the game.
7 We have developed information and identified ways to look at the sensitive areas, which is very
8 encouraging.

9
10 Christiansen added it’s very important to be expedient and diligent in changing policies where they
11 need to change. She commended staff on their hard work.

12
13 **MOTION:** Vicki Christiansen moved that the Forest Practices Board approve moving \$400,000
14 from Tier II to the Tier I budget for the Mass Wasting Prescription-Scale
15 Effectiveness Monitoring Project.

16
17 **SECONDED:** Dave Somers

18
19 **ACTION:** Motion passed unanimously.

20
21 Christiansen said the Legislature has strong interest in the Board and they’ve been asking for quite
22 sometime what is going on, what kind of studies we do, what kind of adaptive management
23 projects. We’ve told them we anticipated the Board would be moving forward with this study, and
24 the Landslide Hazard Zonation project.

25
26 Young added that to potentially expand the geographic scope of the mass wasting “post mortem”
27 study that Julie Dieu had described, it would require an additional \$350,000 that is currently not in
28 the CMER work plan. That is not to say that we couldn’t rearrange our existing resources and
29 reprioritize and build that into the existing funding. When we are getting inquiries from the
30 Legislature it’s a good opportunity to bring this forward as an additional resource need. By
31 expanding the geographic scope of the study we could gain a broader inference to expand our
32 findings and conclusions. But we would have to increase the number of samples to maintain
33 statistical power and to support strong conclusions.

34
35 As far as Landslide Hazard Zonation goes, the project is funded through the end of this biennium.
36 At that time all of the resources originally allocated for LHZ will have been expended, and we still
37 will not have completed all of the high-priority watersheds. If we wanted to continue the work
38 beyond the end of the biennium to complete the rest of the high priority watersheds, an additional
39 \$400,000 would be required. Then if we wanted to add moderate watersheds as a priority as well, it
40 would take about four and a half additional years with a combined cost of about \$1.8 million to get
41 the highs and the moderates. Those are a few options the Board may want to consider if there is a
42 climate for additional funding for LHZ.

43
44 Fox asked Young if the additional funding for the Mass Wasting Prescription-Scale Effectiveness
45 Monitoring project would include additional sampling. Young replied yes and added it could
46 encompass a larger geographic area and more robust conclusions could be drawn from the work.

47
48 Fox asked if the Hood Canal area would be added.

1 Young replied that the Hood Canal area could potentially be added but the science team would have
2 to perform a reconnaissance of the area to determine if it is suitable for addition. It would allow the
3 addition of either Hood Canal lands or perhaps other lands heavily impacted by the storm.
4

5 Hagiwara asked if the funding source has been identified for either the \$350,000 to expand the Mass
6 Wasting Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project, or whatever it takes to do the
7 Landslide Hazard Zonation project.
8

9 Young replied there is no funding source identified, but there have been inquiries from the
10 Legislature, leading one to believe that perhaps funds under the Legislature's control could be
11 available.
12

13 Christiansen added the focus has been on immediate recovery, but questions are surfacing about
14 looking at information needed for future mitigation and prevention. There is a time clock that the
15 Legislature is in as well. This is why the Board should have this dialog now about these
16 opportunities.
17

18 Young mentioned there are other studies in the unstable slopes rule group that Policy has discussed
19 while working toward making the decision to bring the recommendation to the Board. Policy
20 concluded that we need to quickly have a workshop to review all of the studies in that group to
21 determine whether we have listed all the studies needed, and whether all of the studies that we do
22 have are appropriately focused and timely scheduled. Some of the studies haven't been
23 implemented yet, so there may be some other unfunded studies that will need to be carried out.
24

25 Young stated there are many information gaps and the desire to fill those gaps, CMER is working at
26 absolute capacity right now. We need to make sure that our studies are well designed and the data
27 collection is good. We also need to support that with good product management and good Forests
28 and Fish Policy attention. We have to look really hard at additional resources from all of the
29 caucuses to do that.
30

31 Schaaf said he was supportive and felt that we have an opportunity to make things better and right.
32

33 Hagiwara asked what would be the most effective way to obtain funding from the Legislature.
34

35 Christiansen suggested the Board consider a resolution that could be delivered to the Legislature.
36

37 Hagiwara said the more collaboration and people involved the more you will get done. He invited
38 all of the people who testified in the meeting to join in that request.
39

40 Laurie added he was supportive of forwarding a request to the Legislature.
41

42 Somers said the Landslide Hazard Zonation project is a good tool that should be finished. He was
43 supportive of the request to the Legislature.
44

45 Dobbs added that the Board should move forward as quickly as possible.
46

47 **DISCUSSION AND ACTION**

48
49 **MOTION:** Vicki Christiansen moved that the Forest Practice Board affirms that the forest
50 practices adaptive management program is the appropriate research and monitoring

1 program within which studies of relationships among forest practices landslides and
2 floods should be carried out. We support the potential expansion of scope of the
3 mass wasting prescription level effectiveness monitoring to gain broader inferences
4 while maintaining statistical power and will request the appropriate funding from the
5 state legislature. We also support the continuation of the landslide hazard zonation to
6 complete all forested watersheds judged to have a high potential for landslides into
7 the 2009-2011 biennium and request the appropriate funding from the state
8 legislature while informing them of the medium priority landslides yet to be met.
9

10 **SECONDED:** Carolyn Dobbs

11
12 **Board Discussion:**

13 Young said as the LHZ project has progressed, the per-acre cost has gone down.

14
15 Laurie asked how much it will cost and how long it will take to complete the high priority LHZ
16 projects.

17
18 Laura Vaugeois said it would take an estimated \$470,000 to complete the remaining high priority
19 watersheds, and at the current pace and staffing that would take two years.

20
21 Young said it's important to look at the timing. LHZ is completely funded for the remainder of this
22 biennium so the question would be of the next biennium's budget and beyond.

23
24 Moran added she felt it was important that the Board be recognized as the decision making body for
25 these issues. She then asked Christiansen if the motion is suggesting that the Board is making a
26 request to the Legislature.

27
28 Christiansen replied yes but DNR staff would carry that message. In this motion we are
29 acknowledging that adaptive management is the appropriate research and monitoring program and
30 to remind the Legislature there is additional work that needs to take place with the Landslide
31 Hazard Zonation project that is not funded after this year.

32
33 **ACTION:** Motion Passed unanimously

34
35 Christiansen asked the Board to identify issues they would like to address at the next Board
36 meeting.

37
38 Moran said she would like to discuss the need of small forest landowners to get assistance.

39
40 Brent Bahrenburg said he would like to hear more about Lidar.

41
42 Somers said he was interested in a workshop, watershed analysis, and the cumulative approach.

43
44 Christiansen said she would like to discuss watershed analysis.

45
46 Young asked Somers to summarize what type of workshop he'd like to see. Somers said he would
47 like to find out more of the facts and gaps that needed to be handled.

48
49 Christiansen suggested that the Board determine how that would work.
50

1 Dobbs said she felt that an internal in-house workshop was essential to move forward, and would
2 like to find out more about new tools, techniques, and technologies available. She said she was also
3 interested in finding out how the Board could obtain, present, and use other available science.
4
5 Fox said she'd like to go out in the field into some of the riparian zones, to witness the devastation
6 from the December storm first hand.
7
8 Hagiwara suggested that the CMER work plan needs to be looked at, and possibly revamped at
9 some point in time.
10
11 Christiansen told Young there are at least three areas the Board should continue discussing on
12 February 22nd: watershed analysis, dialog around technology, options for a field tour, and ideas on
13 how to assist the small forest landowners.
14
15 Dobbs requested that two separate subjects for public comment be offered at the February 22nd
16 meeting.
17
18 Christiansen thanked the Board members and staff.
19
20 Dobbs and Moran thanked DNR for taking the initiative in putting together the meeting and the
21 topics.
22
23 **MEETING ADJOURNMENT**
24 The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.
25