



**SKAGIT COUNTY FOREST  
ADVISORY BOARD**

Dave Chamberlain, Chairman  
Lisa Cassidy            Ken Osborn  
Al Craney                Chuck Parker  
Gordon Iverson        Tom Nelson  
Paul Kriegel             Aubrey Stargell  
Tim Raschko             Steve Tift  
Fred Loffer  
Kendra Smith, Staff

Minutes  
November 11, 2014

Present: Aubrey, Chuck, Fred, Paul, Dave, Gordy, Tim, Tom and Al

Absent: Steve

Guest: Cathy Mitchell, Dan Berentson, Doug Couvelier

I. Introductions: Cathy Mitchell introduced herself as a new planning Commission member. She wanted to come and talk about the RFI.

II. Minutes : Tim moved and Gordy seconded to approve August, September and October minutes. Passed unanimously.

III. Updates-

A. Dave gave a full background on the work the FAB has done on RFI over the last 5 years.

B. Shorelines have been put on semi-hold according to Cathy.

IV. Discussions

A. Follow up on the work being done by Northwest Natural Resource Group (NNRG). They are on contract with the DNR and have shown their bias on certification (FFC), which does not promote even age stands. The FAB is very disappointed with DNR for allowing the bias of this group to be the only one presented to landowners.

B. Discussion on some of the outcomes of the Oso landslide as presented in the GEER report5. Cathy asked that a copy of the report be sent to her.

C. Bull Trout Overlay (BTO) study- Kendra reported on the results of the eastside study. The study showed that there are insignificant impacts. Based on TFW adaptive management this should mean that the rule can be changed and the BTO would now not be necessary. The Eastside tribes are opposed to this and the federal caucus is concerned with how the data was being interpreted. The results of the BTO study will be sent to FAB members.

D. RFI- The following was noted by the FAB as the discussion continued- If there is development, it is a conversion (that means anything other than forestry including clearing for farming. These activities should be regulated by the Planning Department and the CAO would apply. If there is No development or conversion it should be regulated by the DNR under the Forest Practice Rules. If there is a parcel where a landowner wants to build a house/out buildings/roads and then keep the rest of the parcel in forestry there should be an incentive to do this. Currently a landowner would have to apply the CAO over the entire parcel, which often leads to more development or additional subdivision to offset the costs. Studies have shown that a large amount of the timber that goes to the mills comes from the smaller landowners so encouraging them to stay in forestry is important. Rules were changed at the State level to allow forestry on platted lands without having to do a Class IV conversion. There would need to be a buffer around the development to protect the critical areas from the development. If the land retained in forestry and in the future a landowner wanted to convert it they would be subject to a moratorium, mitigation and other rules that the county is allowed to put in place. Most likely it would have had a timber open space tax classification so would probably be subject to back taxes as well.

V. Adjourn 9:14