



**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

December 9, 2015

Present: Chuck, Gordy, Fred, Al, Dave, Steve, Tim, Aubrey, Lisa, Tom and Paul Absent: Ken

Guest: Commissioner Janicki, Dan Berentson

I. Introductions: The FAB welcomed Commissioner Janicki and Dan Berentson and thanked him for bringing coffee.

II. Minutes. The FAB reviewed and approved unanimously the October 2015 and November 2015 minutes with Tim moving and Gordy seconding approval.

III. Updates: Commissioner Janicki told the FAB she was going to put her application in for the Forest Practice Board county elected official representative. The Fab was very supportive. After discussion Gordy moved and Fred seconded to have the FAB write a letter of support and to have the draft letter circulated electronically for FAB approval and signature by all members. Approved unanimous.

III. Discussion Items:

- A. RFI- This was on the agenda so that the FAB would have an opportunity to share any comments they may have passed on to the Planning Dept. (PDS) and present any other thoughts that may have developed after initial review so that they could pass this information onto the PSD. The discussion centered around the Small Landowner (SLO) Rule and exemption from FPR, however it should be noted that buffers are still required for SLO. (RFI would primarily be associated with the SLO.) Al mentioned that he had met with Gary to talk about the difference in the stewardship program. Dave noted that Stewardship is for folks who need some guidance and are not the ones practicing forestry on a regular basis. Al added that the Program manages all resources on the property.
- B. Priorities (cont.) – FAB had the opportunity to continue to flush out what they felt were their individual priorities as they saw it for the FAB. Dave started with the following: RFI, SMP (specifically bridge work), carbon processes and TDR. Commissioner Janicki said she would be supporting the TDR but would be rolling back the receiving areas from what has been proposed. (The commissioner's vote is 12/15). Paul: FPR, TDR. Steve: where homes are being permitted with respect to possible interference with forest practices (an ex is alluvial fans). Aubrey: RFI/SMP and FP. Tom: FPR and the process...he believes it's important to have Skagit County's perspective in the process. Chuck: Smoke management and fires, Rules. Gordy: FPR and noted that always on the defense and the rules can harm not only industry but the forests, also federal issues. Fred: rules and regulations and the number of entities involved and trying to work through the processes. AL: SLO since there are 3,000 in Skagit County. Also the community wildfire plan importance. Paul: Federal issues and the unintended consequences that arise from folks not being educated. Tim: coordination with the county. Lisa: FPR and SLO and wildfire plan. There was discussion on why it was better to have SLO than development and the impacts to the environment are less with forest activities than with development.

- C. FPR- Kendra reported on FPB meeting that was focused on BM 16, landslides. The FPB agreed that it was important to start using the amended BM immediately since it was far better than the existing manual. However, because of comments from the conservation caucus several areas of the manual are to be re-visited and possibly have some additional information added. The debate continues as to whether that information is more like rule language, which is inappropriate for a Board Manual. Policy: Type F – The Policy Chair introduced a conversation on physicals stating there are several sub-components of the larger “physicals” conversation. Points included: The “last fish” point is an important part of the conversation around the Type F/N break. Which can be found by protocol surveys using electrofishing, and default physical criteria.
- Both tools aim to identify the regulatory break by using different measures: protocol surveys identify “last fish”, and then foresters typically move the regulatory break further upstream. The default physical criteria identify the end of the habitat, thereby identifying the regulatory break without needing to identify “last fish”.
 - Both tools try to be as accurate as possible, but different perspectives agree or disagree with their accuracy. The hope for having the physicals discussion is to determine how they might be used in the permanent water typing system, and to consider if and how they might be refined to improve accuracy, reduce error, and ensure habitat protection.

So two subgroups were formed. Kendra will be working with WFPA and WDFW to try and prepare materials for a discussion on “habitat likely to be used by fish”, which will incorporate FPR .031 as written, as morphed into what is used today from Lenny’s memo and .030. Feds are surveying all caucuses on recoverable habitat. Kendra diagramed nose of last fish that may be used to start the discussions. Both of these reports are to coordinate in some way with the ‘physical’ discussion. Electro fish- The group seems narrowly focused on best management practices for the use of electrofishing. The group spent a significant amount of time at the most recent meeting reviewing the list of questions/documents from Policy and determining whether they are relevant to this group’s narrow framework. The group’s discussions can be separated into two categories: one on topics related to site-specific conditions (e.g., what conditions exist, how are they evaluated or reviewed, etc.), and one on topics related to optimization (e.g., looking at optimizing the process and determining how to make it more efficient and effective, efficiency of detection, notes to the resource, etc.). DNR will be looking at water type modification forms. Policy reviewed the BAS and Alternatives Analysis document from the Westside Type F TWIG Best Available Science (BAS) and Alternatives Analysis. Policy agreed to accept the TWIG’s document and directed the TWIG to follow the hybrid phased approach. In addition, Policy asked for the TWIG to report back to Policy after the pilot study is complete (in three to five years) to explain what they did, what they learned and any recommendations, and how the pilot study informs the next step (BACI study).

IV. Adjourn 9:09 a.m.