



**SKAGIT COUNTY FOREST  
ADVISORY BOARD**

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

Minutes  
December 14, 2016

Present: Dave, Fred, Al, Paul, Steve, Tim

- I. Minutes: No quorum
- II. Discussion Items:
  - a. Major re-organization within Weyerhaeuser; WFPA appears to have a very strong representation from Sierra Pacific. Tom Nelson is now a member of the Forest Practice Board. Fred will be retiring but wants to remain on the FAB.
  - b. TFW- Dispute resolution was called for Off channel habitat, established water-type points and habitat assessment (physicals). Policy has until May Forest Practice Board meeting to have stage II completed with or without minority/majority reports. The Adaptive Management Program manager (AMPA) proposed a test project utilizing LiDAR to generate modeled maps with more accuracy than the past, which will identify F/N breaks. The cost is high for the uncertainty. The caucus' were split and want more information. Presentation was given on the wetland study design. Kendra voiced concerns about a design that used terms linking a single molecule between waters and wetlands. This could lead to many more wetlands being regulated. Not enough research to see the effects of harvest and recovery. SLO template has proposed smaller buffers due to scale. FAB discussed how large buffers for large woody debris still make no sense since research shows that this comes primarily from those trees within 25' or less from the stream banks. Talk about debris flows causing trees to go into streams (believe it is not working they wat some of the interest groups have proposed). Several caucus will submit a proposal for a habitat assessment management plan, which will be reviewed by the AMPA and then submitted to a technical group to determine the best approach for developing a procedure to identify fish...the protocol survey. FAB was asked if they would like to help develop a proposal. Discussion formulated that current practices are working especially with the use of the ID team. Frustration that without science showing there is a problem why is there a push to more the point of last fish up the system. Members suggested Looking into work done by the Oregon Forest Institute and contact AFRC for help. \State Lands: The DNR got the draft EIS out for the marbled Murrelet and the sustainable harvest. They will be having presentations around the regions, January 10<sup>th</sup> will be the one at the NW region.

- c. RFI- Discussed what was presented in November. Dave feels that there is nothing in the RCWs, specifically the GMA subdivision that requires CAO to be done on forest harvests. He believes it is just the opposite in that the resources need to be protected for long-term commercial significance. He has researched this. Al wanted to make it clear that he does stewardship plans to qualify landowners for other funding programs. These are voluntary, and they cost between \$500-\$1,000, which eliminated incentive to practice forestry. Al agreed with what Ken said (“I don’t believe increasing the level of sophistication of the forest (or stewardship) management plan is necessary. Landowners will either ignore or engage in forest management regardless of how good and in-depth those plans are. If the primary goal is to set aside those lands for future management, easier is better.”) The FAB noted that other land uses are not required to have plan. Al said it is a waste of time to write a plan if a landowner doesn’t want it. It did not make any sense to the FAB to increase buffers for hazard trees, that has nothing to do with forest practices They also did not understand the connection to ensuring a clearing and grading ordinance be adopted and implemented with the RFI. Tim wants to see the actual language the Planning Department develops before they pass it onto the Planning Commission. The statement by John Cooper who had indicated at the last meeting that regulations were required because folks are not following the rules currently in place was debunked by the FAB who claim that most people do follow rules. Can keep making rules to take of the few bad doers...educate them instead. This code is to help simplify not keep adding layers of regulation. The FAB agreed that what was being proposed by the Planning Department was not what the FAB had put forward. Tim questioned how the County will try to enforce all of what they have proposed and will this become a full time endeavor.

III. Adjourn. 8:58 a.m.