

Small Forest Landowner Advisory Committee Meeting

Natural Resources Building, Room 461

July 6, 2010

9:00-3:00

Attendees:

Mary McDonald, Phil Hess, Ken Miller, Tammy Perreault, Mark Hicks, Dave Whipple, Jeffrey Thomas, Adrian Miller, Rick Dunning, Lauren Zucati

Via Telephone: Maurice Williamson

Phil and Mary will formulate the agenda for the next meeting. **The next meeting will be October 5th.**

McDonald-suggests having an AG come and discuss the Open Public Meeting Act and how it affects the way the committee members conduct business.

Small Landowner caucus felt that it was time to bring to attention to the advisory committee. **#1.How the Provisions of Chapter 76.13 RCW and Chapter 76.09 RCW and the associated WAC's should be fully Implemented:** Wish is to hear from the agency and other caucuses on what to do on that.

McDonald-DNR -advisory committee assists the SFLO in developing policy and recommending rules to bring forth to the FP Board. The priorities have always been set by the landowners in the small forest landowner advisory committee. There needs to have some recognition on the progress and the products that have come out of this committee. If I understand correctly you want to define what is a low impact harvest? We need to better characterize how a small landowner manages: how often they harvest, proportion of ownership, type of harvest, length of stream etc. There has been a 2011-2013 budget request submitted, and it is part of the strategic plan goal number 3. With this information we feel we could bring forth more contexts to be able to define what a low impact harvest is.

Other state caucus members said they appreciated the lead time for the agenda item they were not prepared to address the referenced RCW's and WAC's specifically. The tribal member stated nothing formal to present.

P. Hess voiced small landowner concerns:

- RCW requires that we define low impact.
- Believes Forest and Fish commits to offer something else for Small forest landowners.
- Concerned that it is a long term project, and an expensive project. The SFLO doesn't have the time or the staff and are concerned that it would take too much time to go through the proper channels.
- What we hear the legislature say is, the smaller the harvest, the lower the impact
- Every science study that has ever been heard about, the key finding is that they need more study. Refers to CMER studies. Point is, they spent a lot of money, a lot a time, and there still wasn't a consensus.

- Is there an option to have someone on the ground to help the Small Forest Landowners? Prefers to have people on the ground to help Small Forest Landowners with alternate plans
- One approach to this would be to have a meaningful dialogue of what risk really is.

Responses:

- Conflict with providing something else and not violating 76.09. Thinks that there should be more science put into it. Without checking the science box, can't in vision the Forest Practices board approving a rule change regarding low impact harvest.
- Talking about data and information gathering. Talking more about characterizing what is going on. If we understood it better, then the low impact scenario can be assessed.
- Commissioner has tagged studying the characteristics of small landowners as a high priority to be done this year. The questions would come from this committee.
- Prior to 2009, there was a Small Forest Landowner forester in every region. The forester would go out to the property and help with the alternate plans.

WA Forest Protection Association: Miller's perspective: Templates yes, Alternate Harvest restrictions- very cautious. Support a fully staffed Small Forest Landowner Office.

Response: This group needs to be an advocate in restoring funding to the Small Forest Landowner Office

Members of the State caucus posed the question: "what is your ultimate expectation?"

Small Landowner Response: We need the ability to manage our riparian forests. Basic principal: manageable single tier, variable or fixed width buffers without an AP. W. and E. WA move forward on a parallel time frame. That achieving this goal would alleviate the financial demand on FREP which we believe the State cannot afford.

The discussion that followed centered on how to accomplish this and still meet riparian function. The industry rep opined that "alternate harvest restrictions" offered potential for greater flexibility and offered to facilitate if WFFA could identify a range of parameters that would have a reasonable chance for success and would stick with them.

Future Meeting

At another meeting, Landowners previously discussed metrics for a fixed buffer width regarding low impact or related to small landowners only. Internal conversations that need to happen first, by the October meeting, might have the perimeters. We can't make any commitments or promises, but will hopefully bring something to the next meeting.

Should start being an advocate for the Small Forest Landowner office. Consider having that as an agenda item if serious about it

Requests:

- a spreadsheet of all the CMER studies. Here is the link to the website for the FY11 CMER work plan. This has the projects within the body of the document and a table listed in Appendix A starting on page 173. http://www.dnr.wa.gov/Publications/bc_cmer_workplan.pdf

- Draft of a document requesting federal funding involving – FFFPP and RMAP (attached pdf)
- Strategic Plan-[DNR Strategic Plan 2010-2014:The Goldmark Agenda](#)

#2.Update on the Small Forest Landowner Programs by Mary McDonald:

Update on FFFPP- We average 60 applicants per year. As a way to add incentive for the landowner to abandon, the **cost share for all abandonment projects has been reduced to \$500**. This will be active for all new applications. Please share this with potential customers. The cost/share obligation on the east side is \$2,000 and \$5,000 on the west side. Mary will forward a publication that is going to the FEDS with the RMAP proposal. In the proposal, it is asked to go to the FEDS for \$10,000. We are working on a grant proposal with NRCS through EQIP for \$300,000.

Update on FREP-hope to be getting something out in the next couple weeks in writing regarding the supplemental budget. There are 84 apps in the backlog currently. Some are a higher priority, some are a lower priority. Going to send out a letter to landowners in the queue asking for information to determine which a high priority app is and which is a low priority. We sold the plane for \$513,000 so there is \$1,013,000 available Acquisition and reform. Reform recommendations must be to the Legislature by October. Reform is two parts: (1) eligibility (2) prioritization. Stakeholder input will be with a web survey and Open Houses

Update on Riparian Open Space Program-open to small and large landowners. Received \$500,000 for the 2009-2011 biennium. Deadline for new applications has passed. 11 apps came in. 8 were Small Forest Landowners. This will be the first time that a Small Forest Landowner will take advantage of the Riparian Open Space Program. For this year only, it is for channel migration zones. Expansion next year will include critical habitat for threatened and endangered species. They will have a technical committee to review applications.

#3.Alternate Plan Tutorial Concept: Mary handed out a copy of a tutorial created by David Bergvall for Alternate Plans. Contains pictures for landowners, what is the main theme, what does a landowner have to consider, and to consider when coming up with an alternate plan? There will be a chance for input at a later date for how this can be improved.