

Unstable Slopes Proposal Initiation
Recommendations from TFW Policy Committee to Forest Practices Board
August 4, 2016

Policy received a board approved Unstable Slopes Proposal Initiation (PI) to address issues raised in written material and testimony at the 10th November 2015 Forest Practices Board meeting. The motion gave specific direction to the AMPA and Policy as follows:

“Carmen Smith moved, the Forest Practices Board forward the Proposal Initiation for Unstable Slopes to the Adaptive Management Program Administrator to initiate Adaptive Management Program review. She further moved, the Board direct TFW Policy Committee to provide to the Board at their May 2016 meeting an Adaptive Management Program work plan and timeline for review of the items in the Proposal Initiation and completion of recommendations for further actions to the Board.”

In summary, the Board’s motion directed the AMPA to initiate an AMP review of the unstable slopes PI:

- The AMPA must present recommendations for AMP review through the Science and Policy tracks including the estimated time to complete each task and the timeline in which Policy will bring recommendations to the Board, completed through memo to Policy, dated 31st March, 2016;
- Work plan must address all items in the PI, completed through AMPAs March memo but not completed by Policy – assigned to a subgroup and presented in this memo; and
- The Policy recommendations and timelines were to be presented to the Board for their approval at their May meeting, not completed.

As an initial step, TFW Policy recommends the following. TFW Policy acknowledges the remaining issues in the PI and proposes that this is the first step:

Topic #1: Potential Instability and Failure Mechanisms of Deep Seated Landslides (DSL)

Recommended Action: Science Track (CMER-UPSAG). Conduct Literature Review within 8 months (by June 2017) to address questions related to the mechanics of non-glacial DSL failure and reactivation, and the impacts of forest practices on same. Policy will consider Literature Review to determine next steps. Draft questions/issues include:

- a. *Groundwater recharge areas (GWRA) of non-glacial (bedrock) DSL*
 - Are GWRA associated with bedrock DSLs?
 - How do GWRA affect bedrock DSL?
 - How do forest practices affect these GWRA?
- b. *Reactivation potential of DSLs*
 - What are the best methods to assess reactivation potential from dormant DSLs of any type?
- c. *Complex/composite DSL behavior*
 - What are the characteristics of large landslides that may predispose them to long rapid runouts or composite failure?
 - What methods might improve prediction?
- d. *DSL Runout*
 - What are the best tools to assess runout potential for DSL?

Topic #2: Terminology related to Reactivation Potential of Relict v. Dormant DSL

Recommended Action: Science Track (CMER-UPSAG) – One UPSAG meeting to evaluate Board Manual Section 6.2. Report back to Policy in ~~October, 2016~~ March 2017.

- Should the BM define relict v. dormant more precisely?
- Should the reactivation potential of relict landslides be included in the BM 16 Section 6.2 bullets?

Topic #3: Scope potential for empirically-based runout risk screening tools for Shallow Rapid RIL Identification and Analysis

Recommended Action: Science Track -- CMER (UPSAG) – Ask CMER to propose a way to address this issue and report back to Policy ~~in three months~~ at February/March 2017 meeting.

- Are there accurate and useful runout tools that can be developed:
 1. By evaluating runout risk distances (e.g. concept of Kennard Runout Risk Evaluation Tool)?
 2. On the basis of empirically-based generalizations regarding potential runout distances – either statewide or at other scales?