

TIMBER / FISH / WILDLIFE STATUS REPORT



February 1993

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Washington State Timber/Fish/Wildlife (TFW) Agreement of 1987 was entered into by private forest landowners, Indian tribes, environmental groups and state agencies because of widespread legal and political challenges to proposed changes in forest practices regulations. Since that time, federal agencies and county governments have joined the process. The TFW Agreement established a cooperative process for meeting goals concerning wildlife, fisheries, water, cultural, and timber resources.

The TFW process has allowed the cooperators to resolve differences in a non-adversarial forum. TFW also established a research program to guide ongoing discussions on changes in the practice of forestry. The proposed 1993 budget for TFW research and monitoring work is \$3.8 million.

TFW cooperators review progress annually, with a major re-evaluation scheduled for 1995. At the fifth annual review, November 23-24 in Seabeck, TFW cooperators reconfirmed their commitment to the process and noted successes of TFW, particularly the Yakima and Nisqually Resource Management Plans, on-the-ground problem resolution and applied research information. New research included basic core work on cumulative effects, watershed analysis and wetlands that was incorporated into Forest Practices Board rules.

The need for renewed vigor and commitment to ensure progress by 1995 was identified, and the following goals were incorporated into the TFW program for 1993:

- ❖ Continue implementation of recently enacted forest practices regulations, particularly watershed planning and development of resource management plans.
- ❖ Continue research efforts, primarily through the TFW Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee.
- ❖ Initiate actions to ensure that progress is made toward meeting the TFW wildlife goal of providing for the greatest diversity of habitats and species to maintain the state's native wildlife.
- ❖ Assist in coordination of the Growth Management Act and the Forest Practices Act; develop actions within TFW's purview to address identified problems and meet the TFW goal of protecting the long term productivity of the state's forest land base.
- ❖ Investigate the possibility of participation in the Clinton Administration's proposed Forest Resources Summit.

Through TFW, representatives of the forest products industries, interest groups and governments involved in Washington State's forest resources have been provided with an open decision-making forum. Rapid and profound changes in physical and political landscapes require the continuation of TFW's ability to resolve disagreements concerning the practice of forestry in Washington through adaptive management, both in the policy arena and in the woods.

INTRODUCTION

Since 1987 state agencies, tribal governments, environmental organizations, federal agencies, county governments, state and private forest landowners, and the public have participated in Timber/Fish/Wildlife (TFW), a cooperative resource management process that is successfully addressing forest practices on state and private lands. The success of TFW is built on a foundation of open participation and the partnership of TFW cooperators.


TFW has been hailed as a national model. It is not an institution, but a living process built on trust, commitment, and above all, cooperation. The involvement of the TFW cooperators in a common process is itself a remarkable achievement. When this is coupled with the process for integrating timber, wildlife, fisheries, water quality and cultural resources, it is unprecedented.

To realize just how far management of state and private forests in Washington State has progressed since TFW, one does not have to look back very far. In the early 1970s, forest management in Washington was a battlefield. Logging activities on state and private forest lands placed treaty Indian tribes and conservationists at odds with the timber industry. State regulators were unable to resolve the impasse.

In 1986 the state Forest Practices Board was prepared to revise forest practices regulations under the Forest Practices Act, which regulates timber harvesting on state and private lands in Washington. Previous changes in the regulations had touched off

battles between the treaty tribes, private forest landowners, environmentalists, and state regulators. The timber industry called the new package of proposed regulations disastrous. Advocates of fish, wildlife and the environment said the changes didn't go far enough.

Cooperation by all parties was an option that had not been considered up to that point in 1986. The treaty Indian tribes and state government, however, were experiencing a greatly improved relationship in management of the fishery resource by replacing litigation with cooperation.



In the summer of 1986, Stu Bledsoe, Executive Director of the Washington Forest Protection Association, was asked by Bill Frank, Jr., Chairman of Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, if private forest landowners would be willing to discuss forest practices with an eye toward finding common ground. From that meeting the historic TFW Agreement was born.

Representatives from the tribes, private forest landowners, environmental organizations, and state government were invited to a three-day retreat at Port Ludlow in late July and asked to explore the possibility that they could "agree to agree." Through an intensive series of 100 meetings, TFW cooperators tried to resolve most of the issues identified at the retreat. A draft agreement was developed in December 1986 and a final agreement in February 1987. From the final agreement, new forest practices regulations were proposed and adopted, bringing an end to the war in the woods.

WHAT HAS TFW ACCOMPLISHED?

TFW has established a set of common goals:

TFW combines the experience of participants in a consensus-built decision-making process. The TFW Agreement is not written in stone. Participants understand and encourage evaluation and modification of the Agreement to the extent the changes improve forest practices. Experience will determine if the needs of the parties are being met. This is the Adaptive Management system that supports monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of the process. The results of this Adaptive Management system provides solutions that are politically, legally and technically acceptable.

Following are the five goals that all parties embrace and support:

Wildlife Goals:

- ❖ Provide the greatest diversity of habitats, particularly riparian, wetland and old growth.
- ❖ Ensure the greatest diversity of species within those habitats for the survival and reproduction of native wildlife on forest lands.

Fishery Resource Goals:

- ❖ Long-term habitat productivity for natural and wild fish.
- ❖ Protection of hatchery water supplies.

Water Quantity/Quality Goal:

- ❖ Protection of the water needs of people, fish and wildlife.

Archaeological/Cultural Goals:

- ❖ Develop a process to inventory archaeological and cultural locations in managed forests.
- ❖ Inventory, evaluate, preserve and protect traditional cultural and archaeological places, and ensure tribal access.

Timber Resource Goal:

- ❖ Continued growth and development of the state's forest products industry which has a vital stake in the long-term productivity of both the public and private forest land base.

TFW has developed and demonstrated an alternative mechanism to address future conflicts and emerging issues:


TFW is a process based on a broad representation of governmental, political, legal, and economic interests. The foundation of the process is consensus-based decision making.

The traditional administrative process usually is composed of a central regulatory body that develops proposals and options, incorporates public testimony, and then determines the best course of action (generally a compromise of all the concerns). TFW, however, is composed of various "stakeholders" who determine the balance of all interests and identify the best course of action.

These actions can be voluntary, cooperative, or presented to the Forest Practices Board or other regulatory bodies.

The success of TFW has provided a model approach for other states and countries to address forest practices. TFW participants have given presentations in Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, North Carolina, North Dakota, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, and Canada on the success of the TFW process. Several of these states have implemented a consensus-based process with similar success. Canada is considering applying this approach to issues involving forest practices and Indian fishing rights.

The State of Washington is now implementing consensus-building processes that have flowed from TFW. These include the Agriculture/Natural Resource Forum to deal with conflicts between agricultural practices and protection of the environment and human health, and, more recently, the Water Resources Forum to address water resource planning throughout the state.



TFW Provides Benefits to the State, Treaty Indian Tribes, Private Forest Landowners and General Public:

A coordinated approach of governments and agencies has provided greater opportunities to integrate responsibilities and authorities. Integration of these efforts has resulted in more efficient use of limited financial and professional resources by all parties. A collaborative resource management approach instills cooperative relations, more efficient implementation and, as a result, greater ability to avoid litigation.

For private forest landowners and the general public, TFW has provided greater stability and predictability of forest management regulations and better protection of the public's resources. Predictability and stability are the cornerstones of the industry's economics.

TFW provides an opportunity for the industry and public to participate in the management of timber and natural resources. Participation by private landowners and the public in the management of the resources allows for cooperative and efficient implementation of forest practice rules and regulations. Furthermore, cooperative participation by industry and the general public has helped foster better relations with tribal communities.

TFW has also provided an alternate means for implementing the Stevens Treaties that reserved tribal fishery harvest rights and the right to have those fish protected from environmental degradation. Cooperation, rather than litigation, can accomplish the objectives of implementing the Stevens Treaties. Cooperative consensus-building processes like TFW decrease confrontation and increase mutual understanding while avoiding legal issues and reducing costs, both political and financial.

TFW on the Ground: Case Studies

Resource Management Plans

The TFW Agreement provides a process to protect and use five major resources: Water, fish, wildlife, timber and Native American archaeological and cultural resources. Development of basin-wide Resource Management Plans (RMP) through the TFW process was one method developed to cooperatively manage the five resources. Two Resource Management Plans have evolved from the process and are currently in use.

Yakima RMP

Local TFW participants formed the Yakima Resource Management Cooperative (YRMC) in April 1989 to develop and implement a cooperative management plan for the approximately 600,000 acres of forested land in the Upper Yakima river basin. Participants include Plum Creek Timber Co., Boise Cascade Co., the U.S. Forest Service and the Washington Farm Forestry Association, resource agencies of the state, Yakima Indian Nation, local and state environmental groups, and community representatives.

The YRMC has focused much of its effort on the cumulative effects of timber harvest on the other resources in the forest ecosystem. This group pioneered the use of analysis methods based on impact thresholds. YRMC members have spent the last three years collecting, analyzing and displaying data on the threshold measures and the amount of impact which has occurred, developing recovery and protection plans, and carrying out early implementation of plans developed thus far. This system is now central to the statewide Watershed Analysis regulations adopted to respond to the cumulative effects of forest practices on water quality and fish.



YRMC accomplishments include:

- ❖ Developing a system for precisely identifying the cumulative effects of forest practices on other resources by selecting indicators of resource condition, and levels of critical impact.
- ❖ Collecting data on sediment, pools in streams, snags, road density, and the amount of young and old forest habitat and sources of impacts in basins and many sub-basins within the 600,000-acre area.
- ❖ Carrying out rehabilitation projects funded by participating landowners and managers. The contribution for this rehabilitation work in 1991 was \$57,570.

The YRMC hopes to reach cooperative and sustainable resource management in the Upper Yakima Basin. It is hoped that knowledge, commitment and rehabilitation will lead to recovery and to ecosystem equilibrium, including use and protection of all forest resources.

Nisqually RMP

In early 1988, development of a Resource Management Plan was initiated on 100,000 acres in the Nisqually River drainage. Thirteen cooperators, including five landowners, four natural resource agencies, and the Nisqually Tribe, participated in the plan's development. The plan, which took two years to develop at a cost exceeding \$130,000, covers a three-year period beginning July 1, 1990.

The plan produced over 50 recommendations to accomplish established goals. Over 40 were approved by the cooperators for initiation during the plan period. Many research

and monitoring needs, along with other activities that could be implemented, were identified.

Three cumulative effects issues were identified to be addressed through the plan: Wetlands, snags and erosion/unstable soils. Thresholds were established for two of these issues. Research, inventory and monitoring needs were identified and tools were developed to respond in the event these thresholds are reached.

To provide flexibility and predictability in forest practices to landowners during the plan's implementation, the plan provides two pathways for Forest Practices Application approval. One is the current customary method of individual application review. The other, a new pathway, is a master application plan for all forest practice activities scheduled in a year's time. Parameters have been established for review and compliance under the master application plan.

Developing the RMP enabled the cooperators to learn more about each other, their concerns, programs, responsibilities and philosophies. It built solid, continuing communications that helped to clarify and resolve issues. This effort also provided a foundation for undertaking short- and long-term cooperative timber and natural resource management efforts in the Nisqually River drainage.

Riparian Management Zones

The importance of streamside protection was recognized early in the development of the Forest Practices Act, but the introduction of TFW Adaptive Management solved two difficult issues in the debate over riparian (streamside) resources. The first issue, resources at risk, is a question of goals:

Which resources are being affected by our actions, and of those, which are we trying to protect?

The second issue, regional variability, is common to all questions of resource management and protection: Does the proposed solution apply to all areas of the state? The example of riparian management zones (RMZ) illustrates the principles of Adaptive Management central to TFW.

In early discussions surrounding the proposed regulations that helped spawn TFW in 1986, an angry impasse had developed over RMZs. The previous regulatory package limited activity in streams and narrow streamside buffers. The new package proposed to widen the buffers, to 200 feet in some cases. The introduction of open TFW negotiations allowed cooperators to agree to provisional regulations and to "go where the truth leads" after further research. The key issue of resources at risk was answered when some cooperators "agreed to disagree" on the primary resource which would determine streamside protection. All cooperators agreed to a plan, pending research results, that would leave a continuous supply of trees to provide shading and woody debris for fisheries habitat.

The regional variability issue arose when TFW cooperators in Eastern Washington felt that the solutions agreed upon were inappropriate for conditions in their area. The following field season, research conducted by TFW cooperators showed that riparian zones on the east side of the state differed from those on the west. Eastside TFW cooperators agreed that wildlife considerations would play a significant role in determining RMZ requirements, and devised an entirely different method for designating RMZ dimensions and leave trees. None of these agreements are set in stone. They all must undergo scrutiny, criticism, research and revision under the precepts of Adaptive Management.

TFW Process And Structure

The TFW process is embodied in ground rules, a decision-making approach and acceptance of the concept of adaptive management. Ground rules include identifying the resource goals of all participants, developing and applying consensus-built solutions to problems, and a commitment to support the resulting agreements.

All committees and groups within TFW work toward making consensus decisions. They also can agree to disagree. Some issues require research and monitoring or further discussions, but this does not stall the process. This approach is applicable at all levels of discussion, including policy, technical and field. Once recommendations or options are developed, they move up the TFW organizational structure to be adopted as policy or procedure, or recommended as regulations.

Adaptive Management is a process that views natural resource management as experimental. Its premise is that scientific knowledge and experience gained by agreed-upon monitoring and evaluation will lead to more responsive approaches for managing natural resources. By accepting the concept of adaptive management, TFW participants are allowed flexibility to test or change prescriptions and methods instead of operating under a rigid set of regulations that can only be successfully challenged through litigation.

Implementation of the TFW Agreement requires the continued participation and commitment of state agencies, tribal governments, environmental organizations, federal agencies, county governments, forest landowners, and the public. The continued support of the legislative and executive branches of state government is also essential. To this

end, TFW participants have established an effective decision-making structure. Each TFW committee has a function designed to carry out the implementation of the TFW Agreement and address newly identified issues.

Following is a brief description of their function:

Policy Group:

The Policy Group is composed of directors of state agencies and policy representatives from federal and tribal governments, landowners and environmental groups. The Policy Group is the TFW Board of Directors.

Administrative Committee:


The Administrative Committee coordinates and implements the TFW Agreement. The Administrative Committee provides day-to-day management and implementation functions and serves as the TFW Executive Committee.

Standing Committees

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation And Research Committee:

The Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER) was established to answer ongoing scientific questions from the TFW Agreement. CMER is the "technical arm" of TFW.

**TFW
DECISION-MAKING
STRUCTURE**



Cultural/Archaeological Steering Committee:

The Cultural/Archaeological Steering Committee assists in the development of a system to protect cultural/archaeological resources under the TFW Agreement.

Field Implementation Committee:

The Field Implementation Committee (FIC) facilitates the implementation of the TFW Agreement, the Forest Practices Act and regulations at the regional and field levels.

Information Management Committee:

The Information Management Committee, currently awaiting funding, will be responsible for identifying and addressing information management issues related to TFW. Committee tasks include establishing data priorities and standards, and coordinating data collection and quality control.

Training, Information And Education Committee:

The TFW Training, Information and Education Committee was established to identify, design and conduct training, information and education projects with emphasis on ensuring consistency.

National Audubon Society Role in TFW

The National Audubon Society has been a contributing participant in TFW since the initial negotiations in 1986. Audubon is represented by professional staff in policy, field implementation, research and education activities of TFW. Volunteers from local Audubon chapters contribute to field activities such as Resource Management Plans, ID Teams and annual harvest reviews.


TFW ACCOMPLISHMENTS

1992

Policy level representatives met to forge a 1993 agenda for the TFW framework. The 1993 agenda will:

- ❖ Implement the sweeping 1992 Forest Practice Board rule changes;
- ❖ Advocate and support the TFW Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee program of result-oriented and applied research and monitoring;
- ❖ Explore options for involvement in the 1993 federal "Timber Summit";

NUMBER OF FOREST PRACTICE APPLICATIONS
Source: Department of Natural Resources



*1987 Data not available

Department of Ecology Role in TFW

Ecology's primary activities entail Forest Practice Application review, ID Teams, water rights investigations, protection of drinking water supplies, shoreline and wetlands determinations, compliance investigations, complaint response and enforcement (with DNR). The role of field staff in the future will be expanded to include training on water quality and wetlands issues and participation in watershed analyses. Ecology staff have played a key role in Resource Management Plan development.

Ecology has rule making responsibility under the Forest Practices Act and works closely with the Forest Practices Board. Ecology also has a responsibility to ensure that rules meet the requirements of the Federal Clean Water Act and its amendments, as well as the Coastal Zone Management Act.

- ❖ Develop landscape-based approach to basin planning that meets the needs of wildlife management;
- ❖ Assess the relationship of TFW to Growth Management planning; and
- ❖ Take action on the Washington Department of Wildlife Priority Habitat and Species program.

Worked with Forest Practices Board to finalize forest practices regulations.

Worked with Forest Practices Board on new rules which bring widespread change to the conduct of forest practices in Washington State:

- ❖ *Cummulative Effects*: Watershed analysis will be conducted statewide to assess and regulate cumulative effects on public resources of fish, water and capital improvements of the state or its political subdivisions. Site-specific prescriptions will be designed to protect public resources while maintaining a viable forest products industry.
- ❖ *Wetlands*: Harvesting, road construction, filling and draining are regulated in wetlands for the protection of wetland functions and public resources.
- ❖ *Class IV-Special and Critical Wildlife Habitat*: New provisions for State Environmental Policy Act review of forest practices involving aerial application of pesticides, threatened or endangered species, and slide-prone areas.
- ❖ *Wildlife Reserve Trees*: Certain trees are left after timber harvest to provide for wildlife habitat needs.
- ❖ *Shade Requirement*: TFW Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee research provided a scientific basis for an improved method for determining shade requirements on streams, providing additional protection to fish.
- ❖ *Clearcut Size and Timing*: Large areas harvested by even-aged harvest methods, including clearcuts, are subject to more intensive review.

Specific provisions are required for clearcuts on islands in salt water.

- ❖ *Chemicals:* Separate provisions cover pesticides, fertilizers and other forest chemicals, providing more protection for lands, fish and water quality.

Department of Natural Resources Role in TFW

The Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR) serves as the administrator of the state Forest Practices Program. DNR facilitates the consensus building process, promoting understanding of the rules and TFW process, and helping the process of ongoing change to be as smooth as possible. The department is the final administrative decision maker should consensus not be reached through TFW.

Acting in a trustee capacity, DNR manages approximately two million acres of forest land. Collectively, the state lands trusts are the largest non-

New rules training held for 500 TFW participants.

Watershed Analysis begun; training held for 250 scientists and consultants.

Over 50 major TFW Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee reports detailing research results made available.

TFW technical assistance provided to small landowners in Eastern Washington.

Provided wetlands training.

Department of Labor and Industries continued cooperative efforts to help achieve wildlife tree retention during timber harvests while providing for worker safety.

U.S. Forest Service participated in several Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee projects.

Completed stream temperature inventory of 12 important fish streams. Also conducted monitoring on specific fish habitat needs such as size and frequency of large organic debris, and pool frequency and depth.

Conducted hydrologic, fish habitat and slope stability analysis of Skagit River Basin.

Conducted extensive upgrading of state water type maps.

1991

Sustainable Forestry Roundtable proposal submitted to the 1991 legislature as the Sustainable Forestry Act.

New rules adopted regarding conversion of forest land to other uses.

Development begun on a landscape-based habitat evaluation technique to complement the watershed screening and analysis effort.

TFW Field Implementation Committee Forest Practices Compliance Survey conducted.

Computerized forest practices application system development begun.

Provided wetlands training for new forest practices rules.

Over a two-year period, spawning gravel assessment project completed and corrective action plan developed in the Yakima River Basin.

Initiated planning for a cultural resource survey program.

Field compliance report published in 1991.

1990

Discovered unknown cultural sites and registered them with the state office of Archaeological and Historical Preservation.

Proposed enhancement, mitigation and restoration plans to landowners who impact fisheries habitat.

Re-typed several streams, resulting in better fish protection.

Sustainable Forestry Roundtable convened.

TFW Wildlife Action Plan finalized.

Priority (wildlife) Habitats and Species project initiated.

TFW technical assistance provided to small landowners in Eastern Washington.

Standardized field data collection methods for ambient monitoring program.

Initiated cooperative efforts with a timber company to develop basin-wide plans in the Deschutes watershed.

Worked with U.S. Forest Services staff to share information.

County Governments' Role in TFW

County governments have important interests in the management of timber, fish and wildlife resources. Natural resource industries drive the economy of many communities in Washington State, their success or failure have significant direct and indirect impacts on the ability of local governments to provide services to their residents.

Several county commissioners participated in development of legislation through the Sustainable Forestry Roundtable. The Washington State Association of Counties was invited to join TFW policy discussions in 1991. County staff also have assisted in field implementation of TFW in several watersheds throughout the history of TFW.

Treaty Indian Tribes' Role in TFW

The tribes bring a dual responsibility to the TFW table. That of resource manager and sovereign government. Each aspect of the tribes' natural resource management responsibilities adds to their motivation in finding solutions and knowledge of the best way to achieve them. Each tribal government brings its own vision to TFW, as well as a holistic watershed approach to problem-solving.

1989

TFW statewide coordinators group formed to foster communications among cooperators.

Klahowya newsletters written and distributed to TFW participants and the general public.

Second Forest Practices/TFW training session held at Central Washington University for 350 TFW participants.

U.S. Forest Service Role in TFW

The U. S. Forest Service's management mandate includes the production of forest products and the conservation and protection of related public resources on National Forest System lands.

The primary role of the Forest Service in TFW is the promotion of integrated management efforts involving cumulative effects, water quality, fisheries and wildlife on federal and non-federal forest lands in Washington and the support of basic forest resource related research.

ID Team Guidelines developed and finalized.

Yakima and Nisqually Resource Management Plans (RMPs) initiated to voluntarily protect natural resources basin-wide.

Abandoned roads pilot project completed; recommendations made to TFW Policy Group for changes.

Mapped winter range habitat areas for elk, moose, and deer. Map locations for sensitive animal species were also plotted and a tracking system was developed.

Developed techniques to measure fish egg survival.

WDW field study of Riparian Management Zones and Upland Management Areas initiated.

Conducted public education efforts, such as presentations to school groups and citizen groups.

Prepared fisheries enhancement proposals for the Dungeness River.

Mid-winter bald eagle surveys conducted.

Snag recruitment program initiated.

Evaluated effectiveness of conditions placed on forest practices.

Conducted negotiations to develop a cooperative resolution to serious water resource management issues on the Pysht River.

Resolved deer winter range issues in Department of Natural Resources Northeast Region.

Department of Labor and Industries Role in TFW

The Department of Labor and Industries is not a co-signer of the TFW Agreement. Several issues of interest to TFW parties, however, may have a direct or potential impact on worker safety and health, which is a direct concern of the agency. The Department of Labor and Industries is involved with TFW in areas of wildlife tree retention planning, logging landing size and location, road construction, and other areas of timber harvests.

1988

Eastern Washington riparian study conducted to develop Riparian Management Zone rules.

Eastern Washington Riparian Management Zone rules adopted in May; supplemental Environmental Impact Statement written.

Department of Wildlife Role in TFW

The Washington Department of Wildlife, as an active participant in TFW, focuses on resolving policy issues, conducting research and monitoring activities, developing resource management plans, and field-reviewing forest management activities on state and private forest lands. The department works closely with the Governor's Timber Team, the Forest Practices Board, and the Department of Natural Resources. This has resulted in improved integration of wildlife protection with forest management on all forest lands.

Training provided to local TFW field staff on specific aspects of the forest rules such as Riparian Management Zones, road abandonment and soil stability.

TFW working groups set up in each Department of Natural Resources region; groups met monthly to implement TFW, work out ID Teams, build consensus.

Workshops held for the public on forest practices regulations and voluntary compliance with the spirit of TFW.

Wildlife Tree Safety program and intensive training for agencies, industry and other interests begun.

Cooperators provided recommendations to protect and enhance wildlife resources.

Washington Department of Wildlife developed a database of wildlife habitat relationships.

Investigated debris flows to determine cause and effect relationships, with particular emphasis on how they affect fisheries habitat.

Worked with private forest landowners and agencies to ensure more stable road locations, reduction of sediment, and improved long-term channel stability.

TFW ID Teams examined potential impact sites and completed draft cultural resource management plan for use on state and private lands.

Washington Environmental Council Role in TFW

The Washington Environmental Council is a statewide coalition of 100 citizen organizations and thousands of individual members working together to protect, restore and enhance the fish, wildlife and other natural resources of Washington. For 25 years the Council has been involved in education and advocacy. The Council has initiated and participated in negotiations to address environmental impacts, and, along with its member organizations, has maintained an active role monitoring forest practices management, regulation and planning.

Annual pre- and post-harvest reviews held. Harvest units were presented and commented upon, making it possible to address tribal concerns for resource protection in the design and structure of forest practices.

Pre-harvest review system developed to seek input from concerned parties at the beginning of the forest practices planning process.

Department of Fisheries Role in TFW

The Washington Department of Fisheries has been a contributing member of the TFW Agreement since its inception. Agency personnel have played an active role in CMER and FIC. The department's Deputy Director currently serves as co-chair of the TFW Policy Group. The department contributed substantially to the development of new forest practices rules that increase protection of fish habitat. It will be actively involved in watershed analysis directed at determining cumulative effects of forest practices. In 1992, the department established a Forest Practices Section to maintain its high level of commitment to TFW.

Private Forest Landowners' Role in TFW

The Washington Forest Protection Association and its members, private owners of nearly 5 million acres of forest land, and the Washington Farm Forestry Association, representing non-industrial forest land owners of 4 million acres, provide the "timber industry" perspective in TFW. The Forest Practices Act requires a balance between protection of public resources and a viable timber industry, one that can continue its contribution to Washington's economy by providing products, jobs and revenues to state and local governments.

Landowners support balanced rules based on sound business and scientific principles. A commitment to balance is expressed in the goals of TFW. Landowner objectives and management practices are often modified in recognition of the balance reflected in TFW goals. Local working relationships, communication with TFW participants, regulatory efficiency, science-based knowledge, balance and fairness are important factors to landowners. The landowner commitment to TFW is evident in their personal participation in all aspects of TFW, in their financial support of TFW activities, including CMER, and in their support of forest practices regulations that have often resulted in increased operational and administrative costs.

1987

New forest practices regulations proposed to implement provisions of the TFW Agreement; draft and final Environmental Impact Statement prepared; nine public hearings held statewide; rules adopted in November, 1987.

Forest Practices/TFW training session on new rules held for 250 TFW participants.

Department of Natural Resources field staff reorganized: Forest practices forester duties separated from state lands responsibilities.

