

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF LANDS

-----X

IN THE MATTER OF:

RULEMAKING PUBLIC HEARING  
FOR IDAPA 20.02.01

-----X

August 15, 2019; 4:30 PM

HELD AT: Coeur d'Alene, Idaho

BEFORE:

APPEARANCES:

TRANSCRIBER: CHARLENE E. GOLOJUCH

1 MR. CRAIG FOSS: All right. Welcome,  
2 everybody. My name is Craig Foss. I'm the Forestry  
3 and Fire Division Administrator for the Idaho  
4 Department of Lands. Thank you all for attending  
5 this hearing. Before we start, I want to provide  
6 some general background. The Idaho Department of  
7 Lands is not proposing any changes to 20-02-01  
8 Rules Pertaining to the Forest Practices Act.  
9 Currently, these rules are in a temporary proposed  
10 status and are anticipated to be reauthorized by the  
11 2020 legislature. This public hearing, by request,  
12 is focused on a specific subsection, the Stream  
13 Protection Rule, 030.07.e.ii, also known as, "The  
14 Shade Rule." The rules promulgation process  
15 described in the Idaho Administrative Bulletin of  
16 June 19th, opened all Idaho administrative rules to  
17 comment. For background on this rule, IDL entered  
18 into negotiated rule-making in 2012 through 2013, to  
19 develop new tree retention requirements for Class I  
20 fish-bearing streams. This was in response to water  
21 quality audit findings from as early as the year 2000  
22 that indicated the rules in place for shade and large  
23 woody debris recruitment for such streams were not  
24 adequately maintaining water quality. IDL believes  
25 the negotiating rule-making process was very

1 productive, and it ended with a new rule to promote  
2 landowners', forest management of the repairing area,  
3 on Class I streams, while providing statutorily  
4 required protection to maintain water quality. The  
5 new rule was published on July 1, 2014. The format  
6 of this hearing is prescribed by rule. This  
7 particular format for proposed rule-making does not  
8 include an opportunity for multi-party dialogue. The  
9 hearing is your opportunity to provide public  
10 testimony regarding the proposed rules pertaining to  
11 the Forest Practices Act. If you have questions or  
12 would like to discuss some other aspect of forest  
13 practices in Idaho, please contact Gary Hess  
14 directly. This is a public forum and I ask all of  
15 you to listen respectfully to all speakers and to  
16 speak respectfully to all listeners. The proposed  
17 rules were published in the June 19, 2019, Idaho  
18 Administrative Bulletin, Special Edition, Volume 19,  
19 pages 4,099 through 4,100; and pages 4,125 through  
20 4,151. The rule in the bulletin is the official  
21 version and all comments should be based on that  
22 version. Our rulemaking website is updated and  
23 provides a web link to the bulletin. A simple  
24 internet search for Idaho Administrative Bulletin 19-  
25 6-SE will lead you to the correct place to read the

**Ubiquis Reporting**

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612

Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

1 rules. Both written and oral comments are useful at  
2 this stage of the rule-making. Changes to the  
3 proposed rules can only be made based on written or  
4 oral comments received on or before August 16, 2019.  
5 IDL will review these comments and evaluate whether  
6 or not rule changes are needed. Your comments and  
7 any IDL suggestions for changes will be presented at  
8 the Idaho State Board of Land Commissioners meeting  
9 in September for a decision. We will compare the  
10 pending rule for review by the land commissioners at  
11 their October meeting. Based on their  
12 recommendation, we'll then submit the pending rule  
13 for consideration by the 2020 legislature. Please  
14 make sure the department receives your comments  
15 before August 16th. If you brought written comments  
16 today, please make sure to give us a copy, because  
17 written and oral comments receive equal treatment to  
18 ensure all who desire to testify get the opportunity  
19 to speak. Those who plan to submit written comments  
20 may want to use this opportunity to briefly summarize  
21 the written comments or to elaborate on specific  
22 points. Simply reading your submitted written  
23 comments verbatim does not enhance their impact.  
24 Regardless of whether you have written comments to  
25 submit, please do not hesitate to testify today.

**Ubiquis Reporting**

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612

Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

1 This is your opportunity to provide feedback on the  
2 rules. Please make sure that you signed in at the  
3 back of the room and have checked the boxes for  
4 either written testimony, oral testimony or both.  
5 Everyone who wants to speak gets one opportunity.  
6 There will be no rebuttals. A time limit on  
7 testimony may be necessary, depending on the number  
8 of attendees that signed up to testify. A few  
9 housekeeping matters. The restrooms and the water  
10 fountain are to the left of the front desk. You came  
11 in; the front desk was in front of you; to your left  
12 down the hall are restrooms and a water fountain.

13 MR. GARY HESS: The agenda for today is the  
14 introduction; then I will address water quality in  
15 Idaho, as it is impacted by forest practices; the  
16 history of Idaho fish-bearing stream, shade and tree  
17 retention rules, what is required by IDL through  
18 state statute and rule and why this rule-making is  
19 being conducted at this time; and then we'll take  
20 testimony. I'm not going to read my slides. I'll  
21 let you read the slides, but I will be reading my  
22 notes. And I'm reading the notes because we had a  
23 session this morning and I wanted to make sure that  
24 the presentation I make is identical between this  
25 afternoon's session and this morning's session.

**Ubiquis Reporting**

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612  
Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

1           Because of federal and state law, the structural  
2           relationships among federal and state agencies, the  
3           monitoring implemented by IDL and DEQ and the IDL  
4           Administration of Forest Practices BMP's , a non-  
5           point source discharge elimination system permit is  
6           not require for timber harvesting. Furthermore, a  
7           third-party certifier, such as the American Tree Farm  
8           System and the Sustainable Forestry Initiative,  
9           reference compliance with these best-management  
10          practices as part of their standards. This slide  
11          depicts the structural relationships and the  
12          monitoring processes in the Forest Practices Rule  
13          Development are depicted graphically on this slide.  
14          And it's a rather busy slide, so take your time  
15          looking at that and let me know if there's anything  
16          that doesn't make sense to you. I want to provide  
17          some detail on the history of the current Class I  
18          Tree Retention rules. Idaho's Forest Practice Rules  
19          were adopted nearly entirely from Oregon's original  
20          rules, which were likely developed by a group of  
21          foresters using the best knowledge available at the  
22          time. Both states' rules were developed in response  
23          to federal requirements under the Clean Water Act.  
24          It would have been inefficient to start from scratch,  
25          yet comparative review reveals that IDL foresters

**Ubiquis Reporting**

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612

Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

1 were selective in what was not adopted from those  
2 original rules. Over time, numerous modifications  
3 and additions have been accomplished by the Forest  
4 Practices Advisory Committee, but some of the rules  
5 remain intact from the earlier-adopted Oregon rules.  
6 In 1990, probably based on 15 year's experiences  
7 trying to develop selective cutting prescriptions,  
8 the original rule was simplified, but specific tree  
9 retention requirements were added. Those tree  
10 retention requirements were shown in this standing  
11 tree table depicted on the slide. There has always  
12 been a shade requirement and for almost two decades a  
13 standing tree requirement. Please note the current  
14 rule still supports the site specific riparian  
15 management prescription variance option implemented  
16 in 1990, where the rule cannot be met due to  
17 particular site conditions. Every four years, Idaho  
18 Department of Environmental Quality Practices  
19 Program by monitoring force practice operations near  
20 Class I streams on all but tribal lands in Idaho.  
21 These audits, combined with IDL identified  
22 enforcement issues have revealed the need to  
23 periodically make adjustments to Idaho's rules.  
24 Twenty years ago, the need to modify the 1972  
25 Development Rule was apparent. In 2004, auditors

**Ubiquis Reporting**

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612

Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

1 initial visual observations of tree-density were not  
2 borne out by subsequent stand density measurements  
3 that were taken during the audit. It was also clear  
4 that repeated entry under the 75% of current shade  
5 paradigm was contributing to water quality issues.  
6 IDL, FPAC and DEQ have evaluated available science  
7 and used empirical studies, as well as modeling, to  
8 inform shade and large-woody debris recruitment for  
9 aquatic habitat health. By the time of the 2012  
10 audit these efforts were well under way. I have  
11 provided a handout that goes into great detail  
12 regarding the rule adopted in 2014. I would  
13 encourage you to read it, because it provides way  
14 more detail than I have time to go into here. The  
15 rule is a compromise between simplicity and specific  
16 applicability in order to provide adequate protection  
17 statewide, while incorporating regional differences  
18 in forest types. Differing forest landscapes can  
19 support varying numbers of trees of varying species,  
20 so the rule uses the expected maximum tree density by  
21 forest type as a metric. The relative stocking  
22 compares actual stand density to this metric and the  
23 limits are set to avoid mortality, and yet still  
24 provide adequate shade and large woody debris. To do  
25 less would risk not adequately meeting water quality

**Ubiquis Reporting**

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612

Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

1 requirements and to do more by incorporating  
2 orientation, topography and stream size would only  
3 create a less manageable rule and likely not gain  
4 much in maintaining water quality. I'm going to  
5 focus now on what IDL is continuing to do to help  
6 landowners achieve their forest management  
7 objectives, while demonstrating that the relative  
8 stocking limits are achieving the desired metrics for  
9 water quality. Idaho private forestry specialists  
10 have conducted hundreds of site visits to assist  
11 landowners and operators with the rule. IDL and IDEQ  
12 have conducted surveys and studies to determine how  
13 the rule is being implemented, how often and how much  
14 actual cutting occurs, and how harvesting relates to  
15 shade reduction. The IDL operational monitoring  
16 survey determined that from 2016 through 2018,  
17 approximately two-thirds of stream protection zones  
18 identified for harvest have demonstrated some level  
19 of harvest. Of those, nearly all of the industrial  
20 landowners and two-thirds of the non-industrial  
21 landowners choose the 60-10, option two. The DEQ  
22 shade effectiveness study will calculate shade  
23 removal through pre-harvest and post-harvest  
24 measurements of sites harvested to the exact limit of  
25 the rule. IDL and FPAC committed to using the

**Ubiquis Reporting**

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612

Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

1 empirical information from these studies to compare  
2 with the calculations done when the rule was  
3 formulated. These comparisons will reveal if the  
4 current relative stocking limits are supported by  
5 what is actually happening on the ground. Idaho had  
6 a legacy fish-bearing stream tree retention rule that  
7 audit findings determined did not adequately protect  
8 shade nor large woody debris recruitment. Regulators  
9 struggled with the term "significant and  
10 substantial," and how to define current shade, post-  
11 harvest shade and until shade recovers. Responsible  
12 operators did not have a definitive guide with which  
13 to manage the timber and the SPZ and uncertain, left  
14 more than necessary. Irresponsible operators  
15 practiced multiple reentry until SPZ's were laid  
16 bare--laid nearly bare, or they were cited. Stand  
17 conditions of riparian areas range from severely  
18 understocked to heavily overstocked and unhealthy.  
19 Today with the current rule, nearly two decades of  
20 research and deliberation have gone into the current  
21 rule and research continues to ensure its validity.  
22 Many operators are surprised at the degree of  
23 management flexibility with in the SPZ, while still  
24 providing sufficient stream protection. A majority  
25 are selecting the option to harvest prescription,

**Ubiquis Reporting**

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612

Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

1 which can provide easily accessible value but also  
2 leaves more trees in the inner-50 feet where the  
3 shade contribution is greater. In many cases, more  
4 trees are being left in the outer-25 feet than  
5 before, which results in a less abrupt change in the  
6 canopy than the previous 50-foot standing tree  
7 buffer. Now, I'd like to discuss the rule-making  
8 process that we're in today. As governed by the  
9 Administrative Procedures Act of Idaho Code, Title  
10 67, Chapter 52, all rules expire July 1st of every  
11 year, unless extended by statute by the legislature.  
12 The legislature did not do this in 2019. All state  
13 agencies initiated a temporary and proposed rule-  
14 making to fill the regulatory gaps. Temporary rules  
15 were effective on June 30, 2019. For IDAPA 20-02-  
16 01, rules pertaining to the Idaho Forest Practices  
17 Act, no changes are proposed to the temporary  
18 proposed rule at this time. This diagram shows a  
19 hierarchy of state documents, from the constitution  
20 down to legislative statutes and the state agency  
21 rules, which is where we are today in this  
22 discussion. And below that are policies, procedures,  
23 guidelines and other written interpretations of the  
24 administrative rules. Under normal negotiated rule-  
25 making there would be stakeholder, technical expert

**Ubiquis Reporting**

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612

Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

1 and Forest Practices Advisory Committee discussions  
2 about requested or suggested rule changes well in  
3 advance of the Land Board approval to enter rule-  
4 making, which typically would occur sometime around  
5 April. There would then be a negotiated rule-making  
6 process to craft specific language then to ensure all  
7 interested parties participate prior to a proposed  
8 rule. This did not happen in this unique situation.  
9 The current rules went directly to the proposed  
10 rules. We started in late June in this current  
11 process with these proposed rules and we are here, in  
12 August now, in the proposed rule-making status. The  
13 very compressed timeline from June to August results  
14 from the Office of Administrative Rules trying to fit  
15 this unique situation into their normal business  
16 schedule. This chart is basically just to compare  
17 what the normal negotiated rule-making timeline would  
18 look like compared to the proposed rule situation  
19 that we're in as a result of the rules not being  
20 reauthorized in January. No negotiations were held  
21 because the existing rules were proposed for  
22 adoption. Changes usually require a negotiated rule-  
23 making. Public comment period is required for  
24 proposed rule-making. In this case, sufficient  
25 petitions were received to schedule a public hearing

**Ubiquis Reporting**

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612

Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

1 for IDAPA 20-02-01, as required by Idaho Code, and  
2 the hearing was scheduled for today, August 15th, in  
3 Coeur d'Alene by request and scheduled in accordance  
4 with 74--excuse me--Title 74, Chapter 204. Public  
5 comments will be accepted through August 16. Changes  
6 to the proposed rule can only be made based on  
7 testimony received at hearing or written comments.  
8 Comments on the proposed rule will be presented at  
9 the September Land Board meeting. Then a proposed  
10 rule will be presented at the October Land Board  
11 meeting and then it would become a pending rule. And  
12 that pending rule and notice must be submitted to the  
13 Office of Administrative Rules by October 16th in  
14 order to get it in to the legislative session, the  
15 2020 legislative session. The format for the hearing  
16 is an opportunity to provide testimony. Time limit  
17 may be imposed depending upon the number of people  
18 signed up to provide oral testimony. Written  
19 comments will also be accepted. This is an  
20 opportunity to comment on the current proposed rule.  
21 It is not a forum to negotiate the proposed rule  
22 language. And with that, we can start our public  
23 testimony. Matt, could you state your name?

24 MR. MATT NYKIEL: Yeah. My name's Matt  
25 Nykiel, N-Y-K-I-E-L, and I'm with the Idaho

1 Conservation League.

2 MR. HESS: If you could please provide your  
3 testimony. There's a microphone here at the podium.

4 MR. NYKIEL: So, Matt Nykiel, with the Idaho  
5 Conservation League. In general, our comments are  
6 just that we would encourage IDL to reject any  
7 changes at this point to the current rule. As was  
8 presented, there's currently a University of Idaho  
9 study underway. We would recommend that we hold off  
10 on changing the rule until that study comes out.  
11 We'd know more information about what the best  
12 adaptive management strategies there are. And we'd  
13 also like to note that, as you're all well aware, the  
14 Shared Stewardship Program is getting off the ground.  
15 And so, we're concerned that if there were changes  
16 made now to the rule it would create, potentially,  
17 too great uncertainty between the state and federal  
18 government on how to run shared stewardship and  
19 whether or not any changes to the rule would  
20 adequately be required to the Clean Water Act NEPA.  
21 And so, that's just added reason why we're  
22 recommending that no changes be made at this point;  
23 we wait until the University of Idaho study is  
24 completed and we continue to maintain that certainty  
25 between state and federal governments for shared

**Ubiquis Reporting**

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612

Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

1 stewardship. We'll be submitting some written  
2 comments that have a bit more detail, but that's  
3 just...

4 MR. HESS: Okay, thank you.

5 MR. NYKIEL: Thanks.

6 MR. HESS: Is there anybody that called in  
7 that wanted to provide oral testimony?

8 MR. HAWK STONE: This is Hawk Stone DEQ .

9 MR. HESS: Yes.

10 MR. STONE: Hawk Stone ?

11 MR. HESS: Yes, we can hear you.

12 MR. STONE: Okay. I just wanted to let you  
13 know that I'm not going to be testifying right now.

14 CORI: Can I get your name, first, please?  
15 You kind of came in at the--in the middle of it.

16 MR. STONE: [Unintelligible].

17 CORI: Can you give me your name? I'm  
18 sorry. I couldn't catch you. What's your first  
19 name? Hello? Sir?

20 MR. HESS: Cori, We'll get his name to you.

21 CORI: Okay.

22 MR. HESS: Anybody else? Okay. That ends  
23 our public testimony. Thank you all. Appreciate it  
24 very much.

25 [END OF HEARING]