

INDEX

March 7, 2007 Board of Forestry Meeting Minutes

<u>Item #</u>		<u>Page #</u>
A.	Minutes – December 14, 2006 Board Meeting via Teleconference.....	3
B.	Minutes – January 3, 2007 Board Meeting	3
C.	Approval of State Forester’s Financial Transactions – FY 2006	3
D.	Rangeland Protective Association Formation	3
E.	2007-09 Biennial Budget Update.....	4
F.	Wildfire Risk Management – Issue 7	4
1.	State Forester and Board Member Comments	4
1A.	Public Comment.....	4
2.	State Forests Management – Issue 2, Obj. 1 – Performance Measures	5
3.	State Forests Management – Issue 2, Obj. 2 – Elliott State Forest	7
4.	State Forests Management – Issue 2, Obj. 4 – Land Acquisition	8
6.	Forest Regulation – Issue 3, Obj. 3 – Voluntary Methods.....	8
7.	Wildfire Risk Management – Issue 7, Obj. 3 – Smoke Management Plan.....	9
5.	Forest Vitality – Issue 3, Obj. 2 – Federal Forestlands Advisory Committee	11

Items listed in order heard

The attachments listed below are available on the web @ <http://egov.oregon.gov/ODF/Board>

Attachments

- (1) Community Forestry Initiative, Agenda Item 1
- (2) Position Statements of the Oregon Society of American Foresters, Agenda Item 1A
- (3) BoF/CSL Map, Agenda Item 2
- (4) Staff Presentation - Performance Measures, Agenda Item 2
- (5) State Forests Performance Measure Matrix, Agenda Item 2
- (6) Staff Presentation – Elliott State Forest Planning Update, Agenda Item 3
- (7) Staff Presentation – Land Acquisition and Exchanges, Agenda Item 4
- (8) Coho Conservation Plan Endorsement Letter, Agenda Item 6
- (9) Staff Presentation – Smoke Management Plan, Agenda Item 7
- (10) OAR Revisions – Smoke Management Plan, Agenda Item 7
- (11) DEQ Presentation – Smoke Management Plan, Agenda Item 7
- (12) DEQ Smoke Management Rule Proposal, Agenda Item 7
- (13) Public Comments – Mike Dykzeul, Agenda Item 7
- (14) Staff Presentation – FFAC Update, Agenda Item 5
- (15) FFAC Vision and Goal Statements, Agenda Item 5

OREGON STATE BOARD OF FORESTRY
March 7, 2007 Meeting Minutes

In accordance with the provisions of ORS 526.016, a meeting of the Oregon Board of Forestry was held at the State Forester's Headquarters, 2600 State Street, Salem, Oregon. Chair Hobbs called the public meeting to order at 8:02 a.m.

Board Members Present:

Steve Hobbs, Chair Larry Giustina Diane Snyder
Jennifer Phillippi Barbara Craig Chris Heffernan

Absent:

Bill Hutchison

Others Present:

Patti Case, Green Diamond
David Cramsey, Roseburg Lumber Co.
Mike Dykzeul, Oregon Forest Industries Council
Eric Geyer, Roseburg Forest Products
Wayne Giesy
Andy Ginsburg, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Craig Hanneman, Oregon Forest Industries Council
M. Hough, LRAPA
Chris Jarmer, Oregon Forest Industries Council
Barry Jones, Pacific Rivers Council
Eric Karaush, Giustina Land and Timber
Rod Krahmer, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Greg Miller, Weyerhaeuser Co.
Harold Merritt, Plum Creek Timberlands
R. Wade Mosby, Collins Companies
Dick Posekany, Frank Lumber Co.
Bob Ragon, Douglas Timber Operators
Ralph Saperstein, Douglas Timber Operators
Gary Springer, Starker Forests
Rex Storm, Associated Oregon Loggers
Ray Wilkeson, Oregon Forest Industries Council
Bob Van Dyk, Wild Salmon Center
Tim Vredenburg, Coquille Indian Tribe
Marc Vomocil, Oregon Society of American Foresters
Ken Williamson, Environmental Quality Commission
Marvin Brown, State Forester
Gayle Birch, Board Support
Darlene Downey
Dan Postrel, Agency Affairs
Rob Nichols
Jeff Foreman
Jeri Chase
Clark Seely, Associate State Forester
Pam Stroebel Valencia

Jim Paul, ASF Forest Mgt.
Lisa DeBruyckere
Jeff Brandt
Barbara Lee
Rosemary Mannix
Nancy Hirsch
Patty Cate
Paul Bell, ASF Protection
Charlie Stone
Jim Trost
Bob Young

Ted Lorensen, ASF Resources
David Morman, Forest Resources
Kevin Birch
Gary Lettman
Peter Daugherty, Private Forests
Mike Cafferata
Mike Bordelon, NWOA
Jim Young, Coos District

Consent Agenda

A. MINUTES – DECEMBER 14, 2006 CONFERENCE CALL

Approved by consent.

The minutes of the December 14, 2006 conference call are approved.

B. MINUTES – JANUARY 3, 2007 BOARD MEETING

Approved by consent.

The minutes of the January 3, 2007 meeting are approved.

C. APPROVAL OF STATE FORESTER'S FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS –
FY 2006

Approved by consent.

**The State Forester's travel expenses and leave usage transactions for
fiscal year 2006 are approved.**

D. RANGELAND PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION FORMATION

Approved by consent.

**The Department is directed to hold a public hearing on the subject of
providing protection from fire for private rangelands in the vicinity of
Juntura, Oregon.**

E. 2007-09 BIENNIAL BUDGET UPDATE

Information – update on the 2007-09 Governor’s Recommended Budget.

F. WILDFIRE RISK MANAGEMENT – ISSUE 7

Objective 2 – Treatment of Vacant Lots Under the Oregon Forestland-Urban Interface Fire Protection Act

Approved by consent.

The amendments to High Density Extreme/Vacant Lot OAR 629-044-1005, 629-044-1020 and 629-044-1075 are adopted.

Action and Information:

1. STATE FORESTER AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

State Forester Marvin Brown relinquished his time for three reports from staff.

Dan Postrel, Agency Affairs Director provided a brief update of the major bills under consideration by the Legislative Assembly.

Jim Paul, Assistant State Forester provided a brief update on the Community Forestry Initiative (Attachment 1). The subject will be discussed in depth at the Board’s April 26, 2007 meeting.

Mike Bordelon, Northwest Oregon Area Director reported the revised estimate of windthrow salvage opportunities was 16 million board feet in the Astoria, Forest Grove and Tillamook Districts.

Chris Heffernan urged the Board and Department to move quickly with the Community Forestry Initiative.

Diane Snyder urged the Department to seek out partners in other sectors also working on Community Forestry issues. Ms. Snyder announced that she had accepted a position with the U.S. Endowment, and would remain in Oregon.

1A. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Marc Vomocil, Chair-elect, Oregon Society of American Foresters (SAF) provided a copy of the position statements of the Oregon SAF (Attachment 2), and focused his comments on the most recent position, Commercial Timber Harvest on Public Lands in Oregon.

2. STATE FORESTS MANAGEMENT – ISSUE 2
Objective 1 – Adapting Forest Management Plans, Performance Measures

Jim Paul, Assistant State Forester distributed copies of a map illustrating the location and acreages of Board of Forestry and Common School Lands administered by the Department (Attachment 3). He also provided copies of the presentation (Attachment 4) and copies of the revised Performance Measure Matrix (Attachment 5).

Lisa DeBruyckere, State Forests Program Director reviewed the nine proposed performance measures, and related indicators, designed to represent the integration of the economic, environmental, and social values that comprise greatest permanent value:

The following reflects key points of the Board's discussion of each proposed measure and indicators.

1. Achieve a Minimum Net Return on Asset Value (ROAV) Calculated across All State Forestlands and Per Each Forest

- Measures to be used together and their influences on each other analyzed.
- Consider revising the performance measure to reflect more than timber harvests and economics.
- Recognize that all of the measures are integrated.

2. Direct and Indirect Financial Contributions from State Forests Program Management to Support Communities

- Clarified the Board is looking at the State's contributions and is not taking responsibility for community resiliency.
- Must be able to articulate contributions to communities and make management decisions with that awareness in mind.
- Proactive language regarding benefits.
- Set appropriate context and reflect the realities of the time.

3. Direct and Indirect State Forests program Financial Contributions to Local and State Government Services

- Represent the multiplier effect.
- Incorporate global look during analysis.

4. Forest Health

- Evaluate the effect of structure-based management on forest health.

5. Percent of Road that Have Hydrologic Connections to Stream Networks and Percent of Stream Crossings with Barriers to Fish Passage

- Utilize partnership opportunities.

- 6. Quantity of Habitat by Forest Management Plan Stand Structure Type, Habitat Components, and the Use of Those Areas by Native Fish and Wildlife**
- 7. Availability, Quality, and Public Use of Recreational Opportunities and Educational Programs**
- 8. Degree of Public Involvement in State Forestland Activities and Processes**
- 9. Support and Public Awareness of the Management of State Forestlands**

- Differentiate between opinions and educational opportunities.

Following discussion of the performance measures and indicators, Jim Paul noted that staff would report on the performance measure indicator outcomes at the Board's June 6, 2007 meeting. Staff would also present an evaluation of the suite of outcomes and provide recommendations on adjustments to the measures to best meet Greatest Permanent Value.

To assist staff in preparing for the June evaluation, the Board discussed the primary tier structure and analysis constraints.

Diane Snyder stated her premise was that existing management was meeting Greatest Permanent Value; of importance was how the indicators match up with Greatest Permanent Value under the existing Forest Management Plans.

Jennifer Phillippi expressed reservations that structure-based management was meeting Greatest Permanent Value; the economic piece was not playing out.

Barbara Craig expressed concern that asset performance was too low and should be measured against a significant increase; the full range should be displayed.

Chair Hobbs suggested the Board examine various scenarios within the context of structure-based management. If the Board determined that Greatest Permanent Value was not being achieved, the next step would be to look beyond structure-based management.

Following the Board's discussion, Chair Hobbs called for public comment, and then asked staff to return for a final discussion.

Bob Van Dyk, Wild Salmon Center, expressed general support for most of the proposed performance measures. He observed that measure 6 was focused on permanent plot data, and would not measure salmon run health. Regarding measure 1, he stated the phrase "achieve minimum net return" was an indicator not a goal, and noted that wider values of public goods would not be reflected in the timber harvest measure.

Marvin Brown described the process for the Board's review and work at the June 6, 2007 meeting. Staff will first report on the nine specific performance measures, followed by a discussion of the likelihood of achievement of Great Permanent Value given the current performance measure outcomes. The third step would be to discuss improvements that could be made toward achieving Greatest Permanent Value if other management approaches were used, and evaluate the likely results and outcomes across the suite of performance measures.

Following a brief discussion, and with Board consensus, Chair Hobbs ordered:

The nine proposed performance measures and associated indicators are approved.

A review of the performance measures will be conducted June 6, 2007, in the context of a range of possible Forest Management Plan improvements, to determine whether or not Greatest Permanent Value is likely to be achieved.

3. STATE FORESTS MANAGEMENT – ISSUE 2
Objective 2 – Endangered Species Act Compliance Tools, Elliott State Forest

Jim Young, Coos District Forester, and Barbara Lee, State Forests Program Policy and Planning Manager provided an update on the Elliott State Forest Planning Process (Attachment 6).

The Elliott State Forest is currently managed under a Forest Management Plan and a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) for the northern spotted-owl. Approval of the HCP in 1995 enabled the US Fish and Wildlife Service to issue the Department a 60-year Incidental Take Permit (ITP) for the northern spotted-owl and a 6-year ITP for the marbled murrelet, which expired October 3, 2001.

The current HCP revision process seeks to provide coverage for the northern spotted-owl, marbled murrelet, and other species. The process is currently in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) phase, which requires an analysis of the "federal action area." The NEPA analysis is referred to as an *Environmental Impact Statement* (EIS), and a draft EIS (DEIS) is being prepared. The DEIS, and the draft multi-species HCP is scheduled for public comment, under NEPA, in June 2007.

Mr. Young reviewed the proposed landscape strategy for the Elliott State Forest and HCP alternatives' annual volume and value.

Marvin Brown noted that the combination of murrelet take avoidance and the current HCP constraints limit the options available. Larry Giustina was concerned that there was little assurance that the habitat conservation strategies would be supported by the Federal Services.

Bob Ragon, Douglas Timber Operators clarified communications with the State Land Board, noted their modeling runs did not assume the de-listing of the marbled murrelet; take avoidance strategies were applied. Responding to Larry Giustina's question, Mr. Ragon stated that he understood the State's murrelet protocol assumes sites would be occupied forever.

4. STATE FORESTS MANAGEMENT – ISSUE 2
Objective 4 – Evaluate the OAR for land Acquisitions and Exchanges

Nancy Hirsch, State Forests Program Asset Unit Manager, and Patty Cate, Land Specialist reviewed the Land Acquisition and Exchange Rules Issue Paper (Attachment 7).

Acquiring land for stated statutory purposes is established ORS 530.010. The Board may acquire lands that are chiefly valuable for the production of forest crops, watershed protection and development, erosion control, grazing, recreation, or forest administrative purposes. The current rules were approved by the Board in September 2001.

Two bills before the current Legislature present alternative for the acquisition of forestland. **The Department recommended deferring revision of the current OAR until the Legislators complete their work.**

In the interim, staff will finalize its internal draft policy, procedure, and guidance documents based on the current rule. District long-range acquisition and exchange plans will be updated, and high priority opportunities will be pursued.

Ms. Hirsch noted she had a conversation with Bill Hutchison, and relayed his request that the Board assure there was alignment overall within the policy direction.

6. FOREST REGULATION – ISSUE 6
Objective 3 – Voluntary Methods
Conservation Plan for the Oregon Coast Coho Evolutionary Significant Unit

Mike Cafferata and Jo Morgan, Private Forests Program described the key points of the Coho Conservation Plan, part of the Department of Fish and Wildlife's Native Fish Conservation Policy requirements and represents progression of the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds (Oregon Plan). Oregon maintains management jurisdiction of the species as coastal coho have not been listed as a threatened species.

The Oregon Coast Coho Conservation Plan strives to ensure the continued viability of the Oregon Coast Coho Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU) and would achieve a desired status that provides substantial ecological and societal benefits.

The Department will continue to support the Conservation Plan through ongoing administration of the Forest Practices Act, conducting monitoring and research, and working directly with landowners to identify opportunities to improve coho habitat.

Following a brief discussion, and with Board consensus, Chair Hobbs ordered:

The Board endorses the Coho Conservation Plan as Oregon's collective means for conservation of the coastal Coho under the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds.

The extraordinary efforts of the Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife in leading the preparation of the plan are recognized, as are the efforts of the stakeholders, including forest landowner representatives, who assisted with the development of the plan.

The Department is directed to actively participate in the governance of the plan and to facilitate the forestland commitments and obligations to the extent provided for in the Department's budget.

The draft letter to the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission endorsing the Oregon Coast Coho Conservation Plan is approved (Attachment 7).

7. WILDFIRE RISK MANAGEMENT – ISSUE 7
Objective 3 – Smoke Management Plan Implementation

[This item was heard in two parts, for continuity, it is shown here in total.]

Charlie Stone and Jim Trost, Protection from Fire Program reviewed the management forecasting process (Attachment 9), and provided an update on the revisions to the Smoke Management Plan OAR proposal (Attachment 10) since the Board's January 3, 2007 meeting. The Department intends to address the fee structure further at a later date.

Mr. Stone highlighted the elements of the redesigned rule on sensitive smoke receptor area (SSRA) designation criteria, which has been revised to require a showing that there have been smoke incidents in a community despite proper application of the smoke management plan.

The proposal requires the Board of Forestry to evaluate evidence to determine the best course of action, and lists several types of information that should be considered. The proposal specifies the range of actions that the Board may take, but states that for communities over 10,000 in population, if a threshold of past incidents has been exceeded, the only choices will be SSRA designation or installation of mechanical monitoring equipment to aid in a final decision within two years.

Ken Williamson, Environmental Quality Commissioner stated the Environmental Quality Commission (EQC) valued the use of prescribed burning to control fuel loads in the forests, yet was highly sensitive to the emission of fine particulates and mercury, and the effects on human health.

Andy Ginsburg, Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Administrator described the air quality issues under consideration by the EQC (Attachment 11), and discussed the DEQ's proposed alternative SSRA criteria rule for the Board's consideration (Attachment 12). Mr. Ginsburg noted the key difference between Forestry's and DEQ's working drafts was that only one agency's approval would be required for SSRA designation in population areas over 10,000.

Following the presentations, Chair Hobbs called for public comments.

Mike Dykzeul, Oregon Forest Industries Council expressed concern that the Department's revised rules emphasize "other airborne pollution" considerations and the option for DEQ to request SSRA designation based upon those pollutants. Mr. Dykzeul offered specific recommendations for rule revision (Attachment 13). He noted that successful restoration of General Funds would be the cornerstone for upgrading technology, improving forecast for public protection and bridging the financial impacts to a flat rate system.

David Cramsey, Roseburg Lumber Co. reiterated earlier comments that rules and regulations that reduced the opportunities to burn, or increase the costs of burning, would greatly affect the public in terms of greater wildfire emissions and wildfire suppression costs. He noted the greatest smoke pollutant was from wildfires, yet prescribed burning was being restricted for air quality. He urged the Department and DEQ to implement a system that would provide real-time data that could be effectively communicated to forecasters.

Following public comment, the Board discussed the proposal with assistance from Charlie Stone, Andy Ginsburg and Ken Williamson. Topics discussed were airborne pollutants, backyard burning, episodic events, incident occurrence, frequency, duration and intensity of verified smoke impact criteria, and how should the statutes governing the Smoke Management Plan be interpreted with relation to the authority to propose and/or approve changes to the plan.

Barbara Craig supported the proposed systematic, evidence-based approach, with established criteria. She encouraged the agencies to work toward joint recommendations to preserve the existing balance of authority.

A Board of Forestry member will attend the EQC meeting in Bend, April 19 and 20, 2007, to discuss the Board's perspective. The Department will return to the Board at its June 6, 2007 meeting with a final rule proposal and a recommendation for approval to begin the formal rulemaking process.

5. FOREST VITALITY – ISSUE 3
Objective 2 – Federal Forestlands, Federal Forestlands Advisory Committee

Kevin Birch, Forest Resource Planning Program, provided an update on the activities of the Federal Forestlands Advisory Committee (Attachment 15).

The Federal Forestlands Advisory Committee (FFAC) was created in 2006 to assist the Board of Forestry in completing the Governor’s charge to “create a unified vision of how federal lands should contribute” to sustainability of Oregon’s forests.

The FFAC is currently developing a Situation Assessment that would provide information on forest trends and conditions to assist in the identification of the most pressing problems to be addressed in the Guidance Document. Mr. Birch summarized background information provided to the FFAC.

FFAC members Wade Mosby, Collins Companies, Tim Vredenburg, Coquille Indian Tribe and Ken Williamson, Environmental Quality Commission engaged the Board in a discussion of the FFAC’s latest draft Vision and Goal statements (Attachment 16). In general, the statements were well received by the Board, and members offered their perspectives for consideration by the FFAC. Board members were encouraged to provide input to FFAC members as their work continues.

There being no further business before the Board, Chair Hobbs adjourned the meeting at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marvin Brown, State Forester and
Secretary to the Board

GB