

**Oregon Board of Forestry
Federal Forestlands Advisory Committee Meeting
February 5, 2007**

Oregon Department of Forestry
2600 State Street, Building C, Tillamook Room
Salem, OR 97310

Meeting Summary

Welcome, and review meeting objectives and agenda

Steve Hobbs, Chair of the Advisory Committee and the Board of Forestry, welcomed the committee members, and reviewed the agenda and meeting objectives which include:

- Begin developing a shared understanding of the current situation
- Develop a working vision statement
- Finalize the charter
- Discuss presentation to Board of Forestry that representatives from the Advisory Committee will make in March
- Plan the agenda for the next FFAC meeting on March 9

Review of draft January meeting summary

Robert Fisher, facilitator with Fisher Collaborative Services, reviewed the January 30, 2007 version of the meeting summary with the committee, and it was approved with corrections to a meeting attendee's name.

Robert noted that Ralph Bloemers was not able to attend this committee meeting and introduced Ralph's colleague, Chris Winter, who was sitting in to offer comments, and convey information back to Ralph. Robert also reminded the group of their decision not to have alternates, and instead for committee members to stay informed if they could not attend a meeting.

Federal Agency Views about the Process

Mike Haske, Bureau of Land Management, began his comments by noting that the management of federal lands is guided by a variety of laws, regulations, and policies, and the BLM is in the middle of extensive efforts to update their land use plans for western Oregon that will also be followed by a regulatory process. The BLM does not view the committee's work as a substitute for public involvement or the more formalized relationship with the state as an official cooperating agency in that planning process. They BLM does view the committee as a tremendous opportunity to discuss public land issues, and also for BLM to explain it's views about the O&C story, including the legislative direction affecting the management of O&C lands.

Mike stated that producing timber on a sustainable basis is the dominant use of O&C lands as described in the legislation and by the courts. This is a distinctly different management direction from the U. S. Forest Service. The importance of this mandate is becoming increasingly

highlighted by the recent ending of the Secure Rural Schools Act, which will cause significant general fund reductions for many of Oregon's counties.

The BLM manages some of the most highly productive forests in the world. Some current statistics:

- Estimated Annual Growth: 1.2 billion board feet
- Estimated Annual Mortality: 124 million board feet
- Current calculated ASQ under the Northwest Forest Plan: 203 million board feet per year

Mike noted that the BLM takes its commitment to economic and community stability under the O&C Act seriously and also plays an active role in providing habitat for recovery efforts for endangered species in partnership with other federal agencies. The BLM would like the committee to recognize these commitments. In addition, the BLM will continue to provide dispersed and developed recreation opportunities.

BLM manages about 230,000 acres of eastside-forested lands, primarily focused on forest restoration, fuels reduction, and forest health objectives. There are a significant number of juniper woodlands in eastern Oregon in need of restoration due to juniper encroachment over the past 100+ years, and BLM will be interested in the committee's discussions about these forests.

Lisa Freedman, U. S. Forest Service, stated that the USFS also welcomed broadening the discussion about management of public lands and how to manage diverse use, and viewed the committee as an excellent way to get additional information. She noted that other processes for input about USFS management would be replaced by this discussion rather the committee is another venue for those discussions. USFS appreciated the state taking the initiative to start the conversation. The USFS would like to continue to work with the committee and would like the committee to work with them.

She cautioned the committee not to develop unrealistic expectations and it would be very helpful if the committee could understand the complexity of their management situation. She noted, that while much discussion has focused on the rural impacts and the rural communities, the I-5 corridor is a significant urban area and there are a lot of urban users on Oregon's national forests. Both constituencies must be considered. She also noted that USFS also is responsible for public lands in the states of Washington and Idaho, and whatever direction is taken for Oregon would have implications there also.

Lisa encouraged the committee to think about future issues over the next 20 years – not to solve problems from the past 20 years. She noted that the USFS has a new Chief, Abigail Kimball, who is an advocate for collaborative forums and listening and working together.

Lisa stated that the USFS would also like eventually for the committee and the state to help them communicate exactly what is happening on federal lands and be advocates for some of the projects that are going on. Lisa also noted that they intend to take the information from committee and work it into their desired future conditions during forest plan revisions.

Questions for the federal agency representatives from the committee included:

- the role of state government in federal forest land policy,

- if there was a place for a single set of forest policies from the state for federal forestlands in the future,
- the role of the Northwest Forest Plan, and
- whether there will be long-term contracts for national forests.

Both Lisa and Mike responded that they view the state as a partner. Lisa noted that ecosystems do not respect lines on a map so we need to be very close partners, and that there are often very close working relationships at the local level. Mike also agreed that the management of BLM lands impacted lands with other ownership and vice versa.

Lisa and Mike indicated that the agencies were operating under the Northwest Forest Plan. A core principle of the Northwest Forest Plan is to look at the science and identify better management strategies. BLM is going through revisions of individual resource management plans focusing on the dominant use of community stability under the O&C Act while integrating the appropriate conservation strategies for species listed under the Endangered Species Act and other regulatory requirements such as the Clean Water and Clean Air Acts. The Northwest Forest Plan amended each of the individual forest or district resource management plans for USFS and BLM.

BLM has 10-year contracting authority and is exploring using them for biomass and stewardship contracting. Lisa offered to check on USFS' use of long-term contracts.

Steve Hobbs the federal lands are national lands and there is interest in them from all of the nation's citizens; yet the impacts can be very local, and policies are almost always most acutely felt at the local level. Integrating those needs – local and state and national – will be the exciting challenge in the committee's work.

Situation Assessment – Presentation and Discussion

Kevin Birch, ODF, gave a presentation that provided an overview of the current situation – an assessment of Oregon's forestlands. He was assisted by Peg Boulay, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, who presented the section on biological diversity, and Marianne Fitzgerald, Department of Environmental Quality, who presented the section on maintaining soil, water, and air quality. The full situation assessment presentation is available on the committee's web page at <http://www.oregon.gov/ODF/BOARD/FFAC.shtml>.

Members of the committee raised the following questions and concerns from the presentation:

- Juniper acreage, which has increased significantly to approximately 5-6 million acres – probably a 95 percent increase over what existed pre-settlement
- Late successional reserves and critical habitat designations
- Oregon Conservation Strategy (e.g. priorities, data, partnerships, and success measures)
- Ownership shifts, including TIMOs and REITs
- Forest health, the social context and the need to be site-specific
- Water quality standards, research, and monitoring (including data gaps)
- Climate change (using this term was requested, rather than global warming)
- Methodology for designating eco-regions
- Tribal and NIPF lands in the production category
- Legal and institutional framework for sustainability

- Role in the global marketplace
- Loss of the timberland base
- Invasive plants and insects
- Fire cycle, suppression, and treatment (e.g. removing biomass to avoid crown fires or ecosystem damage)

Following the presentation, the committee discussed additional information that needed to be added to the situation assessment and areas for staff to concentrate on in developing a summary. This included: a presentation on biomass; incorporating critical habitat maps incorporated; discussion of land change to TIMOs and REITs; discussions of Oregon imports and exports; and information on carbon sequestration and carbon release from wildfire/controlled burns/harvesting.

The Planning Team will incorporate the discussion information into the assessment, and draft a summary for committee member comment and discussion at the next meeting.

Public Comment

Comments were requested on one or more of the following questions:

1. Using the categories in the draft Situation Assessment as a guide, what is the most important concern you have about the current situation of federal forestlands in Oregon?
2. What are the important characteristics of a successful relationship between Oregon and the Forest Service and BLM?
3. Do you have any suggestions about the FFAC charter or process?

Wayne Giesy provided a map illustrating the amount of public and private lands within each state and written comments. He stated that recent congressional action did not include the rural security act for schools and the critical need for that legislation in states with significant federal lands. He is concerned there has been little reference in committee meetings to the urgent need for federal timber for Oregon's economic well-being.

Christopher Winter, Crag Law Center, commented that the situation assessment left out two issues that will threaten the ability of the committee to garner the public's trust and faith: old growth and wildlife, including where we are succeeding and not succeeding in providing adequate habitat and the current biological picture.

He noted that reserves on federal land in Oregon are not off-limits to logging and other activities, which can skew the statistics, and that reserve areas may not provide the majority of remaining old growth on the landscape or the best habitat for the most imperiled species. Roadless areas are not off-limits to logging and critical pieces of the inventory system are missing because it has not been updated and it only focused on areas that were 5,000 acres or greater. He asked that the committee include that information in the situation assessment.

Chris stated that the Northwest Forest Plan must be included when describing central issues and concerns as that is the single, fundamental management plan for the national forests in Oregon and it provides a floor of minimum protection that the public has come to understand and rely upon as a unifying theme. He cautioned the committee from relying on the modeling fire intervals and returns as there are still many questions regarding the model's accuracy and data

gaps that have not been adequately assessed, and the impacts of implementing that model on the ground are unknown.

Chris also questioned the definition for sustainability in the situation assessment, which was quite general and focused on the goal of ensuring there is not a negative impact on future generations. It is very important to define the term because different interests use different meanings at different times.

The committee briefly discussed sustainable harvest levels and in that context, sustainability was being used as a comparison between the amount of growth and amount of harvest. Chris noted the committee must be very careful about how the term is used and to be very honest if sustainability refers to mean annual harvest and annual growth, which does not mean the activity necessarily will be sustainable for wildlife, biodiversity, and other values that the public is interested in having the committee address.

Doug Heiken, Oregon Wild, also commented on the situation assessment:

- Private interests control more than half of the productive capacity of Oregon's forests valuable for timber and it could also be valuable for wildlife.
- Reserves have been so heavily impacted by past management that they are highly fragmented and not fully functional. The balance of forestland uses looks reasonable, but the real question is how much reserves are needed to sustain the services we want from our forests – to avoid listing of endangered species, have clean water, etc.
- The ODFW Conservation Strategy identifies modification of fire and flood regimes and he would like the committee to include disturbance regimes that include timber harvest, which does not mimic natural disturbance.
- He disagreed with the assertion that the forests are suffering high mortality. Historically, state mortality and growth were equal to each other, so mortality is actually low. The forest is suffering from a severe lack of snags and downed wood habitat for wildlife.
- Regarding the fire regime information, there is science to indicate that more of the forest is actually in mixed regimes. He suggested a more cautious approach to treatment, strategically and carefully treating areas that give the greatest rewards – for instance, blocking known fire pathways to protect large landscape areas.

He too strongly objected to the concept that sustainability is defined as cut what is grown. We are replacing four-foot diameter trees with ones that are 10 inches in diameter, not the lost complex forest structure, and this is not a sustainable approach.

In summary, Oregon Wild wants to see restoration of forests; that there is a lot of work to do out there and sometimes that will align with the timber industry, sometimes it will not, and the committee needs to be very careful to leave the wood, use fire appropriately, and not go down a timber industry wish list.

David Owen, citizen, commented on the history of forest policy that has been shaped by private financial interests in the timber and chemical industries, including the current OSU College of Forestry's research and professors, which he believes skews the science from those sources. He challenged the make-up of the committee because it includes those interests and the committee chair is on the faculty of the College. He also questioned the data being provided to the committee, and recommended the committee get alternative information. Steve Hobbs offered to

give him a tour of the College of Forestry and to meet with professors. David noted that he had a meeting scheduled with Dean Salwasser on February 19, and Steve Hobbs said he would attend if possible.

Neila Owen, citizen, commented on making the best choices, and spending money for something that is ecological and doesn't harm people, the environment, or animals. She noted that the future is looking towards higher consciousness and a better way, including organic products. She hopes the committee members will start to make better choices and support the things that are good for people, our environment, and our future.

Daniel Gee, citizen, presented a copy of the movie "An Inconvenient Truth" to each committee member and indicated he would provide comments at another meeting.

Maya Gee, citizen, sang a song she wrote after herbicides were sprayed on federal forestland near Blachly. She asked the committee to spread love over the land instead of poison. She also expressed concern over clear-cutting, cutting more trees than needed and shipping trees abroad.

Tom Partin, American Forest Resource Council, commented on sustainability and his experience as mayor of John Day. He wants Oregon and the committee to address both the sustainability of Oregon's forests and the sustainability of Oregon's rural communities, which are losing the ability to sustain themselves. While mayor, the unemployment rate in John Day was 22 percent and in eastern Oregon the unemployment rate still ranges from 8 to 14 percent. The communities want opportunity, not unemployment. He noted that there are only 10 sawmills left in eastern Oregon and we need to keep the forests healthy because without the infrastructure, eastern Oregon will not be sustainable. Southwest Oregon receives wood from out of state, the coast, or the I-5 corridor, and that is not sustainable. He advised the committee to address issues that need immediate answers, which will be a tough challenge.

Dave Powers, Environmental Protection Agency, encouraged the committee to focus on areas of agreement, noting that federal land management is unique and it will be a challenge not to throw out what is working well. He asked the committee refrain from concluding the federal lands are managed terribly or well. He advised the committee to remember there is truth in everyone's perspective, keep the pieces that are working, look at the multiple values of Oregonians, and search for consensus on areas where it's possible to make headway.

Vision Statement – and Discussion of Goals and Issues

A committee sub-group, composed of Russ, Annabelle, Tim, and Chuck, prepared a draft proposed vision statement for the committee's consideration, based on the draft vision statements developed previously. Robert Fisher pointed out that the vision statement document entitled "Federal Forestlands Advisory Committee Draft Vision Statements Draft Version #2, dated 2/2/06" should read 2/2/07 and included all of the vision statements developed by the committee to date. The proposed draft vision statement reads:

Oregon's forests are a legacy, a resource and a refuge, loved and celebrated by our citizens, inhabited and nourished by thriving fish and wildlife, and managed with humility, wisdom and resourceful

ness to sustain the health and well-being of present and future generations.

The sub-group members noted that they factored into this vision statement the following elements from the previous committee discussions: heritage and honoring in the past, stewardship and responsibility, active management, managing for sustainability, scientific understanding and credibility, connection of people with the land, material and spiritual well-being, healthy fish and wildlife, healthy communities, and future generations. Using these elements and a few simple words, the group developed this proposed draft vision statement as an artistic, visual representation of what we want the future generation of this state to be as it relates to the forest. This is a working statement –a starting place for the committee.

Committee members complimented the sub-group on their work. Discussion about other possible components for the vision included forest stability, that forestry is not a short-term activity, and community stability. Another sub-group, composed of Steve G. (who will coordinate the group's work) Allyn, and Ken volunteered to continue to revise the draft vision statement to the incorporate comments from the discussion. Ralph also will be asked participate on the sub-group. The revised draft statement will be brought back to the committee at the next meeting.

The committee briefly discussed the next step to give the working vision some meaning and definition by creating some goals and how best to do that. Robert Fisher noted there were several ways to approach this and people were different in how they worked. Some people view the big picture and move down to specifics; while others start with the specifics and work their way up to the larger picture. This leads to a choice about how to go about goal-setting and the specifics the committee will focus on. A committee member also pointed out the importance of first discussing the issues before developing top-level goals.

To begin this process, each committee member was requested to submit a list of his or her preferred goals to committee staff. At the same time, staff will individually submit their "top ten" issues, and request the same information be from the reviewers – the organizations and individuals who are interested in the process. Kevin Birch will compile that information – goals and issues, synthesize it (combining similar items where possible) and have that information ready for the committee at the next meeting in March.

Discussion of Charter and Related Issues

Charter; Roles of Facilitator and Committee Chairperson; and Additions to the FFAC:

Some committee members raised questions about proposed changes to the draft charter (January 30, 2007 version) and also about expectations for language that was not included. This discussion was postponed until the next meeting, to enable Ralph to participate and because at this point the committee is simultaneously finalizing the charter and proceeding with it's work.

Suggestions also had been made about modifying the description of the facilitator and chair roles as presented in the draft document distributed and discussed at the January meeting, and possible additions to the committee. This discussion also was postponed to the next meeting.

Additions to the Planning Team:

Staff noted that contact had been made with other state agencies – the Department of Agriculture and the Water Resources Department, and that their concern is with the amount of time it would take to be planning team members. They are willing and available to come when needed, although they cannot attend every meeting. The planning team has been expanded to include USFWS and EPA. USFWS and EPA representatives attended the meeting, sitting with the public rather than at the planning team table, and they to remain will be available as needed. NOAA Fisheries requested to be kept informed and will also participate when needed. The planning team will need to identify those issues and times when these agencies are needed.

Letter to the Congressional Delegation:

Steve Hobbs informed the committee that the Governor will be in Washington D.C. next week visiting with the congressional delegation, and he has agreed to speak with each of them signing a letter endorsing the committee's work. Many committee members viewed this positively.

Board of Forestry Meeting and Message

Steve Hobbs advised the committee that the board meeting is on March 7th and the committee's presentation is scheduled for one hour beginning at 1:45 p.m. Wade and tentatively Russ volunteered to make the presentation. Russ has a potential conflict and if he is unable to go to the meeting Tim will go.

The plan is for those individuals to work with Kevin to develop the Board presentation, which will include a description of committee's work on the vision statement and a condensed version of the situation assessment, including the public opinion work that had earlier been presented to the committee, so that the Board gets essentially the same information as the committee. Steve Hobbs noted that wanted dialogue between the board and committee members – particularly around the draft vision statement. Steve Hobbs also reaffirmed that, as previously discussed, it is imperative for the Board and Committee to work together closely throughout the process so that when the committee's work is completed, the Board understands what has been done and why.

Steve Hobbs and the other committee members at the Board meeting will report back to the committee about the presentation and Board discussion at the next committee meeting two days after the Board meeting.

Planning for next meeting and wrap-up

Agenda Topics – March Meeting:

The following items were included for the agenda for the next committee meeting:

- Issues/goal statements
- Charter discussion
- Vision statement – next version
- Report on Board meeting
- July – December Meeting Schedule
- Decision about June Meeting with BOF
- Situation Assessment – Revisions, Additions, and Draft Summary document

Action Items:

The committee reviewed and discussed the action items identified at the meeting. See the separate action item list.

Other:

Future Meeting Scheduling: Kevin Birch noted that the committee meetings had been tentatively agreed upon for the first Monday of each month, so that will be the starting point to look for available dates from July through December. He will compile that information for the next meeting's discussion on the schedule for future meetings.

Kevin also noted that the committee is scheduled to meet the afternoon of June 5th with the Board of Forestry. There is a question about whether the committee wants to keep their scheduled full-day meeting on June 4th or whether the meeting should occur on the morning only of June 5th. He will also ask committee members their preferences regarding that meeting.

Kevin reported on plans for the committee to meet at locations outside of Salem and to hold the May meeting in Bend. That meeting is on Tuesday, May 15th, with an informal committee get-together event to be held on Monday evening (May 14th).

Public Comment: The committee also discussed how to encourage public comment on the issues and goals being addressed by the committee, and how best to make the public comments as constructive and useful to the committee as possible. There should be a time limit set for each person providing comments and adhered to. It also would be helpful to minimize repetitious comments. The committee wishes to be respectful of everybody wishing to offer comment and consistent in applying any guidelines that are established. The committee will continue to request public comment focused on specific questions, and will not limit anyone from expressing what is important to them. Steve Hobbs will prepare a one-paragraph description of the ground rules for public comment and make that available to everybody in advance.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Attending:

Committee Members: Chuck Graham, Steve Grasty, Russ Hoeflich, Steve Hobbs, Annabelle Jaramillo, Bill Kluting, R. Wade Mosby, Zane Smith, Jr., Tim Vredenburg, Ken Williamson.

Staff: Kevin Birch, Jeri Chase, Cathy Clem, David Morman, ODF; Marianne Fitzgerald, DEQ; Lisa Freedman, USFS; Mike Haske, BLM; Rod Krahmer, Jon Germond, and Peg Boulay, ODFW; Dave Powers, EPA; Bob Progulske, USFWS; Robert Fisher, FCS.

Public: Christopher Winter, Crag Law Center; David Owen; Neila Owen; Daniel Gee; Maya Gee; Tom Partin, American Forest Resource Council; Wayne Giesy; Doug Heiken, Oregon Wild; Chris Jarmer, Oregon Forest Industry Council; Bob Young, ODF; Mike Gaudurn, Oregon Small Woodlands Association.