

**Oregon Board of Forestry
Federal Forestlands Advisory Committee Meeting
March 9, 2007**

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

Meeting Summary

Committee Decisions and Key Items at-a-glance:

- Charter finalized and adopted.
 - Revised description of the Chair/Facilitator Roles agreed upon.
 - Working Vision Statement agreed upon:
Federal forestlands in Oregon are a legacy, a refuge and a resource, loved and celebrated by our citizens, inhabited by healthy populations of fish and wildlife, managed with humility, wisdom, and innovation to sustain the economic, environmental, social and cultural well-being of our rural and urban communities.
 - Process for Committee member information requests to staff, during meetings and in-between meetings, agreed upon.
 - Committee members and the planning team will identify Committee by the acronym "FFAC" in the subject line of e-mails.
 - Public Comment Protocol adopted.
 - Board of Forestry supports the Committee's efforts and the draft working vision statement and requested more emphasis on economics and grazing/ranching.
 - Draft Situation Assessment updated and posted on the website.
 - Committee Meetings Scheduled for July through December 2007.
 - April meeting topics: Forest Service presentation on climate change and focus on proposed goals and issues.
-

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:

- Finalizing the Charter
- Refining and finalizing the working Vision Statement
- Continuing to develop a shared understanding of the current situation
- Beginning to identify key issues and top-level goals
- Planning the next meeting and scheduling future Committee meeting dates

Robert Fisher, facilitator with Fisher Collaborative Services, noted some preliminary items:

- Tim Vredenburg was not able to attend this Committee meeting. Tim's colleague, Jason Robison, was sitting in to offer comments and convey information back to Tim. Robert

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.

- Assistance for Robert with the meeting summaries has been arranged with Elaine Hallmark -- Suzy Driver, facilitator, will assist the Committee. She replaced the person Robert previously mentioned to the Committee.
- Committee members were requested to keep in mind the Operating Principles established at the first meeting.

Review of draft February meeting summary

The Committee reviewed the draft February 5, 2007 Meeting Summary (dated March 3, 2007, version 2).

Ralph Bloemers informed the Committee he will submit a history of the O&C Lands Act from a law review article written by Professor Susan Jane Brown because he believes the statement included in the February Meeting Summary that “producing timber on a sustainable basis is the dominant use of O&C lands” is incorrect. In his view, while the Congressional record and other history identify sustainable timber production as a use, the Act has been interpreted as a multiple use statute, not one of dominant use. He noted the controversial nature of these issues and asked the Committee to be cautious in approaching the O&C lands.

Robert clarified that the meeting summaries were intended to summarize and reflect what occurred at the meeting, and the focus of the review was to ensure the summary was balanced, accurate, and complete. Ralph acknowledged this was his understanding too, and that he was providing his perspective at this meeting in response to what was said at the last meeting. He also wanted to submit the written material for the Committee to consider.

Mike Haske questioned the description of the BLM process for revising its individual resource management plans (page 3, first full paragraph after the bullets). The language implied the BLM pulled the Northwest Forest Plan into their plan revision documents when they also are looking at alternatives. Robert asked Mike to draft suggested clarifying language for the Committee to review so the Meeting Summary could be finalized.

The Committee discussed the page length of the meeting summaries. Some Committee members requested the summary be shortened to one page, while others expressed appreciation for the thoroughness because of the need to keep the public informed about the Committee’s work. To accomplish both objectives, decisions made at the meetings will be stated up front, and the summaries will be complete and as concise as possible.

Report on the Board of Forestry Meeting

Steve Hobbs, along with Tim, Wade, and Ken representing the Committee, met with the Board of Forestry on March 7, 2007. Steve Hobbs reported Board members commented to him that they appreciated the Committee’s work and the working draft of the vision statement resonated with them. Wade noted that the Committee members provided background information to the Board, and the Board reviewed the draft vision and goals. Two individual Board members commented that: (1) the draft vision statement could be stronger on economic benefits; and (2) the Committee should include more on the grazing/ranching interface issues. Ken reiterated the

Board's message that the Committee is on the right track and the value of knowing this early in the process.

Committee members inquired whether the Board provided any sense about the future of the Committee's work. Steve Hobbs indicated it was too early and noted the importance of interacting with the Board regularly so there can be agreement between the Committee and the Board. The key will be to identify the issues and articulate the Committee's recommendations to the Board, the Governor, and the Congressional delegation.

Discussion of Charter and Related Issues

Revisions to the Proposed Charter:

The Committee reviewed the revisions to the proposed Charter made in response to the Committee's discussions. The Committee discussed the process and sequence of events with respect to the Committee's work products, and the importance of submitting the product from the Committee to the Board the end of the process. Committee members reiterated the importance of conversations and communication with the Board, the Governor, and the Congressional delegation throughout the process so that the recommendations will not be a surprise and will be something that can be embraced.

In discussing the O&C Act language in the Charter, Mike Haske quoted the following language from the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals in the Headwaters case that BLM has incorporated into their planning guidance: "It is entirely consistent with these goals to conclude that the O&C Act envisions timber production as a dominant use and that Congress intended to use forest production and timber production synonymously. Nowhere does the legislative history suggest that wildlife habitat conservation or conservation of old growth forests is a goal on a par with timber production or indeed that it is a goal of the O&C Act at all...." Mike noted there are other laws BLM has to comply with as well, and submitted a BLM background information sheet on the O&C lands. Ralph acknowledged there were issues of interpretation and stated that the language in the current draft Charter addressed his concerns.

The Committee agreed to make one change to the Charter was suggested and agreed to add "the Governor," in addition to the Board and the Oregon Congressional delegation as a recipient of the Committee's report of its findings and recommendations (page 1, "Goals" section, third bullet). Committee members reached consensus on the proposed language of the Charter and agreed the Charter was final.

Chair and Facilitator Roles:

Steve Hobbs distributed a proposal from Ralph to describe the roles of the facilitator and Committee Chair and the roles description the Committee discussed at their January meeting. Steve Hobbs asked Ralph to explain the proposal and share his concerns. Ralph expressed the importance of the Committee owning its work, the Charter, and the end product. Because the group did not pick the facilitator or the Chair, Ralph wanted the Committee to state clearly the roles and responsibilities of the facilitator and Chair.

The Committee agreed to delete the second paragraph in the proposal relating to the Chair of the Board of Forestry. With that change, the Committee agreed on revising the roles and

responsibilities of the facilitator and Chair, which will be incorporated into the Committee's Operating Procedures.

Public Involvement:

There were no outstanding issues regarding public involvement.

Vision Statement

A Committee sub-group composed of Steve Grasty, Ralph, and Allyn Ford, prepared and presented a revised draft of the Vision Statement for the Committee's consideration. Russ also suggested minor revisions to the draft statement in advance of the meeting. The Committee discussed the differences in the draft statement and the following elements:

- the meaning and significance of "cultural" and "social" and including both words so there was no misinterpretation;
- replacing "enlivened" with "inhabited";
- including the word "Federal" to be consistent with the Committee's charge; and
- specifying "plants" was not needed because they are included in the "forest."

The Committee agreed to the following working Vision Statement:

Federal forestlands in Oregon are a legacy, a refuge and a resource, loved and celebrated by our citizens, inhabited by healthy populations of fish and wildlife, managed with humility, wisdom, and innovation to sustain the economic, environmental, social and cultural well-being of our rural and urban communities.

The Committee recognized that as a working Vision Statement it will be tested by the Committee's subsequent work, and can be revised later as needed.

Meeting Process (i.e. meeting materials, information requests)

The Committee discussed the volume of meeting materials generated, staff workload, and how information requests from Committee members should be managed. Committee members agreed to use electronic mail where possible and that all e-mails regarding Committee business will begin with "FFAC" in the subject line.

Committee members acknowledged a difference between asking staff to compile new information and providing information that currently exists. This discussion arose, in part, because of an information request from Ralph in-between meetings. Kevin Birch, ODF staff, indicated that some of the requested information was not readily available or did not exist in the form requested, which would require significant staff resources to chase the information. The Committee then discussed how to handle information requests and to allocate both staff and planning team time and resources.

The Committee agreed to use the following process for information requests:

1. If information is requested during the Committee meeting, the Committee will discuss the request and determine whether to pursue the information.

2. Information requested in-between meetings should be sent to Steve Hobbs, who will discuss with staff what's involved and whether the information is readily available. He will confer with the requestor and determine whether staff will pursue the request. If Committee members are not getting timely responses to information requests, they should tell Steve Hobbs. ,
3. The Committee will re-visit the process if there are problems.

Ralph asked Kevin to explain the status of the information request, including the information that is not available.

Public Comment

Public Comment Protocol:

Steve Hobbs provided a proposed protocol for conducting public comment sessions. The proposed process welcomes and encourages public comment, and was designed to ensure fairness and efficiency. Each person commenting will be limited to five minutes. Steve Hobbs will manage the public comment, while Robert keeps time. Robert will signal when one minute is left and when time is up. The time set aside for public comment may be modified at the suggestion of Steve Hobbs and/or Robert with the consensus of the Committee, depending upon the number of people who want to provide comments. Discussion about the process included:

- limiting Committee questions and discussion with each commenter to five minutes, and ways to engage the public through questions asking for clarification or dialogue;
- encouraging written comments;
- collecting comments received between meetings and making those available to Committee members and posting them on the Committee's website; and
- publishing public notice of the agenda one week in advance of Committee meetings to encourage written and oral comments related to agenda items and Committee requests for information.

The Committee agreed with process in the Public Comment Protocol, with the addition that questions, answers and discussion would be limited to an additional five minutes per speaker.

Public Comment:

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

1. Does the proposed Vision Statement capture your vision too? If so, in what way? If not, what's missing?
2. Do you have any suggestions about the FFAC process?
3. From your perspective, what is the most pressing issue concerning the federal forestlands in Oregon for the FFAC to address, and why?

Chris Jarmer, Society of American Foresters, provided a copy of the Society of American Foresters (SAF) Position Statements and the written testimony Mark Vomocil, Oregon SAF Chair-Elect, submitted to the Board of Forestry on Wednesday, March 7, 2007, which includes their newly-adopted position statement on commercial timber harvest on public lands. Chris also described the process to they used to reach consensus on a position statement.

Responding to a question about whether the members favor extraction, Chris noted that there probably is a perceived bias – as the statements are slanted towards active management, which is

important to the society. He also noted that the society does not promote whole-scale harvesting of every acre of forestlands, and sees to balance values – in Oregon and nationwide. Chris also was asked about society membership and he stated the society used to have many more federal land managers, which has changed. Many people have joined the society because they are frustrated with what has happened on federal lands.

Deanna Spooner, Pacific Rivers Council, provided a two-page Summary and Recommendations of a recent report by Jonathan J. Rhodes, an independent hydrologist, *The Watershed Impacts of Forest Treatments to Reduce Fuels and Modify Fire Behavior*. The full report can be provided to the Committee and is available on the organization's website. Donna encouraged the Committee to invite Jonathan Rhodes to speak about fire and fuels management on federal lands.

The Pacific Rivers Council approaches the issue of fire and fuels issues from the perspective of watershed health. While there may be management, social, and economic reasons to concentrate on fuel treatments and fire management, from a watershed perspective fuel treatments don't get at the needed restoration. Addressing the roads system, and the chronic and episodic sediment and landslide problems on state, private, and federal forestlands would do more for watershed restoration than fuels treatments. The Report also describes other management activities the Committee should focus on. The increased symbiotic relationship between federal, state, and private land management agencies through the healthy forestland restoration initiative and other initiatives like this Committee provides the citizens of Oregon with a valuable opportunity to participate in these issues.

Dan Gee, citizen, commented on the management of forestlands. The mountains around them once thrived with biodiversity and habitat for wildlife being clear-cut, poisoned with herbicides, and mono-cropped. He believes that most forest fires, "noxious" plant species, and disease are the direct result of past poor forest practices, and that federal forestlands should not be treated like private and state forestlands. He hopes that the Committee members and the Board to do something to make future generations proud of us.

Dan provided each Committee member with a copy of a DVD about Agent Orange spraying in western Oregon in the 1970s and 1980s. He noted that of the chemicals in Agent Orange, 2,4-D is still being sprayed, although 2,4,5-T is no longer used. Dan expressed his agreement with most of the Committee's vision, and hopes the environment will be first. He appreciated the public comment process because initially they felt resistance and now the Committee is looking for more ways to get comments. Providing information electronically is important because many people cannot attend the meetings and do not believe they have a way to voice their views.

In response to questions about whether his observations about participation were applicable to public lands or limited to private lands, Dan stated that he was mainly referring to private lands, both corporate and individual.

Maya Haps, citizen, described how the people in their community are being affected by the spraying of poisons that persist in the environment – in their water and food. They do not want these chemicals on BLM lands, and want to inspire private land managers to change their ways; if they did more selective cutting, maybe it would mean less money for them and greater good for the whole. She provided some information to Committee members on 2,4-D that is being used around their neighborhood, and the genetic defects that it can cause. She asked Committee

members to think of wellness for people. A committee member recommended that Maya to speak to the “Big Look” Committee about her concerns, and also suggested she could find out about community testing of soils and water on the Environmental Protection Agency’s website.

In response to Maya’s comments, Russ requested information from staff on what chemicals BLM and USFS are allowed to use and whether a different suite of chemicals are allowed on private lands to further the Committee’s understanding.

Situation Assessment Update – Presentation and Discussion

Kevin Birch gave a presentation on the draft Situation Assessment, which will serve as a reference document for the Committee’s work. His presentation narrowed the previous presentation to assist the Committee to identify the top ten key issues for the Committee to address. Kevin requested feedback during the presentation on additional information to include and what to change or delete in the document.

This abbreviated Situation Assessment presentation and the previous presentations provided to the Committee are available on the Committee’s web page at <http://www.oregon.gov/ODF/BOARD/FFAC.shtml>.

There was Committee discussion and/or requests for information regarding the following issues:

- **Air Quality.** University of New Mexico study on air pollution coming across the Pacific Ocean from China; the air quality impacts of large wildfires.
- **Roadless Areas.** Polling information on roadless areas and how the public views them.
- **“Balance”.** How the survey questions were asked, what they meant, or what answers might have been if the questions had been asked differently, or if those being polled had more information.
- **Land Allocations and Actual Use.** clarification of some information; more information regarding late successional old growth forests.
- **Changes in Ownerships.** Measure 37 claims; ownership changes; TIMOs and REITs; ownership types; need for map illustrating this.
- **Timber Harvest.** Modeling versus reality; public and opinion leader perceptions; note that information from state forests are also included in data.
- **Forest Ecosystems.** More recent data; method of spread of invasive species; modeled information on options – natural fire, prescribed burning, mechanical treatment.
- **Water Quality.** 303(d) list and Coho assessment information; DEQ’s Water Quality Index; using trends for water quality information; pesticides used on federal lands.
- **Climate Change.** Migratory movement corridors – birds and mammals (maps from USFS); comparison of carbon sequestration between different building types (wood, steel, brick).
- **Forest Revenues.** Secure Rural Schools Act issues – separate charts; county and federal agency job losses.
- **Federal Agency Economics 101.** To understand the constraints on federal agencies.

Following the presentation, Committee members were asked to review the information presented and the draft Situation Assessment document, and get comments for revisions back to Kevin by March 16, 2007. The Planning Team will incorporate the Committee’s comments and revise the draft Situation Assessment.

Key Issues and Top-Level Goals

Committee members and staff discussed the work on draft “Goals” and “Most Pressing Problems” documents (both dated 3/2/07, version 1). Kevin noted that the guidance document could have the following components:

- an introduction (i.e. the problem, the picture, why the state is doing this);
- the Vision Statement;
- a set of goals (the difference between the vision and current reality); and
- the most pressing problems – the top10 key issues to address.

Kevin emphasized that the work on the goals and most pressing problems section was just a starting point. The Committee needs to have an in-depth discussion, put things in the order, and combine the issues and goals as appropriate. Kevin also cautioned the Committee of the importance of framing and reaching agreement on the problem statements without discussing outcomes, root causes, or solutions.

The next step is for Committee members to review the compilation of the goals and most pressing problems to date, and provide feedback to Kevin about what is included, what is missing, and what issues the Committee would like to see on the list. Committee members were asked to provide comments to Kevin by March 23, 2007.

Planning for next meeting and wrap-up

Meeting Schedule:

The Committee scheduled the following meetings for the remainder of 2007:

- Monday, July 2, 2007
- Wednesday, August 1, 2007
- Friday, September 7, 2007
- Monday, October 15, 2007
- Monday, November 5, 2007
- Monday, December 3, 2007

May15, 2007 Meeting: The Committee is meeting on Tuesday May 15 at The Riverhouse in Bend. There will be an informal Committee get together event Monday May 14. Staff will send out a reminder to Committee members. ODF Agency Affairs still will work on a communications strategy, including public outreach for the meeting in Bend. They were directed to reach out beyond Bend area to Grant and Harney Counties, Baker City, John Day, Burns, etc.

Agenda Topics – April 3, 2007 Meeting:

- Climate change presentation from PNW Research Station staff (in the morning)
- Issues and Goals discussion

A Committee member suggested that future meetings be structured to start with a presentation.

Action Items:

See the separate Action Item list.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Attending:

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

Staff: Kevin Birch, Jeri Chase, Cathy Clem, and Walt Schutt, ODF; Marianne Fitzgerald and Kevin Masterson, DEQ; Lisa Freedman, USFS; Mike Haske, BLM; Jon Germond, ODFW; Bob Progulske, USFWS; Bill Ferber, OWRD; Robert Fisher, FCS, Suzy Driver, Mediation Services.

Public: Daniel Gee; Maya Haps; Wayne Giesy, Hull-Oakes Lumber Company; Dick Posekany, Frank Lumber Company; Jason Robison, Coquille Tribe; Doug Heiken, Oregon Wild; Chris Jarmer, Society of American Foresters; Rex Storm, Associated Oregon Loggers; Deanna Spooner, Pacific Rivers Council.