

**Oregon Board of Forestry
Federal Forestlands Advisory Committee Meeting
April 2, 2007**

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

Meeting Summary

Overview

Decisions at-a-glance:

- February and March Meeting Summaries approved.
- Set timetable for revising the draft Goals document.
- Panel presentations and Committee discussion of issues presented will be scheduled during the morning portion of future meetings.
- Committee decisions will be reflected on the Committee's website.
- May meeting topics:
 - (1) Presentation on "Landscape Resiliency and Disruption of Natural Processes;
 - (2) Continued discussion of the draft Goals document and the draft Most Pressing Problems document.

Key Committee Discussion

Ronald P. Neilson, USDA Forest Service, presented information about climate change and suggested: (1) future forest management will involve dealing with new changes that are hard to predict; and (2) the Committee should focus on keeping leaf density below water carrying capacity to reduce stress on trees, and to maintain plant diversity rather than homogeneity. The Committee identified a range of impacts, management considerations, and potential solutions.

Committee members began discussing criteria for evaluating the importance of the goals. Committee members began expressing their preferences for the problems/issues to be considered. The following issues were identified by the most Committee members: loss of landscape resiliency – disruption of natural processes; lack of active management on federal lands; clarity of purpose is lacking for federal forestlands; lack of funding for the managing agencies to provide basic stewardship of the land and its resources; and the sustainable offering of the full range of environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits. The two problems/issues identified next were: (1) climate change; and (2) losing the local capacity (workforce and facilities) and markets needed to support a viable industry and forest protection and restoration efforts. The Committee agreed the problem statements must be revised before finalizing the list of top issues for consideration.

Key Suggestions from Public Comment

The Committee's goals should focus on (1) the depressed economic condition in rural Oregon counties; and (2) responsible management to sustain predictable resource outputs while maintaining forest and rangeland health, road access, and a variety of citizen uses.

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 proposed agenda and meeting objectives which include:

- Reviewing the February and March Committee Meeting Summaries
- Presentation and discussion on Climate Change
- Discussion of Key Issues and Top-Level Goals
- Public comment
- Planning the next meeting and wrap up

Steve noted that the agenda will include time to discuss issues raised by Committee members -- a request for information about historical levels of old growth on federal lands; Senate Bill 98; a pending information request; technical resources for the Committee to consider; a request for additions to the Committee's web site; and the status of the draft Situation Assessment document.

Review of draft February and March Committee Meeting Summaries

Robert Fisher, facilitator with Fisher Collaborative Services, stated that in preparing the draft March Meeting Summary (dated March 29, 2007, version 2), we included a concise summary at the beginning to reflect Committee decisions and key discussion items and different formats to express agreement and consensus. One Committee member requested the summary be shorter. The Committee approved the draft March Meeting Summary.

The February Meeting Summary (dated March 3, 2007, version 2), also was approved with the proposed revision to page 3, second paragraph (dated March 29, 2007) describing information the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) will consider during the management plan revision process for the O&C lands.

Presentation on Climate Change and Committee Discussion of Issues Raised

Ronald P. Neilson, USDA Forest Service – Pacific Northwest Research Station, gave a presentation on “Climate Change, Uncertainty and Forecasts of Global to Landscape Ecosystem Dynamics, and Reframing Forest Management in the Face of Climate Change, A Forest Service Perspective.”

Ron emphasized that the historical approach to forest management was based on the belief that federal forestland managers could manage for a relatively stable forest in the future by understanding the variables that caused changes in the past. This approach will no longer work. Changes are happening so quickly that we are no longer managing for a continuation of the status quo but rather attempting to manage for changes we cannot necessarily predict. Ron illustrated a number of global, regional and local impacts from climate change in progress now and identified several management planning tools that could be modified to include climate data.

Following Ron's presentation, the Committee raised or briefly explored the following topics:

Impacts

- carbon and mercury pollution traveling across the Pacific Ocean from China
- increased wildfire risks due to climate change
- avoiding catastrophic disturbances that occur as a result of climate change
- geospatial importance and connectivity of systems
- the movement of species, habitat fragmentation, and the nature and rate of migration of different species (rare, endangered, aggressive weed plants and insect pests)
- warming versus cooling effects of forest ecosystems at differing latitudes
- endangered species and the possible incursion of other native species into previously non-native eco-regions

Possible Solutions

- energy efficiency to mitigate climate change
- optimum forest age and rotation cycle to create landscape resiliency to climate change
- optimum age class distribution for a forest to serve the carbon “pumping” role
- California’s recent legislation regarding carbon sequestration
- role of biomass as it relates to climate change
- new Climate Registry and opportunities for carbon credits
- proactive prevention of catastrophic disturbance versus reacting to catastrophic events

Management

- proactive, creative management activities and the need for planetary scale ecosystem engineering that is cognitively planned on a landscape scale
- whether federal laws and regulations on forest planning are flexible enough to respond to climate change
- management protocols to keep ecosystems below their water carrying capacity
- the Pacific Decadal Oscillation and short-term modeling ability

The Committee asked Ron whether he had any recommendations for Goals on Climate Change. Ron identified the following (see Meeting Flip Chart notes):

- (1) Keep leaf density below the water carrying capacity. This will reduce the stress from drought and insect infestations. The leaf area will evolve naturally within the first 5 years after reforestation.
- (2) Maintain plant diversity rather than homogeneity, and let the ecosystem find its own route and evolve naturally.

Ron also provided written handouts from Linda Joyce, USDA Forest Service Rocky Mountain Research Station, titled “Manager’s Responses to a Changing Climate, Future Planning and Management Options for Adaptation,” and Connie Millar, USDA Forest Service Sierra Nevada Research Center, titled “Re-Framing Management Strategies in the Face of Climate Change.”

Key Issues and Top-Ten Goals

Goals Discussion:

Committee members began the discussion of the Goals document by identifying criteria for evaluating the importance of each goal. The following represents their individual views for evaluating the goals, and not the consensus of the Committee concerning either the list or the expression of each of item.

- Achievable – balance of values
- Opportunities for agreement
- Threats to forest (local/regional)
- Institutional design improvements—legal, agency, economic
- Sustainability (in all aspects)
 - Economic
 - Biodiversity
 - Social aspects (rural communities and Indian tribes)
- Adaptability – flexible to adapt to changing circumstances
- Overarching, top of the pyramid, big picture
- Building trust among the various interest groups
- Positive impact on the landscape
- Forestland resiliency
- Institutional capacity to manage the federal lands
- Temporal and spatial impact and the need to quickly make a difference
- Scientific integrity

Steve Hobbs noted that developing the Goals and Most Pressing Problems would be an iterative process. The Goals will be working Goals the Committee will test and revise as appropriate.

The Committee discussed the draft Goals document (version 2, dated March 26, 2007) and suggested changes, which were incorporated by the planning team during the lunch break into a revised draft Goals document (version 3, dated April 2, 2007).

Public Comment

Comments were requested on the following questions:

1. From your perspective, what is the most important goal for the federal forestlands in Oregon for the FFAC to address and why?
2. From your perspective, what is the most pressing issue concerning federal forestlands in Oregon to address and why?

Dick Posekany, Frank Lumber Company, commented that taking action to correct the depressed economic condition in rural Oregon counties is the most important and immediate goal for the Committee to address. Steve Hobbs and other Committee members commented that the issues raised in his testimony were very important, and that consideration of rural communities will be an important component of the Committee's work. Steve also noted that the draft Goals document is currently not in any priority order, and the Committee is an advisory body with no authority to release timber for harvest on federal lands.

Rex Storm, Associated Oregon Loggers, Inc., commented that the most important goal is for Oregon's federal forests to be responsibly managed to sustain predictable resource outputs, in a

manner that maintains forest and rangeland health, road access, and a variety of citizen uses. He identified other positive outcomes that could result from the accomplishment of this goal. He also expressed the view that the most pressing issue concerning Oregon's federal forests is the federal agencies' failure to responsibly manage forest and rangelands to: (1) maintain healthy forest and rangeland ecosystems that yield a full range of multiple uses; and (2) build and maintain sufficient road and trail access to manage for multiple uses.

Key Issues and Top-Level Goals (continued)

Goals Discussion (continued):

Kevin Birch reviewed the changes that were made to the draft Goals document (version 3, April 2, 2007), which included:

- Grouping "process" and "resource" goals (divided into ecosystem, social, and economic);
- Combining goals with the same number to create groupings rather than redrafting them;
- Adding language to address concepts of accountability and flexibility to previous Goal #3 to create a new Goal #4;
- Drafting new language to address social and cultural concepts for a new Goal #10;
- Including the climate change concepts in a new Goal #8;
- Combining previous Goals #9 and #10 to become a new Goal #11;
- Re-numbering previous Goal #11 which was not changed, and renumbering Goal #5;
- Re-numbering previous Goals #4, #6, #7, and #13 to become new Goal #6 (the planning team grouped the previous Goals together for this draft rather than combine them or develop new language);
- Modifying the previous Goal #7 on diversity of habitat, now (c) under Goal #6; and
- Incorporating site-specific variations in regional policy, along with community-based management principles, in new Goal #10.

The Committee discussed the revised draft Goals and members made the following observations:

- Avoid the terms "urban" and "rural" where possible;
- Include language about unique landscapes and looking at local site specific landscapes, rather than just regional landscapes as part of an ecosystems goal; also including this concept in a social goal;
- Incorporate specific language about diseases and pests into a goal (Goal #7 was suggested);
- Include language in Goals #3 and #4 defining the process as gathering information, making an informed decision, then getting it done efficiently and effectively;
- Apply rules efficiently and giving the agencies tools to work with to make things happen;
- Compare verb tenses throughout the Goals document for consistency and other refinements in language;
- Broaden the economic statements to include other forest products and the value of activities in the forest (hunting, fishing, etc.);
- Include risk prioritization in Goal #8 (climate change);
- Suggest a goal of having the forests be self-sustaining and self-funding in Goal #5;
- Include cultural components and more social, cultural, and economics goals;
- Need information from the federal agencies about opportunities for policy and funding changes;

- Focus on both incremental and larger scale changes and what can get done in the next two years; and
- Do not hold back on tackling issues of national scope in Oregon that may affect other western states, as there are common themes across a broader regional and west-wide landscape and there may be the opportunity to partner with other states.

Some Committee also expressed concerns about --

- Combining the four subparts of Goal #6 – the suggested modifications included combining 6c and 6d; 6a is general; 6b are large core issues of their own (soils and roads); separating the biological (fish and wildlife) from the physical processes (water and habitat);
- Collaboration and the capacity of organizations and the public to participate in collaborative processes;
- The word “restored” in Goals # 6a and #7 which implies something is wrong and needs to be corrected; the word “restored” as it is not clear to what previous level or time period; and the need to look forward not back.

Some members of the Committee also observed that community-based management principles consider the needs of a community (as opposed to community management) and the localized awareness of the unique attributes and biological diversity of local site-specific landscapes.

The Committee agreed to make additional comments on this version of the draft Goals document to the planning team by Monday, April 9, 2007. The planning team will incorporate those ideas into a new draft for Committee members to review by April 16, 2007. Committee members will provide comments on that version to the planning team by April 23, 2007 in preparation for the next Committee meeting on May 15, 2007. Steve noted that the plan is for the Committee to reconvene next month with a nearly final version of the Goals document.

Issues Discussion:

Committee members were asked to look at the revised draft Most Pressing Problems document (version 2, dated March 26, 2007), and identify missing pieces or changes that are needed, and consider a topic for the next meeting. Robert noted that this draft was a compilation of the ideas received and that the issues were not listed in any priority order. He also identified an alternate framework Allyn provided as another way to group and consider the issues.

Kevin noted that he used the same framework to prepare the draft Most Pressing Problems document that he used to draft the Situation Assessment document, the Montreal Process, which is also the framework for the Board of Forestry's *Forestry Program for Oregon*. He noted the language and presentation of the issues reflected the input received. The 25 “letter” headings are the actual “issues” and the rest of the document includes information that will be further developed when the Committee narrows the issues to their top ten.

Committee members were asked to identify their priorities for the top ten issues (as described in the current draft) using a multi-voting technique. Each Committee member had ten “votes” and could use more than one “vote” for an issue to signify how strongly they felt about a particular issue. Twelve issues received four or more “votes”: 3a, 3b, 7a, and 7d (nine each); 5b and 6b

(eight each); 2b (seven); 4b (six); and 1a, 4a, 6a, and 6d (four each). These “votes” represent the strength of interest in the problem as stated, rather than actual votes.

Some Committee members expressed difficulty with using the March 26 draft to select their top ten issues because of the way the some issues were framed and described. A Committee member pointed out that the issues with the most interest were broadly stated, while many of the other issues were stated in very short sentences. The latter issues may have received less attention because of the way they were written. Committee members agreed that more discussion was needed before they could make a final selection of the top ten issues to focus on. To prepare for that discussion, the draft Most Pressing Problems document (version 2, dated March 26, 2007) will be revised to reflect the Committee’s initial prioritization.

Planning for Next Meeting and Wrap-up

Agenda Topics – May Meeting:

Committee members agreed that while they were finalizing the draft Most Pressing Problems document, they could select one issue of concern to work on during the next meeting. The Committee selected draft issue 3a, “Loss of Landscape Resiliency – Disruption of Natural Processes” as the topic for discussion during the May meeting.

Committee members discussed how to structure the May meeting and future meetings that include presentations. The Committee agreed to schedule the panel presentation in the morning followed by Committee discussion of the issues. The Committee will schedule between 90 minutes and two hours for this portion of the meeting, and continue further discussion of the Goals document in the afternoon. Several Committee members suggested individuals for the speakers panel: (1) Cal Mukumoto to talk about biomass; (2) an expert from one of the agencies on the wildland-urban interface; (3) Professor Dick Waring from OSU; and others. The Committee also discussed how to frame the topics and questions for the panelists, and agreed to provide any suggestions for speakers or questions to the planning team by Wednesday, April 4, 2007.

The planned May agenda will include:

- Panel Presentation on Loss of Landscape Resiliency – Disruption of Natural Processes
- Issues and Goals discussions continued

Other:

Request for historical data on old growth on federal forestlands. Russ described his request for information. Oregon Department of Forestry analyzed this request and determined that it could be done, although not quickly or easily. Committee members discussed possible sources of existing information. Steve Hobbs agreed to contact Tom Spies to see if he could direct Russ to any existing sources for this information.

Senate Bill 98. Russ also asked why Senate Bill 98 was introduced by the Oregon Department of Forestry, and whether the intent was to use this vehicle to acquire federal lands. Kevin identified the Department’s concern as loss of private forestlands as working forests. The Department prepared a paper on this issue for the 2005 legislative session, which led to a bill that passed last session for community forest authority (allowing local communities to acquire forestlands) and

the Department's bill last session and this session – Senate Bill 98 – allowing forestland acquisition. Kevin agreed to provide a copy of that issue paper to Russ. Lisa Freedman stated that the federal government does not sell working forestlands, although it does on occasion engage in land exchanges with other entities. Kevin noted that this Senate Bill 98 has no relation to a separate proposal for the state to manage the O & C lands receiving publicity in southern Oregon.

Outstanding Information Request. Ralph and Kevin agreed to schedule a meeting to discuss the status of Ralph's information request.

Technical Review and Experts. Ralph noted this no longer needed discussion.

FFAC Website. Ralph suggested that Committee decisions be specifically reflected on the Committee's website. Department staff agreed to work with Ralph to accomplish this.

Draft Situation Assessment Document. Kevin shared that he was working on a revised draft of this document, and identified some of the work that remains to be done. He plans to finish the revised draft at the beginning of May.

Action Items:

See the separate Action Item list.

Steve Hobbs adjourned the meeting at 3:55 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, and Tim Vredenburg.

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

Public: Wayne Giesy, Hull-Oakes Lumber Company; Dick Posekany, Frank Lumber Company; Chris Jarmer, Oregon Forest Industries Council; Rex Storm, Associated Oregon Loggers, Inc.

Note: All written materials and presentations provided to the committee and referred to in this meeting summary are available on the committee's website at www.oregon.gov/ODF/BOARD/FFAC.shtml.