

**Oregon Board of Forestry  
Federal Forestlands Advisory Committee Meeting  
June 3, 2008**

Oregon Department of Forestry  
2600 State Street  
Salem, OR

**Meeting Summary**

On June 3, 2008 the Federal Forestland Advisory Committee (FFAC) held a meeting at the Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) in Salem, Oregon. The primary objectives of the meeting were to:

- *Review draft Guidance Outline and determine level of support/consensus*
- *Prepare for joint meeting with the Board of Forestry (BOF)*
- *Plan next steps*

The following summary was prepared by Department staff, revised by the facilitation team, and is subject to review and clarification by the FFAC members. The summary contains the following sections:

- Opening Remarks, Review of Meeting Objectives and Agenda
- Brief Review of Synthesis Committee Efforts
- Goals for Joint Meeting with Board of Forestry
- Review Draft Guidance Outline
- Draft letter from Forest Practices Subcommittee of the Governor's Task Force.
- Next Steps and Wrap Up

**Opening Remarks, Review Meeting Objectives and Agenda**

Steve Hobbs welcomed committee members, reviewed the agenda, and outlined the meeting objectives. He commented on how gratifying it has been to see the progress and work products being developed by the committee. The *Draft Letter from the Forest Practices Subcommittee of the Governor's Task Force* regarding the loss of county payments was introduced and added to the agenda for discussion towards the end of the morning session.

**Brief Review of Synthesis Committee Efforts**

The *Expanded Outline*, presented to the Committee for review, was a subcommittee work product. The subcommittee recommended the state take a leadership role in facilitating cooperative partnerships with local communities. The recent success of the collaborative efforts in Grant County, pertaining to the Thorn and Egley projects, was noted as a positive sign for the potential of implementing FFAC recommendations. It was suggested that FFAC members receive and review the settlement agreement documents for further information.

### **Goals for Joint Meeting with Board of Forestry**

Chairman Hobbs reported he had personally visited with each board member to apprise them of the FFAC work and progress. He noted that each board member was accommodating, encouraging, and appreciative of the committee efforts. The following goals were outlined for the afternoon meeting with the BoF:

1. Come to agreement on the problems;
2. Come to agreement on strategies to address the problems;
3. Come to agreement on actions required; and
4. Come to agreement on implementation strategy/strategies.

### **Review Draft Guidance Outline** (Expanded Outline)

Chairman Hobbs introduced the *Draft Guidance Outline* document as a synthesis of FFAC work and the first step towards culminating the committee's task. The objective for this morning session was to review the document and identify any areas of concern in order to address and resolve them before discussion with the BoF, or to surface them and make everyone aware of all perspectives before working through them with the BoF. In advance of a specific section-by-section discussion of the *Draft Guidance Outline* document, the FFAC started with a general discussion of initial reactions to the document.

The success of collaborative efforts, such as the Lakeview project and the recent agreements in Grant and Harney counties on the Malheur National Forest (related to the Thorn and Egley timber sales), were posited as demonstrations of the potential for success on a larger scale. These projects also provide important lessons to consider when recommending additional collaborative processes. Recommendations should have enough detail to be substantive but not so prescriptive that local partnerships would not have the flexibility to achieve their goals.

The Sustained Stewardship Group in Lake County is a collaborative group now receiving their first Stewardship contract for 600,000 acres. The group is an example of a fairly large collaborative effort where trust had to be rebuilt. The consistent involvement of a facilitator, the dedicated involvement of local community residents, and a three day conference focused on establishing goals were suggested as factors in the success. This group, and others like it, can function as non-profit entities that function with low overhead and are able to leverage additional funds. Developing local community leadership and sustainable program funding were also highlighted.

Additional suggestions included the development of an interdisciplinary team of state and federal agencies working together to facilitate the approval process and to reduce reiteration. When forming this group it would be important to consider who needs to participate to get NEPA document approval (e.g., Fish & Wildlife) and who needs to participate to work on water issues. This would require a paradigm shift in how regulatory agencies are inserted into the collaborative process because it would require their involvement in shaping a project rather than just analyzing effects. It would also encourage agencies to be part of the process from the beginning to the end which may be challenging due to lack of funding and staff. To promote this concept legislative action

may be necessary. FFAC would need to build a logical case about how to expand local partnerships to a broader scale with state and federal agencies, and recommend that regulatory agencies get involved at early stages of the process. Constructive critics as well as supporters should be included; however the core value of members should be to find common ground. Additionally, agencies should work with communities rather than present themselves as regulatory (i.e. telling communities how/what to do). It was also suggested that barriers to participation by interested parties should be identified and mitigated, and facilitation support should continue from the outset of the process through implementation and monitoring.

### **Discussion of document:**

(Reviewed section by section)

#### Preface

- Suggest different, more positive beginning such as, “Oregon has a unique role to play in influencing as a partner the outcomes on Federal Forestlands”.

#### Visions and Goals

- Ensure state and local needs are identified – perhaps open the document with goals then follow with the process
- Move collaboration more towards beginning of document
- Consider adding a short term / long term time dimension
- Process should not be listed as the first goal

#### Sense of Urgency

- Review document to identify and replace words that can be considered value judgments such as “catastrophic,” or “growth has exceeded harvest”
- Annotation: references will be added and made available to FFAC but not included in the final document
- Add global climate change message - conveying many positive aspects of restoring a healthy forest
- Consider what to do about referencing the Forestry Program for Oregon (FPFO)
  - Some expressed concern and hesitation about citation due to bias
  - Some suggested a reason for citation would be because it was adopted by the BoF, the BoF is now asking for recommendations, and including the FPFO shows what Oregon is doing and how this relates to desired actions on Federal lands
- Add a conservation oriented statement
- Determine where to introduce the need for funds and policy change (maybe executive summary)

#### Problems

##### *Forest Health:*

- Add more to the list: e.g., homogeneity of forests and excess road density.

*The Desired Amount of Older Forest:*

- State that we do not have enough older forest
- Consider adding “protect what we have now”

*Overarching Problems:*

- Bring funding issue (4<sup>th</sup> bullet) to the forefront
- Include statement such as “the most cost effective response to global warming is to restore our federal forest health” (i.e., resiliency of forest health)
- Ensure a logical progression such as: 1) look at problems first 2) identify what can be done locally 3) what can be done nationally
- Place concepts in the context of water preservation and global warming so that it comes to the attention of the Governor’s Global Warming Strategy
- Note that agencies are spending a lot of their budgets fighting fire and how that interrelates to global warming issues.
- Add that the Federal Forests need a separate firefighting fund

Recommended Solutions

*#1 – State Leadership and Support*

- Integrate Sustained Stewardship Group funding strategy into “Potential Funding Component ideas”
- Add more concerning global warming
- Insert more about collaboration – possible that the state might be able to provide the following support for collaborative efforts:
  - Provide facilitator
  - Pay for GIS work
  - Agency expertise
  - Stay at table from beginning through implementation and work being done on the ground with the same facilitator
- More consideration and articulation of funding issues (e.g., grants and incentives as a core operation of the state)

*#2 - Local Partnerships*

- More explicitly add partnership opportunities with counties and tribes
- Provide support not mandates for partners

*#4 - Large-scale Enhancement Projects*

- Reconcile tension between “economic viability” and “communities where labor, transportation & processing infrastructure are at risk”

*#5 - Older Forests*

- Action item 3 is a goal.

*#6 and 7 - Trust and Coordination of Policies*

- The facilitation team will make a bullet list from the morning discussion identifying elements of successful processes and actions that can help build trust

*National Solutions*

- This sections points to a need for a corollary funding section for the state
- This is difficult to consider since it is basically a legislative concept without a bill
- Talk more about goals of a funding bill rather than include a name in quotes which may appear to be an endorsement
- Suggest reviewing and amending (if needed) existing federal authorities to reduce repetition, overlap, and conflict

**Draft Letter from Governor’s Forest Practices Sub-Committee of the Governor’s Task Force on the Loss of County Payments.**

Steve Hobbs emphasized the letter is in initial draft form and lists recommendations the subcommittee would like the FFAC to pursue. The FFAC made comments on the following points.

#1) “Federal processes should be amended to expedite and streamline appeal processes” has been discussed by the FFAC.

#2) The letter suggests the state should advocate changes to federal law that would allow county revenue sharing from stewardship contracts. There was hesitation by FFAC to incorporate this point without more detailed discussion. There was concern about the economic viability of some stewardship contracts and the fact that the emphasis was not directly targeted on improving forest health. It was suggested that 2c) be incorporated.

#3) Title III payments should be reinstated to agency budgets & paid out under individual cooperative agreements with specific local services. Kevin Birch explained that Title III payments are used by counties to perform services on federal lands, like search and rescue and fire protection. The social aspect of sustainability asks that these funds continue, otherwise the counties expend but don’t get reimbursed. This needs to be explained more clearly in the final letter.

#4) There was general support for a biomass tax incentive, though a need to confirm this support before making an FFAC recommendation.

#5) Omit this section, particularly 5c.

#6g) Not a recommendation from FFAC.

#6h) Needs further development.

#7) The FFAC supported this idea but suggested more detail and integration with climate change and water issues.

**Next Steps and Wrap Up**

Due to time constraints, it was suggested that FFAC members direct any comments or edits to the April meeting summary via e-mail to the facilitation team by June 17.

It was suggested that the *Key Discussion Questions* document be used as a vehicle for discussion with the BoF during the afternoon session instead of reviewing the *Expanded Outline* item by item. The intended result was described as two-way discussion that surfaced the best response to the questions and identified areas in need of additional work and clarification.

Overview of proposed schedule for completing work:

- August 2008 (first week): Draft document complete, public review
- September 3, 2008: BoF discussion of draft document
- November 6, 2008: Public comments synthesized, reviewed by BoF
- November 2008 - January 2009: Final changes made, professional edit
- January 2009 (first week): BoF final review and adoption

It was stressed that additional steps, in a more expedited manner, should be taken to help ensure success due to political and timing issues surrounding the budgeting process. The following additional actions were identified.

Additional Identified Actions

- Meet with Marvin Brown and the Governor's staff to determine the critical dates by which to develop the Policy Option Package (POP)
  - Prioritize placeholders that are needed for legislation and funding
  - Work with ODF legislative liaison to develop a POP
  - Seek input from and coordinate with BoF
- Synthesis Subcommittee to make revisions to the document based on the FFAC and joint meeting discussion.
- Circulate the revised document
- Hold additional FFAC meeting to discuss revisions and scheduling issues
- ODF to integrate FFAC material into their POP

**FFAC meeting adjourned for joint meeting with the Board of Forestry.**

(See below for summary of joint meeting)

Attendees

**Committee Members:** Chair Steve Hobbs, Ralph Bloemers, Allyn Ford, Chuck Graham, Russ Hoeflich, Bill Kluting, Annabelle Jaramillo, Tim Vredenburg, Kenneth Williamson

**Staff:** Lisa Freedman, USFS; Kevin Birch, David Morman, Jeri Chase & Mary Schmelz ODF

**Facilitation Team:** Robert Fisher and Rob Williams

## **Written Material**

- *Key Discussion Questions*
- *Expanded Outline*
- *Draft letter from Forest Practices Subcommittee of the Governor’s Task Force*

### **Oregon Board of Forestry**

#### **Joint Meeting with the Federal Forestland Advisory Committee June 3, 2008; 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

#### **Meeting Summary**

Following introductions, Steve Hobbs, Chair of the Federal Forestland Advisory Committee, began the joint meeting by reviewing the day’s objectives:

- Come to agreement on the **problems**.
- Come to agreement on the **strategies** to address those problems.
- Come to agreement on the **actions** required.
- Come to agreement on an **implementation** strategy or strategies.

Robert Fisher, Fisher Collaborative Services and Oregon Consensus Program, facilitated the day’s discussion, following the outline contained in the Key Discussion Questions.

#### **Vision and Goals**

Participants indicated that the vision and goals appeared reasonable and congruent with expectations. Some ambiguous words (e.g. “adequate”) could use some more attention and definition, but the tone and message generally resonated. It was recognized that implementation may be difficult since it would require a significant commitment of resources at a larger scale than considered before.

#### **Sense of Urgency**

The section generally conveyed a sense of urgency, though concern was expressed over the inclusion of some value statements conveyed by word choice (e.g. “catastrophic”) and the omission of some points. It was confirmed that the final draft would include additional statistics and all would be cited to ensure accuracy and credibility. It was also clarified that FFAC frequently chose to provide general guidelines and goals instead of specifics in order to provide sufficient flexibility to implement recommendations. Other comments and suggestions for inclusion included the following:

- Well-being of rural communities should be explicit
- Stress the linkage between a healthy forests and healthy communities including the opportunity to develop a diversified restoration based economy
- Highlight the important role forests play regarding global climate change and water supply

- Reference Northern Spotted Owl Recovery Plan lessons:
  - Active management is needed for the health of the forests, species and habitat preservation, but it is not happening
  - Additional tools must also be considered to preserve and enhance wildlife and ecological values
- Make the section more Oregon-centric, while recognizing the national and global context
- Be more explicit regarding the need for conservation-ecological values
- Articulate how federal disinvestment is more than just a lack of funding for forest health, it also defunds water quality, roads, wildlife habitat, and recreational facilities

### **Problems**

The group addressed the question of forest health as a problem itself or the symptom of many problems. The FFAC had originally titled the problem statement “natural processes have been disrupted” but chose to change the name to “forest health” because it is generally recognized and understood. It was clarified that the larger issues relating to the forest health problem will be addressed in the situation assessment along with a historical perspective. Participants also suggested including additional information in some of the problem statements (e.g., roads, water quality, loss of receipts to counties and schools, and reduced timber harvest) to make them more compelling. It was also suggested that additional information be added to emphasize the need for economic returns from the growth of timber and to provide more specifics on the desired amount of older forest to reflect the recommendations.

### **Recommended Solutions: State and Local**

The group indicated this effort provides an opportunity to move away from the politics of limits to the politics of possibilities and solutions. The State can play an active and helpful role in this process. The issue of scale, however, is of particular importance and there are particular needs at local, state, regional, and national levels. It was specifically suggested that a regional level of recommended solutions should be added. The general challenge was articulated as a need to address issues at all scales while maintaining local ability to tackle problems relevant to their situations. This was also articulated as an opportunity to move away from a prescriptive top-down approach and try something new that might better enable collaboration and trust building. It was suggested that a focus on rebuilding diversity and resiliency, while restoring economically viable timber harvest, was a logical starting point and opportunity for successful collaborative efforts. The recent agreements on the Malheur National Forest (Thorn and Egley timber sales) were posited as a successful example of collaboration with the agency serving as a convener. Future efforts could take a larger landscape scale to the degree tolerated within the NEPA site specificity concerns. Additional discussion points included the following:

- Must not put the State in the position of mandating to local communities; must be from the community. FFAC proposes the State will *help* local collaborations efforts happen
- There is an opportunity for developing common ground on the definition of “old growth” / “older forests”

- Terminology is particularly important and simple one-size-fits-all size definitions have not been successful
- To address the documented degradation of forestlands, focus must be on building diversity and resiliency. Business-as-usual will not break through the barrier
- Communities must be empowered to design a *desired future condition* within their geographies
- Trust must be built at all levels, which takes a long time. Motivations are diverse
- Protecting older forest types must be managed over time and space, and must be articulated
- Regulatory agencies must be at the table for collaborative efforts to be successful

In the interest of time, Chair Hobbs suggested that specific questions be addressed, rather than the full list. The questions addressed by the group are included in italics below and taken from the “Key Discussion Questions” document.

*Does the Board agree that focusing on the forest health problem is appropriate and that by necessity, will require addressing the other problems identified in the outline to varying degrees?*

The group appeared supportive of this focus as a good place to start since it is “the wolf at the door” and an opportunity to build trust in communities. It was suggested that the message should be reiterated that the health of the forest and the health of communities are interrelated.

*Does the Board agree with the concept of State facilitation and support of local partnerships or advisory committees (i.e., unit of state employees with clear direction and budget sufficient to carry out the mission)?*

Discussion began by recognizing that the allocation of funding to facilitate and support an aggressive level of collaborative efforts was a significant part of FFAC’s bold statement to address needs on the landscape. The general idea expressed was to establish six community dialogues in the first year that would initiate large scale projects (approximately 250,000 acres) from conception, through NEPA assessment, to implementation. Six additional efforts would be initiated in the second year. These twelve concurrent efforts would encompass approximately three million acres and make Oregon the first state in the nation to reach this scale. There was general support for a large scale focus and timely action across the state. There was also concern about the cost and the concern about the cost of not taking dramatic action. Some additional comments are recorded below:

- Would require quadrupling the Department’s policy option package for federal lands
- Unclear how the Bureau of Land Management would fit
- Difficult to maintain separation between a desired future condition and a community based assessment document, and then transitioned into a NEPA document
- The Board has its hands full dealing with State Forests’ issues
- The proposed project does not have a budget

- Costs must be weighed, pro and con, and much hinges on the willingness and ability of the Federal government to change its management habits and work with local interests
- The line between appropriate boldness and irresponsible nuttiness depends upon the vehicle in which to get there. Could use existing structures
- Federal managers are ultimately responsible for the decisions. Local partnerships can provide guidance and advice to federal managers to help set priorities that meet community needs, and provide the political capital needed to carry out the operations
- Money is available; priorities can be changed
- Assessments should happen at a large scale with respect to fire and fire ecology
- Third-party facilitation has been an important element of success
- Independence is critical and the Oregon Consensus Program is one organization considered “independent”
- Having the State as intermediary between the local communities and federal agencies would enhance the collective capacity
- The USFS is currently working on Forest Plan revisions - another vehicle for use over the next decade
- This fits with the obligation to prepare for climate change

*Should the State become directly involved in the NEPA process as originally envisioned by the FFAC Synthesis Subcommittee, or should it focus its energy on supporting increased funding dedicated to increased federal training and personnel for NEPA work?*

During the conversation it was clarified that this was not intended to allow State agencies to take over responsibility for the NEPA process or Federal agency roles. The intention was to provide additional State agency capacity (e.g., a NEPA strike team) to help make NEPA compliance more expedient, robust, and able to withstand legal challenge. Some State agencies and institutions of higher learning might be able to provide additional competency on some specific issues (e.g., soils, species, etc.) with additional funding. This additional support would also help address the concern that Federal agencies have been defunded and face personnel shortages.

*Timing: Schedule for completion of the report, and how it does/does not fit with the Legislative schedule.* [Project will require resources. Budget processes for the next Legislative session are underway. The project is scheduled for completion in January 2009; which is too late for the budgeting process. Appropriate funding request must be made for the Governor’s consideration.]

- One of the Department’s three key policy option packages is related to Federal lands. The Board and FFAC can have further discussion about the development of this option
- There are opportunities for coordination with the policy option package development process of other agencies since FFAC members are involved: ODFW (Dan Edge) and DEQ (Ken Williamson)

- Asking for dollars and budget priorities takes a strategy and communications plan - political support is necessary before asking for funds

*Should the draft be vetted through public review, or does public input received by the FFAC suffice?*

- Development of the document will continue to be an iterative process with more opportunities for public involvement which is important since public support is critical to successful implementation
- FFAC should pursue and incorporate public reaction before it is submitted to the Board. Time is running out for another joint meeting with the FFAC. The Board should receive a final document for review
- The Synthesis Subcommittee will work on the draft document, send it to the Board and FFAC at the same time, and request written input
- More thought to be given to the development of a communications political strategy.
- The document must “live” past the current Governor’s administration
- Steve H. and Kevin B. will head up a small group to develop a committee work plan outlining the next steps, the interaction with the Board, where public comment will occur

**Adjournment**

Following adjournment of the joint meeting at 4:00 p.m., Marvin Brown presented Steve Hobbs, past-Chair of the Board of Forestry with a plaque and gift recognizing his contribution and service to the State of Oregon.

**Attendees**

*Board Members Present:*

Larry Giustina	Bill Hutchison	Peter Hayes
Jennifer Phillippi	Barbara Craig	Cal Mukumoto

*FFAC Members and Staff:*

Steve Hobbs, Chair	Kevin Birch, ODF
Ralph Bloemers	Mary Schmelz, ODF
Allyn Ford	Jeri Chase, ODF
Chuck Graham	David Morman, ODF
Russ Hoeflich	Robert Fisher, Facilitator
Bill Kluting	Rob Williams, Facilitator
Annabelle Jaramillo	
Ken Williamson	
Tim Vredenburg	
Lisa Freedman	
Dan Edge	
Cal Joyner, guest - USFS	
Ed Shepherd, guest - BLM	

*Others present:*

Paul Adams, OSU  
Elaine Hallmark, Oregon Consensus Program  
Chris Jarmer, OFIC  
Jose Linares, USFS  
Van Manning, O&C Counties  
Terri Moffett, US Senator Gordon Smith's Office  
Turner Odell, Oregon Consensus Program  
Mateusz Perkowski, Capital Press  
Dick Posekany, Frank Lumber Co.  
Ralph Saperstein, Boise Cascade  
Gary Springer, Starker Forests  
Bob Van Dyk, Wild Salmon Center  
Diane Vosick, TNC  
Marvin Brown, State Forester  
Gayle Birch, Board Assistant  
Mike Cafferata, State Forests  
Nancy Hirsch, Div. Chief, State Forests  
Barbara Lee  
Dan Postrel, Agency Affairs  
Jim Paul, Div. Chief, Private Forests  
David Morman, Resources Planning  
Walter Schutt  
Clark Seely, Associate State Forester