

**Oregon Board of Forestry
Federal Forestlands Advisory Committee Meeting
June 4-5, 2007**

Oregon Department of Forestry
2600 State Street
Salem, OR 97310

Meeting Summary

Day 1, June 4, 2007; 1:00 – 5:15 p.m.

Opening Remarks, Meeting Agenda and Objectives

Steve Hobbs, Chair of the Advisory Committee and the Board of Forestry, welcomed the Committee members and others attending the meeting, and reviewed the proposed agenda and meeting objectives which included:

- Finalizing the top-level goals
- Finalizing and prioritizing the most pressing problems for consideration by the FFAC
- Public comment

Steve requested the Committee work towards reducing the number of goals and problem statements.

Top-Level Goals – Review and Revision

Kevin Birch stated that the goal statements will be used in three different ways:

1. To flesh out the vision statement (visions tend to be short and broad, and goals provide details and specificity)
2. To help identify problems (the difference between the goals and the current situation gets us to the problems)
3. As a tool to use when reviewing federal plans and projects (are these consistent with what the state wants)

Kevin noted that the discussion of each individual goal statement can identify what is missing or needs to be changed; then the suite of goals can be reviewed for overarching ideas that are not yet identified. Then the Committee can reduce the number of goals from eleven to five or six by combining or deleting.

Committee members and the planning team staff discussed the draft goals document (Version 6, dated 5/25/07) and recommended the following changes, which will be incorporated into a new draft for Committee review later at the meeting.

Goal #1: No conceptual discussion. Retain as is – no suggested changes.

Goals #2 and #3: Revise - combine together into one goal. Conceptual discussions included:

- Inclusion of Indian Tribes and focus on collaboration
- Sets a goal of more collaborative partnerships across ownership boundaries and tries to get synergy between public agencies and private ownerships
- #2 addresses partnerships between governments; #3 focuses on collaboration, a new way of decision-making, including the public.

Goal #4: Sideline for the time-being; revisit if needed to achieve other goals. Conceptual discussions included:

- The tension between balancing accountability and preserving flexibility
- It might be difficult for the Committee to influence or change laws and statutes (NEPA, etc.), focus on finding common ground, not changing laws
- Possible tests, experiments, pilot projects where waivers could be requested
- May be beyond the Committee's scope.

Goal #5: Revise. Conceptual discussions included:

- More specificity, i.e., concept of the forests paying their own way – or at least part of their own operational and restoration needs; also, how to value all of the forest goods and services.
- Need a federal commitment to meet stewardship, restoration, and sustainability obligations; that includes funding, although it's not the sole focus.

Goals #6, #7, #8, #9 (all "ecosystem" goals): Revise and combine into one. Conceptual discussions included:

- Combine concepts of protection, restoration, and management, and monitoring – retain all
- #6 as the overarching goal with #7, #8, and #9 formulated into recommendations, because they relate to specific problems – also seen as tools
- Include concepts of resiliency, connectivity, clean air.

Goal #10: Revise. Conceptual discussions included:

- Replace "urban and rural" with "tribal, local, state, and national"
- Flexibility to re-visit when other groups working on the same types of language finish their work.

Goal #11: Revise. Conceptual discussions included:

- This goal relates to the full suite of forest economic products (carbon sequestration, value of clean water, etc.), not just timber-focused – suggested language change: "full suite of ecosystem goods and services"
- Add the concept of "local" to communities
- Remove "economic outputs" – replace with "revenues" – shared revenues which historically has been the case.

Most Pressing Problems

Robert Fisher noted that the charge from the Committee at their last meeting in May was to revise the problem statements, collapsing some things together, and the latest draft of the Most

Pressing Problems document (Version 6, dated 5/25/07) reflects that work – reducing from 26 draft problems to 10. He asked for general feedback on the work, which was generally positive.

Committee members and the planning team staff then discussed the draft the Most Pressing Problems document (Version 6, dated 5/25/07) at a conceptual level – focusing on the problem statement (in bold) and agreeing to note that the descriptive paragraphs are still “works in progress”. The Committee recommended the following changes, which will be incorporated into a new draft for Committee review later in the meeting.

Problem #1: Revise. Conceptual discussions included:

- Increased fire funding needs, reduced overall funding – doubles the impact of the problem
- Include BLM in discussions
- Appropriateness/prioritization/allocation of funding
- Forest managers need more flexibility in expending funds, based on plans, prioritized at the local level.

Problem #2: Revise. Conceptual discussions included:

- “Little direction” not accurate – too much direction – conflicting
- Multiple-use, sustained yield is difficult – that will not change
- Balance is the key; how to make decisions – the criteria and guidance needed
- Lack of national policy for the management of federal forestlands
- “Ever-evolving” legal framework – lack of knowing a solid framework
- “Balance of economic, environmental, and social resources” rather than “production of multiple resources”
- Add concepts of legal framework, court decisions, and shifting legal landscape.

Problem #3: Revise. Conceptual discussions included:

- “Overstocked” and “massive” – level of problem and how to describe it – use “unprecedented” in scope and that it is “landscape” in scale
- Remove the last two words “to wildfire”

Problem #4: Revise. Conceptual discussions included:

- Effect of climate change – whole-scale conversion of habitat types and other things – not just limited to “combined with wildfire”
- Climate change – always occurred and changed species of forest; managing for it is the issue
- Need discussions about other things to do with climate change – natural flux of carbon, etc.; finding the baseline

Problem #5: Revise. Conceptual discussions included:

- Economic and social benefits would always be below “potential” – statement is too general
- Assumptions that harvest decline has created conversion to non-forest uses on private lands – other contributions such as population pressures
- Different structural loss pressures on eastside versus westside

- Federal policy has shifted from the economic and social benefits provide from the forests – large changes to community economic and social benefit structure with no guidance; induced change with no direction on how to manage for that change
- Too much risk spread across the landscape
- Counties have a large percentage of federally-owned lands; to survive, they need to get something from that land to support them economically (payments, taxes, or products) – they have no other options
- Options for several recommendations to improve the social and economic well-being; not “back to the old days”, but maybe even to get to the timber harvest levels proposed in the Northwest Forest Plan
- No transition plan – unintended consequences
- Referring to lost infrastructure does not describe the devastation of communities
- Suggested language: “Reduced timber harvest from federal forest lands has resulted in diminished forest industry infrastructure with unintended economic and social losses to rural communities”.

Problem #6: Revise. Conceptual discussions included:

- Water quality and quantity are only two elements – timing of release is also impacted (hydrologic structure)
- After management, there is an immediate impact
- Include the present, not just the future
- Fish drive a lot of the water issues; also driven by adequate riparian zones – many of the upland small streams (100-year-old problems caused by long-ago management that cannot be fixed by changing today’s management)
- The phrase “beneficial uses” (rather than “important uses”) has a technical meaning in water law and policy
- Much of the problem could be resolved with funding, policy, and leadership
- Polling information shows Oregonians concerned about water quality and quantity; put water policy up front and on the table
- Suggested language: “The current condition of federal forests is not providing adequate water quality, quantity, and hydrologic flow to protect beneficial uses”.

Problem #7: Revise. Conceptual discussions included:

- Change to be similar to changes made to #6 (above). Suggested language: “The current condition of federal forests is not providing adequate habitat for wildlife diversity”.

Problem #8: Revise. Conceptual discussions included:

- Bold statement and explanatory text do not match
- Old growth – what does that mean and how to say it; definition for common ground
- “Within the context of sustainable forest management” – the entirety of social, economic, and environmental values – integrated. Decisions about timber harvest should be made in the context of all those things; same with old growth; decision not made in a vacuum.
- Suggested language: “The desired amount of older forests on Forest Service and BLM lands needs to be established within the context of “sustainable forest management”.

Problem #9: Revise. Conceptual discussions included:

- Framed as something that should be done rather than the problem is
- Movement of industrialized nations has led to problems in developing countries in terms of resources
- Incorporate into problem #5 – also could keep separate as this also is a biological issue not just economic,
- Suggested language: “Decisions about federal forestlands do not fully recognize the global context”.

Problem #10: No discussion or revisions.

Lack of Trust is another problem missing from the list.

Committee members also were asked to consider their priorities for addressing the problems in order to share and discuss the problems on Day 2.

Public Comment

Comments were requested on the following questions:

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

Wayne Giesy, Hull Oak Lumber Company, and Dick Psekany, Frank Lumber Company, provided written comments regarding rural Oregon and federal forestlands. They stated that much of the federal forestlands are in an overstocked condition, raising the danger of fire, disease, and insects; many federal land management statutes need revision; and rural counties are losing infrastructure. They suggested starting with a small amount of harvest to provide some immediate financial aid to rural Oregon by harvesting ten percent of the net growth on federal lands, incrementally increasing the harvest by five to ten percent per year as infrastructure allows.

Rex Storm, Associated Oregon Loggers, provided written comment on the questions. He stated that the economic goal (#11) is the most important and federal forestlands have failed to accomplish this goal since 1990, with the result being the “wholesale collapse of the economic, environmental, and social attributes formerly derived from active management of those forests.” He mentioned the benefits that could be accomplished by responsibly managing these federal forestlands to sustain predictable forest products. Rex then stated that the most pressing issue is the economic issue captured in #5.

Doug Heiken, Oregon Wild,* stated that one drawback to limiting the Committee’s work to federal forestlands is that Oregon’s economic problems cannot be solved by federal forestlands;

*

even if we protect and conserve these forests the public values that Oregonians enjoy are not monetized or rated in markets. There is also a private land base that the Committee should consider whether or not these values should flow from and if they are doing that or should be doing better. He provided the following observations on the pressing problems:

- #1: past management (clear-cutting and fire suppression) has created the current problems – need for stand management, pre-commercial thinning, etc., and to quit burdening the future and take responsibility for future management costs
- #3: another natural process that was disrupted on the westside in the 60's, 70's, and 80's with clear-cutting is long intervals of uninterrupted growth. Broaden from the dry forest focus.
- #4: climate change problem statement misses the point that logging has contributed to the problem and will contribute.
- #5: Rural communities are adjusting to changing economic conditions and will continue to adjust. Federal forests are not the only cause and timber harvest from them cannot be the solution.
- #8: The last revision of this problem eliminated the shortage of old growth forests.
- #9: The problem statement should be broadened to incorporate that we export environmental benefits as well as environmental problems, when we store carbon here by not logging – thus improving the global ecosystem.

Tom Partin, American Forest Resource Council, provided written comments. He discussed previous work that had been done by an eastside forest advisory panel and included copies of that Committee's report, an 11-point strategy for restoring eastern Oregon forests, watersheds, and communities, and the 2002 report "Working to Restore Eastside Forest Ecosystems and Community Health: Oregon's Experience."

Tom noted that the most important goal for federal lands in Oregon is to manage our federal forests in a balanced and sustained manner to provide for health forests, healthy watersheds, and healthy communities. The most pressing issue concerning federal forestlands in Oregon is that federal forests are lacking needed active management because of fuels build-up, inadequate funding, legal challenges, and communities not being considered as needing to be sustained.

Steve Hobbs adjourned the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

Day 2, June 5, 2007; 8:00 – 11:15 a.m.

Opening Remarks, and Reviewing Meeting Agenda and Objectives

Steve Hobbs, Chair of the Advisory Committee and the Board of Forestry, welcomed the Committee members and others attending day two of the meeting, and introduced Dan Edge, the new Committee member representing the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission (replacing Zane Smith, Jr.). Steve reviewed the proposed agenda and meeting objectives, which included:

- Reviewing the newest version of the draft top-level goals

Note: Following the meeting Doug submitted a written copy of his comments, which were distributed to Committee members and posted on the public comment portion of the Committee's website.

- Reviewing the newest version of the draft top-level the most pressing problems for consideration by the FFAC.

Steve noted the priority was to have a set of goals and problem statements ready for discussion with the Board of Forestry at the joint meeting scheduled to convene at 1:00 p.m., and if time permitted, the Committee also would discuss the FFAC process. He also noted he leave by 10:00 a.m. to chair a Board of Forestry Executive Session, and Steve Grasty would Chair the meeting.

Draft Goals – Review, Discussion, and Revision

Robert Fisher noted that the revisions discussed at yesterday’s FFAC meeting had been incorporated into the draft Goals, Version 7 dated 6/4/07. He noted the format had been changed – with the definitions and vision moved to the back of the document; the number of goals was collapsed to six – with an additional potential seventh one included – thus changing the goal “numbers”. He asked for general reaction to the revisions, after which time the Committee would review them individually.

General overall comments:

- Lack of trust was added as a problem; should “build trust” be added as a separate goal? It relates to all of the existing goals, and identify processes to engage communities to re-build trust
- The climate change sentence in #4 – does not have the right verbs and “measure and anticipate” is too passive. Suggest tying back to benefits by adding something about the “potential effects of climate change on the sustainable ecosystem benefits need to be measured, anticipated, and properly managed”
- Suggest changing the category “ecosystem” to “environment” to be consistent with language used relating to sustainability that is woven throughout the rest of the Committee’s work
- There is a hodgepodge of disconnected statements in #4 –that don’t lead to specific outcome
- Reduce to four goals – roll the process goals into a single goal
- Process goals could be more aggressive, not rubber stamping the past
- Concerns about what happened with the previous work by the eastside forest health committee and why they failed to have an impact; and not having the same thing to happen with this Committee; want to make a difference (possible goal?)

Committee members and the planning team staff then discussed the goals individually, and recommended the following changes be incorporated into a new draft for review and discussion with the Board of Forestry at the joint meeting on the June 5.

Process Goals #1, #2, #3: Revise. Conceptual discussions included:

- Concerns about the information about the previous eastside forest health committee’s efforts; the FFAC’s challenge is to figure out how to do something different from past efforts
- Change passive language to be more aggressive
- Add a goal about implementation and develop an implementation strategy

- Develop into an action statement, government bodies united to take specific action to change the paradigm of how federal lands are managed – uniting with communities – behind a specific vision.
- Put the core elements into one very active statement
- Develop long-, mid-, and short-term goals, and processes that are not burdensome, and the commitment to action and dedication to process to achieve them
- Include local governments
- Retain piece about resolution of conflicts – a new paradigm for conflict resolution in forest management
- Clearly define mission, priorities, and long term strategies on some of the most pressing problems that we can measure and accomplish measurable gains
- Power to action needs to be included
- Tension within the system

Goal #4: Revise. Conceptual discussions included:

- Change title from “ecosystem” to “environment”
- The over-riding objective for this goal is unclear -- Preserving and restoring evolutionary processes – fire, flood, diversity of species etc. -- and it doesn’t lead to a specific outcome
- Retain the ideas included, but much past “Diverse native forest” could be reflected in problem statements and recommendations
- Shorten - include first and last sentences; concise statement about what we are trying to protect, restore, maintain, and manage
- Retain climate change; a driving factor that would demand healthy ecosystems in place that are resilient and describe what that means.

Goal #5: Revise. Conceptual discussions included:

- Include the element of trust, a spirit of trust within communities, instilling collaboration as a norm, best intentions, adaptive management and learning as we move forward
- “To the extent possible” leaves too much leeway to not accomplish anything

Goal #6: Revise. Conceptual discussions included:

- “Goods and services” encompasses “ecosystem”
- Whole systems accounting, parity
- Public learning and finding ways to capture economic value and the mix
- Still a work in progress, make that clear to the Board

Potential Additional Goal #7: Revise. Conceptual discussions included:

- Shorten, and move the last sentence first. Suggested language: “Policy guidance balances the need for accountability while preserving flexibility in the management of federal forestlands to ensure sustainability while meeting state, tribal, local, and national needs”.
- Still needs work and a longer discussion; make suggested changes, and put aside for now

Most Pressing Problems

Robert Fisher noted that the changes requested at the previous meeting had been made to the latest draft of the Most Pressing Problems document (Version 7, dated 6/4/07) and also that the note had been added about the descriptive text. He asked for Committee feedback on the new version, focusing on the “bold” text (not the narrative).

Committee members discussed the new version and recommended the following changes, which will be incorporated into a new draft for the joint meeting with the Board of Forestry (during the June 5 meeting).

Problems #1, 2 5, 7, 9 and 11: No revisions or discussion.

Problem #3: Revise. Conceptual discussions included:

- “Dry forest types” language; revise to include all of Oregon’s forests, particularly acute in dry forest types

Problem #4: Revise. Conceptual discussions included:

- Still incomplete, difficult to predict impacts or to know how to mitigate the risk
- The potential to severely impact federal forests is a huge driver not included before
- Question whether they have the resources necessary to build resiliency into the system to prevent catastrophic loss

Problem #6: Revise. Conceptual discussions included:

- Proper terminology is hydrologic regimes (rather than hydrologic flows)

Problem #8: Revise. Conceptual discussions included:

- Remove quotes around language of sustainable forest management
- Change “within the context of” to “as a component of”
- Defining this is a key goal – causes a lot of consternation
- Add “and protecting”
- For consistency, replace “Forest Service and BLM” with “federal lands”

Problem #10: Revise. Conceptual discussions included:

- Add lack of “effective” process and “tribal”

Prioritizing the Most Pressing Problems

To begin to prioritize the Committee’s limited time and resources, Robert asked the group for an initial prioritization of problems – for group members to identify what their most pressing issue is. After discussion, group members agreed to identify what they would choose if they had to pick one and a brief statement on the reasons for their choice.

	<u>Goal#</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Allyn	3	We need a call to arms and to be bold; #3 does this best
Bill	3	
Chuck	1	From the manager perspective, with funds could take care of #s 3-7

Dan	3	Followed by #s 6-8
Ralph	1	For the same reasons as Chuck, it drives everything else
Russ	3	Same reasoning as Steve G
Steve G	1	Because agree with the Board of Forestry on their strategies, and they put legal and process first, could interchange with #3
Tim	2	Legal morass often limits good plans, followed by #1
Wade	3	# 5 second, #2 third

Prior to leaving, Ken indicated to another Committee that #3 and #6 are high priorities, as he is very concerned about water flow, and Steve Hobbs chose #3.

Robert then asked the Committee members to identify the five problems they would focus on, if the Committee does not have time to focus on all ten. Following that exercise, #3 and #5 were each chosen seven times; #2 was chosen five times; #6 was chosen four times; #10 was chosen three times; and #4 and 9 were chosen twice. (Note: this exercise did not include choices from the three Committee members who were not at the meeting.)

July Committee Meeting Planning

Committee members discussed the July meeting and agreed to spend time planning and organizing the Committee's scheduling and work, discussing potential speakers, and framing the questions that speakers will be asked to address. It was also agreed that the landscape resiliency/natural processes issue document would be sent to the panelists from the May meeting in Bend for their input, revised if needed, and sent to the Committee for discussion in July.

FFAC Process

Robert asked for Committee feedback on what is going well and what to do differently. Committee members discussed how to best review and provide input on work, and it was agreed to continue this discussion at the next meeting in July.

Steve Grasty adjourned the meeting at 11:15 a.m.

Attending on Day 1:

Committee Members: Ralph Bloemers, Chuck Graham, Steve Grasty, Russ Hoeflich, Steve Hobbs, Bill Kluting, R. Wade Mosby, Ken Williamson, and Tim Vredenburg.

Staff: Kevin Birch, Cathy Clem, Jeri Chase, ODF; Marianne Fitzgerald and Koto Kishida, DEQ; Steve Calish, BLM; Rod Krahmer, ODFW; Dave Powers, EPA; Suzy Driver; Robert Fisher, FCS.

Public: Dick Posekany, Frank Lumber Company; Sean Malone and Chuck Brushwood, Crag Law Center; Wayne Giesy, Hull-Oaks Lumber Company; Rex Storm, Associated Oregon Loggers; Doug Heiken, Oregon Wild; Tom Partin, American Forest Resources Council.

Attending on Day 2:

Committee Members: Ralph Bloemers, Chuck Graham, Steve Grasty, Russ Hoeflich, Steve Hobbs, Bill Kluting, R. Wade Mosby, Ken Williamson, Allyn Ford, Dan Edge, and Tim Vredenburg.

Staff: Kevin Birch, Cathy Clem, ODF; Joshua Seeds, Koto Kishida, DEQ; Lisa Freedman, USFS; Steve Calish, BLM; Rod Kraemer, ODFW; Suzy Driver, Mediation Services; Robert Fisher, FCS.

Public: Chuck Brushwood, Crag Law Center; Wayne Giesy, Hull-Oaks Lumber Company; Rex Storm, Associated Oregon Loggers.

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.