

**Oregon Board of Forestry
Federal Forestlands Advisory Committee Meeting
September 7, 2007**

Oregon Department of Forestry
2600 State Street
Salem, OR 97310

Meeting Summary

On September 7, 2007 the Federal Forestlands Advisory Committee (FFAC) held a meeting at the Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) in Salem, Oregon. The primary objectives for the meeting were to:

- Explore water quality and related management challenges on federal forestlands;
- Identify potential solutions and develop recommendations;
- Review the revised problem statements;
- Receive public comment and input; and,
- Address scheduling and location for future meetings.

The following draft summary was initially prepared by ODF staff, revised by the facilitation team, and is subject to review and clarification by FFAC members and the public at the November meeting. The summary contains the following sections:

- Meeting Discussion
- Process Issues
- Flipchart Notes
- Attendees

Meeting Discussion

Opening Remarks and Review of Meeting Objectives and Agenda

Steve Hobbs, Chair of the Advisory Committee and the Board of Forestry, welcomed all meeting the Committee members and others attending the meeting, and reviewed the proposed agenda and meeting objectives (described above). No modifications to the agenda or objectives were requested.

Robert Fisher introduced Rob Williams who is joining the facilitation team.

Briefing on Natural Processes on Federal Forestlands – Focus on Water Quality

The invited guest speakers (listed below) each gave approximately 20 minute presentations that were followed by a brief question and answer period with the Committee. The presentations

preceded the public comment/input section of the agenda and a more in depth discussion among Committee members and presenters.

John D. Bailey, Oregon State University, gave a presentation on the requested topic of Water Quality and Fire, noting this was a bridge between the committee's previous discussions on the issue of fire and their discussions today about water quality.

Gordon Reeves, U.S. Forest Service Pacific Northwest Research Station, gave a presentation on the requested topic of Water Quality and Fish.

Fred Swanson, U. S. Forest Service Pacific Northwest Research Station, gave a presentation on the requested topic of Water Quality and Hydrology.

Barry Norris, Oregon Water Resources Department, gave a presentation on the requested topic of Water Policy.

All of the presentations are available on the FFAC website at:
www.oregon.gov/ODF/BOARD/FFAC.shtml.

Public Comment

Specific comments were requested on the following topics:

1. What is the most important factor(s) contributing to water quality and related management challenges on federal forestlands in Oregon, and why?
2. What policy solutions or approaches do you recommend the FFAC consider to address water quality issues, and what are the potential opportunities and challenges presented by your proposed solutions?
3. What information, if any, in addition to the information provided by the presenters should the FFAC consider about water quality on federal forestlands in Oregon?

Tom Partin, American Forest Resource Council, provided written comments and other materials on the issue of water quality and related management challenges on federal forestlands. He stated that catastrophic wildfire posed the greatest threat to water quality and species that depend on that water. He indicated his support for periodic active management instead of a "hands off approach" and provided an example from 2006 - the Shake Table Fire on the Malheur National Forest - which occurred in an area where preventative forest health projects had been blocked and a 14,500 acre fire destroyed valuable elk, deer, and aquatic species habitat.

Wayne Giesy, Hull Oak Lumber Company, and Dick Posekany, Frank Lumber Company, provided written comments regarding federal forestland challenges and rural Oregon. Wayne noted that natural processes occur in federal forests whether or not forest management activity occurs and though high-risk areas must be designated and addressed, there are sufficient environmental safeguards in place to protect against known water quality and quantity issues on federal forests. Wayne also made reference to other items on the Committee's list of "most

pressing problems” such as the reduced timber harvest which impacts the economic livelihood of many Oregonians, especially in rural communities, and combines with a of lack of effective federal agency processes and funding to create further hardship.

Bronwen Wright, Pacific Rivers Council, provided comments on mechanical fuels treatments and water quality. She stated that those types of treatments are not a way to achieve better water quality. There may be a social, economic, or forestry reason for fuels reduction treatment, but she cautioned the committee to explain those justifications and not state that it would be to improve the water quality. She stated that the ability for thinning to alter fire behavior was speculative, without scientific buy-in; but negative effects on water quality were certain.

Discussion of Natural Processes on Federal Forestlands – Focus on Water

The objective of this Committee discussion with the presenters was to identify possible solutions and objectives that could be included in the FFAC recommendations on federal forest issues. Robert Fisher opened the discussion with a brief summary of themes from the presentations:

- Affect of roads
- Physical/Social Distinctions – A distinction between the physical aspects of what is happening on the ground versus the political, social, and economic considerations taking place – and the need for clarity in distinguishing between them
- Dynamic versus static systems and processes
- Paradigm shift – The possibility of a needed shift in the way of addressing and approaching problems and solutions
- Fire – The impact of fire on natural processes, water quality and quantity

Discussion regarding possible solutions, consequences and barriers

General

- The need for leadership across the state – not one institution – to step forward and discuss new challenges that forests face
- The need for the U. S. Forest Service to get back to their work as a land management agency – and recognition and acknowledgement that they are the experts in that field who are charged with that responsibility
- The natural range of variability for systems and forests – and what is meant by that term
- Terminology/language - be careful about use of terms with multiple meanings – be explicit about use of terms and seek to understand intentions (e.g., “salvage”)
- Honest analysis of effect (there is no such thing as “no” effect), with pros and cons so that decisions can best be made – realistic about potential
- Two-tiered response (timeframes of short/medium or medium/long)
- Legal challenges and need for response

Public Perception / Knowledge

- Need for greater understanding and local conversations about active forest management

- Public perception, understanding, and opinion – trust (sustained place-space partnerships of managers and researchers to constantly learn from and adjust)
- Unrealistic expectations for the land; match the ecological capability with the expectations
- Need for a unified message and communication of FFAC recommendations

Learning Opportunities

- Creating interpretations and alternatives – other ways of approaching compliance
- Look at applying Westside effort by BLM/USFS/DEQ on riparian thinning and water quality issues (approx. 2002) as a potential model for the eastside
- Western Governor's Association policy on sustainability
- The BLM Western Oregon Plan Revision Process (WOPR)
- The Northwest Forest Plan – potential and actual implementation
- Congressman DeFazio's proposed legislation
- Develop way to address the misconception of “no negative approach”
- Projects that may result in changes in laws
- Need for sustained place-based management

Active Management

- No action is action/impacting
- Moving from reactive (after the fire) to prevention and proactive – strategic recommendations for placement of large-scale treatment
- Potential problem of protecting a species to death
- Losing, rather than making up ground (examples of recent fire boundaries in central Oregon)
- Develop uneven aged management programs

Watershed Scale Planning

- Off-stream and off-system storage
- Increasing issue of juniper
- Managing for disturbance – leaving a legacy so that the systems can respond in a positive way (while recognizing there will be variability); systems managed so that when the system falls apart, it can respond positively – resiliency and jumpstarting the recovery process
- The difference between expectations for a landscape and expectations for individual components of that landscape

Research Pilot Projects

- Projects that attempt to create flexibility within standards and interpretations (not changes in laws)
- Five Rivers Project on the Siuslaw National Forest as an example of a innovative experimental approach at a large scale
- The need for immediate action that address the social, economic, and environmental aspects
- The scale needed; research projects of low acreages will not accomplish the task
- Research projects that try new and different approaches
- Develop projects to help create an understanding of what is meant by “managing for disturbance”
- Expand on possibilities of Adaptive Management Areas

- Develop a collaborative effort on a green tree thinning project
- Look to develop a collaborative research project on the types of issues most frequently litigated

Coordination Issues

- Land management agencies/jurisdictions
- Align with other efforts
- Cross-agency coordination/messages
- Maintaining institutional capacity for management
- Identify regulatory agency roadblocks

Direction to Planning Team

Committee members discussed the direction to the Planning Team and the draft work product regarding the natural process (water quality) issues that would be expected for further committee review. It was requested that the Planning Team be sensitive to language issues (avoid absolutes – language that makes problems intractable), distinguish between short and long-term solutions, distinguish between wet and dry forest types, and categorize or group related items to the extent possible.

Process Issues

Revised Problem Statements

Robert asked for committee member feedback on the *Most Pressing Problems v11* document. After Committee discussion it was determined that the draft will continue to be a working document and it is sufficient for now to provide to provide information on the problems to potential speakers and presenters.

Review Draft Meeting Summaries – May, June, and July

Robert noted that May and June meeting summaries were distributed to the committee for input, comment, or feedback. Wade noted a correction and clarification that was needed on the May meeting summary in his discussion about the Collins Companies' purchase of the poplar tree farm. The language should be changed to reflect the correct location – “Boardman” – and that it would be the largest hardwood sawmill in the nation producing 60 million log scale feet and 100 million board feet. There were no other comments. With those corrections to the May meeting summary, the May and June meeting summaries were approved. The July meeting summary will be provided to committee members for their review soon.

Summary and Next Steps

Implementation Subcommittee

The Implementation Subcommittee is currently on hold and considered pre-mature at this time. Russ noted he had concerns about missing opportunities that may be occurring, and Steve Hobbs stated he would work with the Planning Team to see if any adjustments could be made to the Committee's schedule to more quickly accomplish the issue exploration phase of the Committee's work.

Action Items

- Circulate WGA sustainability policy
- Review DeFazio proposal, compare with FFAC ideas, and consider briefing by staff
- Consider BLM briefing on WOPR
- Revise speaker list and develop more specific questions for speakers
- Provide speaker bios to FFAC in advance of meeting
- Transmit on-line scheduling request to identify February, March, and April meeting dates

Meeting Schedule and Speakers / Next Meeting/ December Meeting in Burns

The Committee determined that the December meeting would be in Salem, not Burns, due to weather related travel concerns and agreed upon Monday, January 7, 2008 in Salem as the January meeting date.

Suggestions for the October meeting included Darryl Ross, OSU Entomologist, to speak to the topic of insect movement/forest health. It was also suggested to invite someone to discuss the latest information on a 500-square-mile spruce budworm infestation, and having someone speak to the issue of juniper (possibly Hugh Barrett or Rick Mueller). Kevin noted that the Planning Team will be further refining the questions speakers are asked to address, and requested committee members provide any ideas for specific issues they would like speakers to address.

The following speakers were suggested for future meetings:

- Matt Donegan, Forest Capital Partners (regarding timber harvest and infrastructure)
- Tom Spies, Pacific Northwest Research Station (regarding old growth)
- Charles Wilkinson, University of Colorado at Boulder Law School (regarding process for coordinating policy decisions)

Kevin noted that the Planning Team will strive to provide presentations from speakers in advance of the meetings but recognizing a likely difficulty with this request will provide information about the speakers themselves (bios).

The Committee discussed the need to begin scheduling meeting dates for 2008. The facilitation team will send an on-line meeting scheduling request to all Committee members to identify dates in February, March, and April 2008.

Steve Hobbs adjourned the meeting at approximately 3:55 p.m.

Flipchart Notes

Issues

- Are rules consistent with science and view of the world?
- Can we do honest analysis of effects (pros & cons) – then decide can we live with it?
- Losing ground on fuels and density
- Constant stream of lawsuits
- Connectivity between agencies and policy disconnects (intra-state too)
- Communications between different landowners (e.g. private land under NWFP) at landscape level
- Language (e.g. salvage vs. post fire)
- Narrowing acts leads to lawsuits (creates zero sum game)
- CWA more constraining than ESA
- Stands per acre
- How to prevent next catastrophe fire
- SCAL – look top down, not bottom up

Potential Solutions

(Short-Term)

- Leadership – face new challenges – active mgt., community conversations about future of forests
- New research (pilot projects) with CWA exemptions to look for new solutions
- Five Rivers Project as an example
- Change standards without changing laws

(General)

- Expand range of alternatives considered
- Look at issues being litigated to understand problems
- Green thinning for multiple-layering stands
- Scale – to return to range of natural variability
- Water storage (where?)
- Water management to enhance snow pack (consistent with fuels reduction)
- Be realistic about analysis of effects
- Look at reports from other areas (e.g. Colorado, NRC)
- Public perception and understanding about natural resource management
- Admin rules and procedures – if problem let's say so
- Lawsuits – reduce numbers without jeopardizing rights to participate
- Public discourse about state of forests (builds trust)
- Cultivate broader public trust
- Watershed scale planning – desired future conditions addressing 3 areas
- Cleanup – agency missions and cultures
- Eliminate admin boundaries for land management – match to landscape and forest types

- Manage based on what landscape can do (Coho example) – match ecological ability of land to expectations
- Other efforts (e.g., WGA sustainability) lineup with
- Do something on the ground
- Maintain institutional capacity to manage land
- Create and act on learning opportunities
- Active management
- Manage for disturbance and recognize variability (riparian buffers in right place for resiliency and positive recovery)

Barriers

- Manage for disturbance – education/accept discomfort in face of uncertainty
- Language and how used (e.g., salvage vs. post fire)
- Timing to implement - looking at lawsuits can result in new lawsuits from other groups
- Participation in collaborative efforts
- Unwillingness/uncertainty about how to be creative
- Business as usual
- Need research community as part of pilot projects
- Different laws apply to BLM and Forest Service

Consequences

- Stability
- Collaborative efforts could reduce or eliminate lawsuits - affect outcome or speed for making decisions - if everyone at table including those who don't want to collaborate

Action Items

- Circulate WGA sustainability res/policy
- Review DeFazio Proposal and compare with FFAC ideas (briefing by staff?)
- Consider BLM briefing on WOPR
- Revise speaker list and develop more specific questions for speakers
- Provide speaker bios to FFAC
- Scheduling for February – April 2008 (Rob will setup WEB-based system)

Attendees

Committee Members: Ralph Bloemers, Allyn Ford, Chuck Graham, Steve Grasty, Steve Hobbs, Russ Hoeflich, Annabelle Jaramillo, Bill Kluting, R. Wade Mosby, Tim Vredenburg.

Staff: Lisa Freedman, U. S. Forest Service; Mike Haske, Bureau of Land Management; Kevin Birch, Cathy Clem, Ted Lorensen, Jeri Chase, Chad Allen, Keith Baldwin, Ian Yau, and Jo Morgan, ODF; Koto Kishida, DEQ; Rod Kraemer, ODFW; Bill Ferber, Water Resources Department; Robert Fisher, FCS; and Rob Williams.

Scheduled Speakers: John Bailey, OSU; Gordon Reeves, USFS-PNW Research Station; Fred Swanson, USFS-PNW Research Station; and Barry Norris, Oregon Water Resources Department.

Public: Dick Posekany, Frank Lumber Company; Wayne Giesy, Hull-Oaks Lumber Company; Rex Storm, Associated Oregon Loggers; Tom Partin, American Forest Resources Council; Bronwen Wright, Pacific Rivers Council; and John Ashley, The Nature Conservancy.

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.