

**Oregon Board of Forestry
Federal Forestlands Advisory Committee Meeting
October 15, 2007**

Oregon Department of Forestry
2600 State Street
Salem, OR 97310

Meeting Summary

On October 15, 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:

- Review and discuss draft potential solutions from the September meeting;
- Explore natural processes issue, focusing on juniper, roads, insects, and forest health;
- Discuss the next steps for the potential solutions document;
- Receive public input and comment; and
- Set the 2008 meeting schedule.

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 Reviewing Meeting 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.

Steve H. introduced Steve Calish who was attending on Mike Haske's behalf.

Policy Recommendations for Natural Processes and Water Quality on Federal Forestlands

Robert Fisher asked for committee member input on the format and content of the Potential Solutions document (*Draft Version 3*).

Kevin Birch explained the intended process for developing the *Potential Solutions* document: (1) initial materials from the FFAC meeting discussion to the Planning Team within a week; (2) Planning Team members would develop ideas and share with the Team and section drafting lead within two weeks; (3) the section drafting lead and Kevin consolidate the information and transmit the document to the FFAC approximately one week in advance of the meeting.

Bob Progluske, the Planning Team lead for the water quality portion of the natural processes issue, created the structure of the *Potential Solutions* document. The level of completeness of the document was described as approximately step 2 of 5, and it was acknowledged that the information had not been vetted with the invited speakers. Review by the speakers would be desirable step if the speakers were willing. It was also acknowledged that the *Potential Solutions* was a working document that needed to be vetted with many so that it did not contain the recommendations of one person on an issue.

Some initial comments on document content included:

- Section 2.11 - Finesse wording about lack of leadership and flush out exactly what is meant by that phrasing and describe the need for leadership in many venues and at all levels. It was suggested that leadership for FFAC meant being involved in the process through the implementation of the ideas generated. It was also suggested that specific leadership was necessary to help create a paradigm shift from management of static systems to management of dynamic systems.
- Section 2.12 - Research: should not rely solely on research, should be one of many tools
- Section 2.13 - Issue of active management: change label to “lack of active management” as the problem
- Section 2.13 – Need tools in addition to green thinning
- Section 2.11 - Public perception and understanding, and systematic leadership educational failures
- General – Remember the directive to “be bold” – look at examples from Colorado, Arizona, and Montana, as well as the “Options Forestry” piece about the large scale management in the Siuslaw National Forest working on multiple objectives in one EIS.
- Direction to Staff – FFAC encouraged staff to make recommendations to the best of their ability using their professional judgment.

Next Steps

- Direction from 10/14 meeting to be drafted within the first week and circulated to Committee members and planning team members (raw draft)
- Individual Committee members can send comments on draft document from the meeting to Kevin within one week
- Kevin to collect/collate comments received by committee members
- Planning Team to meet at beginning of second week to discuss action items and make plan for revising/building *Planning Solutions* document
- Individual sections of the document assigned to individual members of the planning team with lead responsibility
- Distribution of revised *Planning Solutions* document to FFAC one week in advance of meeting

Briefing on Natural Processes on Federal Forestlands – Focus on Juniper, Roads, Insects, and Forest Health

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.

Tony Svejcar, U.S.D.A. Agricultural Research Service, gave a presentation on “Western Juniper – Issues and Solutions”. Tony also provided the following other materials: “Research Progress Report 2005: Eastern Oregon Agricultural Research Center, Burns”; “Biology, Ecology, and Management of Western Juniper”; and “The Quiet Invasion...Managing Juniper in Eastern Oregon” (video).

Arne Skaugset, Oregon State University, gave a presentation on “Forest Roads”.

Scott Black, Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation, gave a presentation on “What Good are Bugs? Importance of Invertebrates to Northwest Forests”. Scott also provided the following publication: “Logging to Control Insects: The Science and Myths Behind Managing Forest Insect ‘Pests’ – A synthesis of Independently Reviewed Research” and an Invertebrate Conservation Fact Sheet – “Pollinates in Natural Areas – A Primer on Habitat Management”.

Darrell Ross, Oregon State University, gave a presentation on “Forest Insect Pests – 30,000 Foot Overview”.

Public Comment

Specific comments were requested on the following topics:

1. What policy solutions or approaches do you recommend the FFAC consider to address juniper, roads, insects, or forest health issues, and why?
2. What are the opportunities and challenges presented by your proposed solutions?
3. Additional information, if any, the FFAC should consider about juniper, roads, insects, for forest health in the federal forestlands in Oregon?

Tom Partin, American Forest Resource Council, provided written comments and a hand-out on annual growth and mortality for the Iron Triangle Forests. He provided some statistics for Oregon’s eastside national forests on annual growth, mortality, removal of growth for management, and net growth. He then discussed the amount of acres for three specific national forests in northeast Oregon and southeast Washington, the Malheur, Umatilla, and Wallowa-Whitman, that are in moderate to high risk of wildfire – a total of 3.9 million acres. His recommendations included using the hazardous fuels line item of the Forest Service’s budget to get the work done and using the Healthy Forest Restoration Act authority also for treatment projects. He also indicated that experience in California indicates that legislation will likely be

necessary and he suggested the creation of a “forestry czar” who would work on treating a specific number of class II and III lands.

Doug Heiken, Oregon Wild, commented that the survey and manage program was only initiated because of past over-logging and that if that had not happened, or if current/future logging of old growth forests was not happening, survey and manage would not be necessary. He expressed concerns with the Healthy Forest Restoration Act’s elimination of alternatives and less informed decision-making process. He indicated there is a lack of public trust in the program – a problem, rather than the kind of solution this committee should be advancing. He also indicated that the designation of entire county boundaries as wildland-urban interface boundaries is generally not appropriate.

Wayne Giesy, Hull Oak Lumber Company, commented on leadership and the need for an objective that land managers can manage to achieve, and the difficulties that managers will continue to have until that is put in place, citing examples of problems such as the low percentage of harvested wood from the Biscuit Fire. He also encouraged the Committee to seek legislative solutions.

Discussion - Natural Processes: Focus on Juniper, Roads, Insects, and Forest Health

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 and to incorporate the ideas expressed during the public comment period. The following ideas were discussed and are grouped according to the issues identified in the *Potential Solutions* document:

General

- Opportunity to build trust with a focus on improving forest health
- Advancing the level of trust by demonstrating improved forest condition
- Focus on building and communicating successes at a local level
- Create on-pager educational documents to describe key issues and ideas
- Remember to manage for landscape diversity and manage for function
- Pooling resources and projects on state or regional level – to recognize some projects may not be economical
- Trust issues – who's doing monitoring and assessing, who needs to be involved, and what resources are needed
- Accounting methods need to recognize values (e.g., forest health)
- Direction comes from mission in management plan and source of funding (e.g., KV funding)

Road Rehabilitation

- Fire suppression activities use the roads network – also recreation; activities that don’t generate revenue depend on a transportation network
- Develop fire suppression set aside to fix road issues put in on initial attack or address legacy road issues

Overstocked Forests

- The Forest Service budget amount for fighting fire; using those funds for fire prevention – shifting the resource priority
- Lack of clear objective for management of federal forest lands - on-the-ground
- Focus on – removal protocol/certification to make trade-offs acceptable
- Lessons learned on private land will inform federal agencies and they should be encouraged to partner
- Combine intensive monitoring with large scale efforts

Overstocked Juniper

- Landscape level treatment of juniper, given:
 - water consumed, and
 - particulate matter from fire
- Possible OWEB involvement and resources – restoring natural conditions
- Relating to juniper and rangelands - restoring those lands to a natural range of variability creates a role for the state to play in research and private lands projects with potential partnerships to get the necessary resources
- Build on Lakeview example

Biomass

- Inequities in subsidies for biomass versus other energy projects
- The need to understand recommendations from recent biomass working group
- Economic difficulties in terms of transportation costs and infrastructure; guaranteeing supply at a level to enable investment
- Co-locate biomass facility with commercial for co-generation

Process Issues**Review Draft Meeting Summary - July**

Robert asked for comment or input on the draft July meeting summary. The July meeting summary was approved as submitted.

Summary and Next Steps***Write-up of Potential Solutions***

The general protocol for document development is as follows:

- Direction from meeting to be drafted within the first week and circulated to Committee members and planning team members (raw draft)
- Individual Committee members can send comments on draft document from the meeting to Kevin within one week
- Kevin to collect/collate comments received by committee members
- Planning Team to meet at beginning of second week to discuss action items and make plan for revising/building *Planning Solutions* document

- Individual sections of the document assigned to individual members of the planning team with lead responsibility
- Distribution of revised *Planning Solutions* document to FFAC one week in advance of meeting

Other potential action items

- Steve Hobbs will consider if there is a more effective way for agency personnel to be able to provide input and make recommendations to the Committee
- Planning Team will distribute the revised *Potential Solutions* document in its draft form and Committee members can comment if they choose
- Re-connecting with biomass working group: Kevin offered to supply the report to the Committee and ODF's staff person to that working group – Joe Misek – can join the committee at the next meeting when they discuss the potential solutions that came out of this meeting
- Find somebody for the December meeting to discuss financial issues, particularly in terms of investment criteria

Meeting Dates – February through April 2008

Committee members will consider an alternate meeting date for the December 3 meeting due to a number of scheduling issues that have occurred for many members. The January 7, 2008 meeting will remain unchanged.

In planning meetings for February through April, 2008, there were no dates in those three months that all committee members could attend; however, according to the availability provided no committee members would miss more than one meeting with the following schedule:

- February 1
- March 10
- April 4

May will be reserved for document development before a joint meeting with the Board of Forestry in June.

Topics and Speakers for Next Meeting on November 5

Kevin Birch reviewed the upcoming meeting topics and speakers. In November, the work on the topics from today's presentations (juniper, roads, insects, and forest health) will be reviewed for committee discussion. That work will also include ideas from the meeting in May. In the afternoon, the issue of timber harvest and infrastructure will begin with presentations on economics from Ted Helvoigt, EcoNorthwest and Eric Hovee.

The December meeting will be focused on those same topics, with tentative presenters Doug Robertson, Jim Walls, and an additional speaker to discuss financial issues. Steve Hobbs requested time for a strategic look at future planning and discussion of coordination issues.

The topic for January and February meeting discussion is older forests with scheduled presentations from Norm Johnson and Tom Spies in January. The February speakers are not yet

determined and it was suggested to have someone from Congressman DeFazio's office, along with other Oregon delegation staff, discuss proposed legislation and the issue of older forests, along with someone from ODFW to provide their perspective on older forest issues.

In March, the issue will be coordinated processes and decisions across the agencies and in April, funding.

Other

Steve Grasty noted that he had provided a copy of a just-published report from the Association of Oregon Counties on the Secure Rural Schools and Communities Self Determination Act of 2000 – "P.L. 106-393 Status Report".

Steve Hobbs adjourned the meeting at approximately 3:50 p.m.

Flipchart Notes

Action Items

- Solutions Document:
 - FFAC comments to planning team (Kevin) within one week from meeting focusing on reasons for changes, new ideas, issues to be addressed by FFAC in a meeting
 - Future discussion with agency heads to get input?
 - Planning team will distribute draft solutions document when it goes to planning team
 - Coordination with biomass group to understand findings and transportation issues (juniper supply, density to return to condition class 1, bug kill threat)
- December Meeting:
 - Finances

Leadership

- Paradigm shift in forest management – change from managing as a corn field to manage as a dynamic large scale system
- Acceptance of dynamism and risk – public education, too
- Mimic fire with training regime
- Legal constraints (e.g., G. Reeves suggestions for salmon)
- Provide supervisory level and ability to make decisions and take risks
- Legal constraints continued – NEPA/ESA – focus on small scale, static approaches, rather than grand projects – do something to minimize disturbances and conflicts
- Leadership for FFAC – stay engaged for action on the ground
- Federal leadership – need model (discuss CO, AZ, and MT approaches at December meeting)
- Lacking public understanding of natural processes

- Public info about FFAC work and recommendations (press reports, media) – once reach consensus

Committee/Presenter Discussion

- Balance incentives for treatment and paying for project or creating income
- Funding mechanisms to ensure right treatment at right place with right motivations
- Pooling resources and projects on state or regional level – to recognize some projects may not be economical
- Federal – increased resources to avoid sacrificing quality of treatment – where would it come from (forest resources) or what would be cut
 - Shift resource priorities
 - \$ from fire budget
- Direction comes from mission in management plan and source of funding (e.g., KV funding)
- Activities that don't generate revenue still depend on road network (e.g., fire suppression)
- Maximize utility of juniper (biomass) to get back to natural range of variability
 - Barriers: transportation costs, investors want/need 20 year guaranty of supply
- Excess amount of juniper that could be used for biomass (high BTU value)
- Landscape level treatment of juniper, given:
 - water consumed, and
 - particulate matter from fire
- Focus on – removal protocol/certification to make trade-offs acceptable
- Forest service still has mission to provide wood products
- Invest in roads for firefighting up front rather than have firelines/temp. roads built while fighting fire
- Fire suppression budget – dedicate some amount for roads and rehabilitation of legacy roads
- Lessons learned on private land will inform federal agencies and they should be encouraged to partner
- Recommend:
 - Investment by OWEB to remove juniper throughout state following protocol for research and monitoring and partnering with federal agencies (check with Russ for language)
- Co-locate biomass facility with commercial for co-generation
- Unequal subsidies for alternative energy and particularly biomass
- Manage for pests and maintain ecosystem function
- Learn as we go
- Focus on minimizing risk of investment
- Biomass – need certainty of supply to make infrastructure investments
- Combine intensive monitoring with large scale efforts
- Trust issues – who's doing monitoring and assessing, who needs to be involved, and what resources are needed
- No single answer – must be flexible and recommendations need to provide for flexibility

- Forest service can provide supply at specific price to provide certainty for biomass investment
- Adaptive management – to learn from experience – monitoring has an upfront cost
- Ability for forest service to enter into longer term commitments beyond 10 years
- Difficult to project social perspective and needs to 20 years
- Activities need to create value
- Accounting methods need to recognize values (e.g., forest health)

Attendees

Committee Members: Ralph Bloemers, Chuck Graham, Steve Grasty, Steve Hobbs, R. Wade Mosby, Dan Edge, Ken Williamson, and Tim Vredenburg.

Staff: Steve Calish, Bureau of Land Management; Kevin Birch, Cathy Clem, Jeri Chase, Dave Morman, Chris Friend, Chad Allen, Keith Baldwin, and Paul Clemens, ODF; Josh Seeds, DEQ; Rod Krahmer, ODFW; Bob Progulske, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service; Rob Williams; and Robert Fisher, FCS.

Presenters: Tony Svejcar, U.S.D.A. – A.R.S., Arne Skaugset and Darrell Ross, Oregon State University; and Scott Black, Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation.

Public: Wayne Giesy, Hull-Oaks Lumber Company; Doug Heiken, Oregon Wild; and Tom Partin, American Forest Resources Council.

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.