

**Oregon Board of Forestry
Federal Forestlands Advisory Committee Kickoff Meeting
November 29, 2006**

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

Meeting Summary

Welcome, Introductions, Review Meeting Objectives and Agenda

Steve Hobbs, Chair of the Advisory Committee and the Board of Forestry (Board), welcomed the committee members and expressed his thanks to them for agreeing to participate in the project. Forests provide a wide range of values. Because federal lands are the majority of the forest landbase in Oregon how they are managed affects all the forest values that are important to Oregonians. Committee members introduced themselves.

Steve Hobbs described the charge to the committee -- create a vision of how federal forestlands can be managed in Oregon to contribute to the sustainability of all Oregon's forests, treat Oregon's forests in totality, and produce a guidance document that shows how to achieve that vision. The committee has an opportunity to lead and set an example to other states. This will be challenging and the effort offers rewards. The committee can create a map for how state and federal governments should cooperate in providing sustainable social, economic, and environmental values.

Robert Fisher of Fisher Collaborative Services, facilitator, also welcomed the committee members and reviewed the meeting agenda and the desired outcomes, which were to:

- *Discuss the purpose, scope and role of the Committee*
- *Understand expectations for the process and outcomes*
- *Review, and agree on if possible, the Charter and Operating Procedures*
- *Understand the role of agencies and the technical support available to the Committee*
- *Begin developing a shared vision*
- *Plan future meetings, including meeting dates*

The primary goals were to leave the meeting with the charter and operating procedures as close to agreement as possible and begin to start developing a vision.

Governor's Message to the Committee and Planning Group

Mike Carrier, Governor's Natural Resource Policy Director, expressed appreciation on behalf of the Governor to the committee members for serving on the committee and his thanks to the Board of Forestry for undertaking this initiative at his request.

The committee's work is very important to the Governor for a number of reasons, some of which he expressed in a speech at the Oregon Economic Summit. Mike Carrier read an excerpt from that speech, Governor Kulongoski said

"Although I want to build a strong federal-state partnership, I consider this an issue that cries out for State's rights. The Oregon Department of Forestry is one of the nation's leaders in applying principles of sustainability to resource-based economies. ...the federal government [should] improve its management practices, allowing responsible harvesting of timber in a manner that reduces susceptibility to costly forest fires."

"I stand firm for the principle that there is real economic vitality in rural Oregon. There are 16,000 jobs in rural Oregon that are tied to sustainable forestry and watershed protection. And these jobs are growing at a rate of 25-percent a year. We should take advantage of this growth by retraining workers for high-skilled jobs that sustain and protect our natural resources."

The Governor has expressed confidence in the Oregon Board and Department of Forestry as a place for leading Oregon through a number of natural resource policy questions, and he wants to move forest policy from the governor's office to the Board and Department of Forestry. The Governor's October 2004 speech to the Board of Forestry provides important background on forest issues and contains the charge that led to the formation of the committee. The Governor's Natural Resource Office web site expresses his values about forestry and his vision on the Board's role.

Mike Carrier explained that committee members were selected because each of you brings a somewhat different and diverse perspective. Those perspectives bring value and completeness to the process. But you are not obligated, nor expected to approach issues from just your perspective. In fact, your obligation is to strive to embrace the perspectives that others bring. Today, too many consensus models of stakeholder collaboration fail because they begin with the wrong assumptions about how to participate. The model of "reverse representation" is the only way to truly achieve consensus. Committee members must wrap your mind around diverse concepts, diverse interests, and other people's needs, not just your own.

Three important tasks to focus on today:

1. Get to know one another and understand the interests and diversity at the table.
2. Own the charter of this group.
3. Make sure the federal partners are comfortable with this process. This process is about how the state inserts its interests, needs and priorities over the management of federal lands. This has to be a partnership of federal, state, and local government.

Overview of the Committee and the Proposed Process

Steve Hobbs briefly explained the formation of the committee. One challenge is to represent all the values that Oregonians have. We were seeking people that have interest and a proven track record in being engaged in constructive dialogue over forest policy. We also recognized that we needed to keep this group to a manageable size. We recognize some stakeholder groups are disappointed they are not on the committee. However from a practical standpoint they are part of the process, which will be open and transparent and seek to engage a wider group of stakeholders than just those around the table. This committee has real diversity in its perspectives, which is crucial to the success of the project. Members were chosen primarily from recommendations made by the congressional delegation to represent the governance structure on federal lands and other affected interests..

The public will have several opportunities to provide input into the process. Committee members will be asked to keep their constituents informed and engaged as appropriate. Committee members will bring technical information and the views of their constituents and others with similar interests to the advisory committee process. There will be specific points where the public will be asked for input. As sections of the guidance document are produced, they will be sent to interest groups and interested individuals for review and comment. Those comments will be provided to the committee and Board in preparation for joint sessions between the committee and the Board on the draft documents. The public also will be invited to testify before the Board at several points in the process.

Kevin Birch gave a short overview of the proposed process as envisioned by the Board. The process is constrained by both time and budget. Proposed process timelines and milestones are in the draft charter. The process would include four meetings to discuss and deliberate on a vision describing how federal forestlands can better contribute to the economic, social, and environmental values Oregonians want and need, and containing a small number of goals that are useful in crafting policy and reviewing federal forestland management actions. The committee, with assistance from the Planning Group, will produce a draft document for public review and comment. Those comments will be provided to the committee and Board in preparation for a joint work session that will be used to resolve areas of disagreement and give direction on producing a final vision.

The next step involves two meetings to discuss and identify a list of issues (i.e., top 10) that need to be resolved to achieve the vision. The Board, Governor's office, and congressional delegation also will suggest potential issues to be considered by the committee. The committee would identify the most pressing issues for meeting the vision and devote the next ten meetings to individual issues. The committee would identify available information and experts on each the issue. A one-day meeting of the committee would be held to develop guidance on each issue, including review of the draft write-up of the previous issues, presentation of relevant information, and discussion of the issue and potential recommendations, and, to the extent possible, consensus on the guidance for each issue. Staff on the Planning Group will produce a draft document on the issues for public review and comment. Those comments will be provided to the

committee and Board in preparation for a joint work session to resolve areas of disagreement and develop direction for producing a final guidance document.

A final draft of the vision and guidance document would be sent out for public review and comment. In consultation with the Advisory Committee, Board, and Governor's office, staff will make final changes to the vision and guidance document. The Board will adopt the final product and submit it to the Governor for approval.

Some committee members expressed reservations about the process, as described in the Discussion of the Committee Process and Structure. Some committee members also expressed a desire to have more resources devoted to the project for information gathering and outreach to communities of interest. Kevin Birch committed that staff would devote as many resources as possible within the project's time frame. Robert Fisher pointed out that the budget is limited and the committee will have to deal with that issue as needed and decide how to proceed.

Expectations for the Process and Potential Outcomes

USFS – It is timely to engage at a high level in advance of planning process. The Forest Service (USFS) views this process as collaboration. Finding in other collaborations that what is standing in the way of success is forces of budget, resources, and process. The USFS would like to hear consensus from the group, which is not being provided by the public. The USFS generally hears a wide diversity of views and then has to winnow them down to make policy. The effort should result in a greater level of cooperation for the state and potentially develop a new model for cooperation. There are lots of challenges, and it's important to work toward solutions.

BLM – Denis Williamson handed out information about of the O&C Act, which governs most of BLM W. Oregon forestlands. O&C is unique and different from FS legislative mandates because it provides for timber production as a dominant use. Historically O&C lands produced up to 1.1 billion BF per year and produced revenue for counties used for schools, roads and other services. As the process moves forward, keep in mind the history and commitment unique to BLM, and consider O&C lands as a separate category.

USFS & BLM will be engaged throughout process, and will provide information and resources for the project.

Committee Members*

- Need to clarify the committee's role and how much we will deal with; is the focus what we can do or should do? Need to find a balance between what fits within the

* The following description presents the committee members' individual expectations for the process and potential outcomes, and does not represent agreement by the committee or the views of other committee members.

existing framework and what is outside. Governor has requested that we think big and don't be constrained, but the committee has to decide where the balance exists between constraints and change.

- Jobs have been lost in rural areas which has hurt many communities. Payments to counties for schools will go away. Promote a policy that works for the people of Oregon. Rural communities need help.
- USFS should need and expect the support of the state to influence federal processes in support of sustainable forestry. We are outsourcing harvests and therefore environmental problems when we have some of the most productive forestlands in the world. The committee has an opportunity to change what we expect as a nation and state.
- Identify ways that we can look across the landscape to recover forest values. Focus on water/hydrologic system and rest of the forest system will fall into place. Important in rural E. Oregon communities, which are at a standstill.
- Communities have changed dramatically. To get back to balance, address forest health and social and economic values will follow. State agencies need a single position on forest issues.
- Align forest policies between federal and state lands. Water, wildlife, and other values do not depend on ownership.
- Forest health is in a state of decay. Vibrant sustainable forests will lead to sustainable communities. Necessary resources are needed to engage communities to develop desired future conditions. Voice of communities and people need to be heard.
- Balance needs to occur. Resolve differing opinions on state & federal forest policies to create balance. Concerned about county payments and support for counties services.
- Need to structure public participation and process to break down barriers on issues. Assess what Oregonians want and collaborate with public before policy recommendations are made. Uncomfortable taking risks about the environment. Need to clarify how the committee will access scientific data and respond to issues like global warming. Spend time doing fact finding and seek data from federal agencies and congressional delegation.
- Emphasize collaboration, bring diverse groups together to find common ground and deal with issues like forest health, fire, and loss of infrastructure. Forest certification needs to be looked at on federal forestlands. Issues include biodiversity and greenhouse gases, reducing litigation, rural community needs, secure school funding and county payments from timber receipts. Need to use scientific and professional forest management as a guide. This is an opportunity for dialogue.

Common themes included: commitment to the committee and being at the table to tackle issues; make the process relevant and not waste of time; and need for the diversity of opinions/views work toward constructive outcomes.

Committee Process and Structure

The committee reviewed the proposed charter, including the goals, process and commitments. Individual committee responses and discussion included the following.

Committee Charge and Role of the Board

The charge and work of the committee would be more powerful and should come from both the Governor and the congressional delegation working in unison, rather than the Board. Some of the proposed changes – changes in law, funding, etc. – will need to be addressed by the congressional delegation. Concern also was expressed about reporting to the Board and how the Board will respond to committee recommendations.

Can keep the Board as the body that the committee reports to, but clarify that both the Governor and the Congressional Delegation should be the recipients of the committee recommendations.

Steve Hobbs pointed out the Governor gave the Board a clear charge for forest policy and the Congressional Delegation was brought into this process through identifying members for this committee. Will reach out to engage the delegation with what ever is in the guidance document. Working for the Board in no way limits the flow of information to the delegation. Will build in frequent communication and interaction with the Board throughout the process to increase agreement in the end.

Goals, Objectives, and Key Factors

In Goal 1 remove “Oregonians want and need,” it does not add to the goal and will be difficult to determine.

Goal 3 in the charter needs to be aligned with the 2003 Forestry Program for Oregon statement about framing the future and expresses the Board’s vision of how Oregon’s private and public forest landowners can work with the rest of Oregon’s citizens to ensure that our forests are managed in a sustainable manner.

Need to clarify Key Factor #1 in the charter, which primarily addresses National Forest revenues; O&C revenues that go directly to county general funds and supports health and safety programs are not addressed.

The terms “united voice” and “unified vision” are high-level goals that could be better defined in Key Factors #3 and #4.

Community/Public Involvement and Outreach

More work is needed on the public review and public involvement process. More public outreach is needed on values and the issues to be addressed by the committee. Task staff with identifying what additional information on public values has been collected since the information provided to the committee was produced. Need to be creative and find additional ways to get information about the committee's work to communities and get responses from them.

A committee member suggested engaging with OFRI (a state agency charged with doing education, information and communication on forest related issues) to provide an additional link to communities. Other committee members were uncomfortable with OFRI because of the lack of conservation interests represented on its governing board, which predominantly has representation from the forest industry.

Might be informative to know what the counties visioning processes hold. Many counties have developed visions for natural resources. The county members offered to assist with collecting that information.

Public input should be taken before the committee selects which issues to address in the guidance document.

Science, Data, and Technical Resources

Process would benefit from an independent source of scientific assistance and additional structure to provide that information. OFRI may provide perspective of industry group, not necessarily unbiased information. Polls can be subjective, and it would be better to have board-based neutral polling.

Need to identify additional technical support and resources from other state and federal agencies (e.g., EPA, USF&WS, Economic Development, Water Resources). Independent scientific assistance will be identified on individual issues.

The committee needs to have a meaningful conversation about the interpretation of the data and the conclusions. To get to that point, the committee needs to address the hurdles about who conducted a particular study. The committee needs to sort through collectively different sets of data and judgments, from multiple view points, for the committee, and then get to the questions about what conclusions can be drawn from the data and studies.

Decision-Making

Maintain a running list of committee agreements.

Committee members discussed the pros and cons of sending majority-minority opinions, and the option of voting for different opinions, as consensus can be a difficult process

with different levels and might be hard to achieve. The committee was generally satisfied with description in the proposed charter of what happens if the committee cannot reach consensus. The committee also requested adding language about majority-minority reports. In addition, if part of the committee wants to make a recommendation and others do not, the committee will address how to handle that situation at that time.

General Comments

Forest diversity within the state is great. The committee should consciously recognize that diversity (east v. west) in the recommendations. Policy is not always the problem. There are limitations outside of the control of the agencies due to litigation etc. that limit the ability to implement the policy. The committee will be best served by looking for room for change within current statutes.

Timing of deliverable products in the guidance document may include both short and long term strategies. Can be looking too high up at the policy and lose sense of direction or too low and get mired in the details of management and in the end not accomplish anything. Need to position the committee to come out of the process with a product. Objectives 3 and 4 in the proposed charter are intended to address that issue by identifying current policy or management issues emerging issues that could be important in the future.

Committee members expressed a desire to work electronically as much as possible. Staff will look into possible options and report back to the committee.

Committee Agreement on Alternates and Proposed Operating Procedures

The committee discussed whether to provide for alternates in case a member was unable to attend a meeting. The committee agreed it was important for the members to attend the meetings and to not have alternates. Members committed to staying informed about the committee's work if they cannot attend a through the meeting summaries and conversations with staff and other committee members.

The committee also reviewed and discussed the proposed Operating Procedures, including the provision "To enhance creativity and problem solving during meetings, individuals are not expected to restrict themselves to their prior positions, or the prior positions held by their agency or organization." A committee member indicated this might be difficult for organizations that previously have taken public positions. A committee member also questioned the roles of the chair and the facilitator, and asked for more clarity. The committee agreed to the Operating Procedures, with changing the title from Workgroup to Advisory Committee.

Vision for Federal Forestlands in Oregon

The committee began developing a vision for federal forestlands by focusing on three questions:

- How does Oregon benefit from the federal forestlands?
- What are important characteristics of a successful partnership between Oregon and the Forest Service and BLM?
- What changes would you make if you could wave a magic wand?

The committee members' responses to these questions are listed on the flipchart notes attached to the summary. Staff was asked to take the committee members' ideas and develop draft vision statements for consideration by the committee. It also was suggested that the committee review and comment on those draft vision statements by email to make as much progress as possible in developing the vision statement before the next meeting.

Discussion of Committee Operations

Potential Agenda Items for the Next Meeting Include: vision statement, Charter, Public Involvement and Outreach Plan, Begin identifying the potential issues, Public comment

Future Potential Meeting Dates for the Next Six Months:
(subject to change by committee approval)

- Jan - 1/5
- Feb - 2/5 (1st Monday)
- Mar - 3/9 (tentative)
- April - 4/2 (1st Monday)
- May - 5/15
- June - 6/4

These meetings will be held in Salem at the Oregon Department of Forestry (Tillamook Room) from 9:00-4:00. The committee will consider holding other meetings in southern and western Oregon.

Wrap Up and Next Steps

Action Items – see the task list dated Dec. 7, 2006.

Public Comment

Public comment to the committee was provided in writing.

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.

Staff: Kevin Birch – ODF, Cathy Clem – ODF, Marianne Fitzgerald – DEQ, Jon Germond – ODFW, Jim Golden – USFS, Mike Haske – BLM, Ted Lorensen – ODF, Gill Riddell – AOC, Denis Williamson, BLM, and Robert Fisher – FCS, Facilitator/Mediator

Public: Dan Gee, Maya Gee, Jim Geisinger, Wayne Giesy, Doug Heiken, Chris Jarmer, Rod Krahmer, Dick Posekany, Dave Powers, Rex Storm, Laurel Singer, Jay Ward, Ron Weatherly

**Oregon Board of Forestry
Federal Forestlands Advisory Committee Kickoff Meeting
November 29, 2006**

Flipchart Notes from Vision Discussion*

Benefits

- Multi-use lands
- Contribute to national problems
 - Biomass energy
 - Carbon sequestration-climate change
- Provide diversity of values
- Important to quality of life
- Maintain hydrologic systems and proper functioning and create jobs
- Clean air and water and wildlife
- Take pressure off other diverse places in the world
- Greater protection and diversity globally
- Scale of ecosystem
- Great recreation
- Support rural communities and social structure
- Environmental, economic, social/cultural
- "Sustainable" proportionate share of environmental, economical, and social
- "Sustainable" forest plan that's followed
- Self-sustaining rural areas
- Clean drinking water
- Healthy pops of native fish and wildlife
- Commitment to consider common good
- Source of inspiration

Characteristics for Partnership

- Credibility and trust
 - Stability
 - Sustainability
 - Consistency
- Feel hope needs will be met
- Multi-lateral planning and decision-making
- Alignment of goals and objectives between federal and state
- Combine FWS/FS/BLM – one agency with one rulebook
- Ability to delivery

* These are the notes as written on the flipchart during the meeting. They capture an abbreviated version of the individual committee members' ideas, and may not represent the views of other committee members.

- Commitment
- Respect for diversity of areas/regions
- Recognize unique continuity of government ownership
- Importance of intact systems and plan for protection

Waving the Wand

- Combine USFS and BLM
- Manage state and fed lands under one management plan
- Look at impacts on all adj. lands, including private lands - comprehensive at landscape level – across ownership – look at entire system
- Depoliticize on the ground decisions – return management to people on land – too cumbersome now
- Consistent w/ and contributes to achieving state goals
- Rules that stay the same
- National standards, neighborhood solutions

Biologic, Community & Eco.

- Facilitate/stability – massive land exchanges between private, state, and federal
- More continuity of professional management
- Remove barriers to solving human induced/forest health problems (e.g., high fuel loads)
- Involve FSW in setting rules
- Stop outsourcing national resources
- Fixing problem – assets undervalued because benefits undervalued
- Adequate resources for professional staff
- Engage silent majority
- Common vision
- No amendments to plan or litigation for X
- Long-term budgets for federal agencies
- Fire righting agencies on same rulebook