

Oregon Board of Forestry
Joint Meeting with the Federal Forestlands Advisory Committee
June 5, 2007, 1:00 – 4:00 p.m.

Oregon Department of Forestry
2600 State Street
Salem, OR 97310

Meeting Summary

Opening Remarks, and Reviewing Meeting Agenda and Objectives

Steve Hobbs, Chair of the Oregon Board of Forestry and the Federal Forestlands Advisory Committee, welcomed the Board and Committee members and everyone introduced themselves. Steve then reviewed the proposed agenda and meeting objectives which included Board and Committee agreement on the goals and the most pressing problems, and discussion about an implementation strategy for how the guidance will be acted upon and put in place.

Overview of FFAC Work to Date

Steve gave a general overview highlighting the FFAC process and work to date. The charter has been developed; it includes 13 components including goals and objectives for the Committee, milestones, process, the Committee's operating procedures, key factors, indicators of success, and the decision-making process. Staff has also developed a situation assessment and – most recently – the Committee has been working on developing goal statements and the most pressing problems.

Steve noted the Committee's goal is to finish its work by November 2008, the Committee has been meeting monthly for seven meetings so far, and that members are devoting a lot of time.

Top-Level Goals

Kevin Birch began discussion of the Committee's draft Goals (Version 8, dated 6/5/07), requesting comments on whether the goals captured what is important, if there was anything missing from them, or if there were any comments for changes or suggestions.

He noted that the goals serve three purposes:

1. To "flesh out" the vision statement, adding specificity – what we want to see in Oregon from federal lands,
2. To look at the current situation and identify the gaps; help identify problems and issues,
3. For staff to use as a review/reference tool when reviewing federal plans to help determine if those plans are meeting the state's goals.

General overall discussion regarding the goals included:

- Pressing problems come and go, but goals do not go away

- Goals are aspirational in nature – an end product, the desired future condition
- Not necessarily a one-to-one correlation that each goal has an issue
- Covers the range very well

Process Goals - #1, #2, #3: Conceptual discussions included:

- Include references to federal statutes throughout this group (spoken to in #3, but not in #2)
- Private landowners, neighbors with federal lands – access issues; clear outreach to parties with adjacent lands with targets for that specificity
- Aspirational goals – committing to a process that manages the legal constraints
- Potential goal #7 also deals with laws, administrative procedures, regulations

Environment Goal - #4: Conceptual discussions included:

- A description of desired future condition
- Again, aspirational, rather than specific recommendations included in the goals on how to achieve success
- Similarities to Greatest Permanent Value (management of state forest lands); the three-legged stool of environmental, economic, and social productivity – a holistic management paradigm
- Many of the environmental goals have social as well as economic aspects
- Itemizing every issue, runs the risk of not being inclusive or missing something (could address with language such as “included but not limited to” or through a glossary)
- Need to understand there’s a lot of interaction and areas that cross boundaries

Social Goal - #5: Conceptual discussions included:

- “Material” means goods and services, as well as products
- Including adaptive management is included
- Missing concept of economic contributions that have a significant effect on the social fabric of communities and infrastructure; positive influence on the social health of a community. Suggest including language about stable jobs and economic and social well-being

Economic Goal - #6: Conceptual discussions included:

- Add the concept of social well-being of communities
- Economic values of these federal lands go beyond the state – throughout the region and the country; greater national good, greater purpose for the entire country
- Recognize Oregon’s responsibility to the nation as a large federal landowner within our borders – responsibility and credit

Potential Additional Goal - #7: Conceptual discussions included:

- Add something regarding the legal framework

During the discussion about goals, three potential overarching conceptual goals were identified:

1. One goal that ties together – economic, environmental, and social; the notion that each of these three sets of values need to be delivered in a way that is mutually supportive of one another – an interconnectedness, how the balance is struck. It would recognize that an intended desired future condition is one where these three sets of values are supporting one another.

2. Stress accountability, and do not assume all actions will be focused within Oregon's borders – there should be a much higher level of accountability than just what happens here
3. A national goal that we are stewards of these federal lands in our boundaries and they benefit our state, and we have a responsibility to manage them also for the nation, the ultimate landowner. National assets, not just Oregon's (possibly add this to #7, which becomes another overarching goal)

Most Pressing Problems

Robert Fisher reviewed the latest draft of the Most Pressing Problems document (Version 8, dated 6/5/07), which the Committee has been working on. He requested that members focus on the bold statements, noting that the descriptive material in the paragraphs has not yet been finalized and may be incomplete. The purpose for this discussion is to find out if the right problems have been identified, and if anything is missing or needs to be changed. He also noted that the problems are not listed in any priority order.

Committee members noted that Oregon has a large problem and if we don't do something about it, it will get worse. There is a sense of urgency – not only biological escalation of decayed condition, but particularly in eastern Oregon where the threat of infrastructure loss is a very real possibility unless something is done quickly to address the problem.

General overall discussion points regarding the most pressing problems:

- Problems do need to be boiled down but impact can also be lost by taking the active words out (need to add language to grab peoples attention)
- Coordination among state agencies also in natural resource issues – always something to work on (examples of effective coordination include the cooperative agreements signed by state agencies relating to federal land management planning processes)
- Issues are more complex than they used to be; definite centralization in Washington D.C.
- Wilderness and roadless areas comprise 27 percent – untouched and will become older forest structure

Problem #1: Conceptual discussions included:

- This must be emphasized
- Can't do anything without funding; greatest plans will never get off the ground without the funds to implement them
- Difficult to separate funding from legal aspects; so much tied up in court that funding has shifted to fire or is otherwise tied up and unable to be utilized
- Regarding funding, competition for funds, federal government needs to realize that these forests can produce environmental, economic, and social benefits – wildlife habitat and environmental and recreation opportunities - but can also help pay for itself with some management to help with overcrowding and fire issues.
- Funds generated in the region used to stay in the region – changes to that and how that happens now
- Input to understand to the economics of the funding structure – budget and revenues (how it flows, how it has flowed, and how it could flow). USFS and BLM could provide some

administrative and historical information; others (perhaps congressional staff persons) could provide critique and suggestions for improvement

- Relates to #5

Problem #2: Conceptual discussions included:

- Drop “While” from the third sentence (in descriptive text)

Problem #3: Conceptual discussions included:

- Also must be emphasized
- A problem, but also an opportunity to move positively and aggressively with a mixed group of people to get to a good place
- Previously tried to use management to replicate natural processes, but not managing has caused other circumstances and disrupted other processes; complex issue, but nucleus and facts are here – need opportunities to market and educate

Problem #4: Conceptual discussions included:

- Climate change represents both a problem and an opportunity – in terms of increasing the visibility and use of the forest for renewable resources – not recognized here (however, the benefits and difficulties are recognized in the goals)

Problem #5: Conceptual discussions included:

- Relates to #1

Problem #6: No specific discussion.

Problem #7: No specific discussion.

Problem #8: No specific discussion.

Problem #9: No specific discussion.

Problem #10: Conceptual discussions included:

- Isn't this the most important, i.e., what the Committee is all about?
- Language still needs some work, refining; historical perspective valuable

Problem #11: Conceptual discussions included:

- This is a concept that has been added but not yet flushed out

Prioritization of Most Pressing Problems

During discussion about which problems would be most important, Board members discussed their own individual priorities, which are summarized below:

- Larry: It comes down to legalities and having changed laws to allow for management back in the mix – to create revenue, or stop fires, or for recreational uses, or for wildlife benefits; until management can get back into the forest, none of the others count.

- Barbara. If I had to set a priority, it would be the first three: funding, legal framework, and a baseline of where we are. #5 says a lot to me – not just in economic terms, but also all of the unintended rural and social and community consequences. I would frame those four as the most critical – not that the others are not important, but they can be collateral or woven in
- Bill H. It would be interesting to see “lack of trust” flushed out. I agree with Barbara and one thing that could come from this Committee are the answers to #10 – your legacy could be an integrated decision-making model. It would be great to have a product, delivered at the federal level, that reflects a new paradigm that is adapted to our specific requirements and expectations
- Barbara: I would agree with that; I only didn’t say it because in fact it is almost like it is beginning to happen already
- Jennifer: I agree that #1, #2, and #3 are the priorities – and #10 seems to be part of #2 to me. #11 seems like a component of the whole problem – may not be a separate issue, but the result of larger problems. I find myself bundling them into groups – so that #1, #2, and #3 are discrete; #4, #6, #7, and #8 are a bundle; and #2 and #10 are a bundle. #5 interests me, but not having the text could change that a lot so I would need to see that before I can comment on that one. In a previous iteration I was concerned about the either/or concept (that has now been removed) and I don’t think it has to be either/or.
- Chris: I still like #3, but on this

Implementation/Communications Discussion

Committee and Board members discussed the nation-wide nature of the work, and how best to engage Oregon’s congressional delegation and, ultimately, others in the nation. Being chartered by the Board of Forestry, and ultimately the Governor, could be a disadvantage in this process and how can that be best addressed and overcome to move forward.

The involvement of the congressional delegation to date was discussed – staff member liaisons have been appointed and are receiving information about the Committee’s work, the State Forester’s has personally visited them in Washington D. C. and he regularly updates them, and they have been given information from the Governor. A product that focuses on common ground, and has broad-based involvement and support ultimately may be what ultimately has the most interest and value.

Having the work of the Committee best applied and making change, Barbara Craig recommended real specificity of actions – near-, mid-, and long-term, finding common ground on those actions and then marketing and communicating to target audiences. Bill Hutchison noted that this could be an affirmative, positive program to move forward with – achieving consensus and overcoming the gridlock regarding these federal forest lands.

Exploring the possibility of a pilot project on a statewide scale was also discussed, and the risks that would accompany that work at a scale to make a difference in eastern/southwest Oregon. Barbara Craig stated that she did not think the goal should be to avoid lawsuits; the goal should be to create the process and the record and the involvement – identify priority projects, gain community support, and take action, letting the lawsuits come if they will, but with a good record, perhaps injunctions can be avoided.

Steve Hobbs stated his intent to get a small group of Board and Committee Members together to work on the issues that have been discussed regarding implementation and communications, and that he would be asking for volunteers for that project. This could include ideas that had been discussed such as representatives of the diverse interests on the Committee and Board meeting with the congressional delegation and/or their staff and the Governor to update them on the process and the priorities, and requesting their early and continual engagement.

Steve Hobbs adjourned the meeting at 3:45 p.m.

Attending:

Board of Forestry Members: Steve Hobbs, Barbara Craig, Bill Hutchison, Larry Giustina, Jennifer Phillippi, Chris Heffernan, and Marvin Brown.

Federal Forestlands Advisory Committee Members: Ralph Bloemers, Chuck Graham, Steve Grasty, Russ Hoeflich, Bill Kluting, R. Wade Mosby, Ken Williamson, Allyn Ford, Dan Edge, and Tim Vredenburg. [*Note: Steve Hobbs- also FFAC Committee Member - included in list as Board of Forestry Member.*]

Staff: Kevin Birch, Gayle Birch, Cathy Clem, Jeri Chase, Walt Schutt, David Morman, Ted Lorensen, Dan Shults, Clark Seely, Dave Lorenz, Mike Cafferata, Peter Daugherty, Jim Paul, Paul Bell, and Dan Postrel, ODF; Joshua Seeds, Koto Kishida, and Marianne Fitzgerald, DEQ; Lisa Freedman, USFS; Steve Calish, BLM; Rod Krahmer, 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; Bob Ragon, Douglas Timber Operators; Gary Springer, Starker Forests; Mike Schnee; Chris Jarmer, Oregon Forest Industries Council; and Mike Gaudum, Oregon Small Woodlands Association.

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.