Committee for Family Forestlands
Meeting Minutes
December 16, 2014

Pursuant to public notice made by news release with statewide distribution, a committee meeting of the Committee for Family Forestlands [an advisory body to the Oregon Board of Forestry with authority established in Oregon Revised Statute 527.650] was held on December 16, 2014 in the Clatsop Room, ODF Headquarters, 2600 State St., Salem, OR

CFF Committee members present:

Rick Barnes, Voting
Scott Gray, Voting
Sara Leiman, Voting
Evan Smith, Voting
Mike Cloughesy, Ex-Officio
Peter Daugherty, Ex-Officio/ODF
Cindy Glick, Ex-Officio (Conf. call)
Joe Holmberg, Ex-Officio
Jim James, Ex-Officio
Rex Storm, Ex-Officio
Lena Tucker, Secretary/ODF
Susan Watkins, Acting Chair
Brad Withrow-Robinson, Ex-Officio

Members not in attendance:

Roje Gootee, Voting

ODF Staff present:
Susan Dominique

Guests:
Emily Jane Davis, OSU
Gary Springer, BOF
Bob McNitt, FSN

Agenda Items:

1. **Welcome and Review of the Agenda**
   Watkins requested any additions or correction to the Agenda. Noted invited guest not attending. Added Smoke Management Rule Changes.
2. **Introductions**

3. **Approval of last meeting's minutes**
   (Delayed until the next meeting.)
4. **Public Comment**
   No public comment offered.

5. **Discussion on Nominations**
   Comments:
   - The frequency and duration of our meetings, and the considerable workload the Committee takes on were looked at as reasons for nominee's declining to join the committee as they all have had considerable workloads of their own.
   - Potential nominees were historically from academic backgrounds.

Action: Roje Gootee, Brad Withrow-Robinson, Mike Cloughesy, Evan Smith are to field nominee ideas. Lena Tucker to consult with Peter Daugherty and Doug Decker for suggestions for Chair.

- Need to vet people's availability, qualities and interest.
- Suggestions were discussed for Rick Barnes and Susan Watkins' replacements coming in July 2015.

6. Eastside Private Forest Collaborative – Emily Jane Davis, PhD, OSU

Davis, Professor and Extension Specialist shared her background and then moved her presentation to the Ritter Project and the progress to date. Emily Jane started at OSU in April 2014 filling a new position created by Dean Maness and has background in social sciences and collaborative governance. The Dean was interested in having OSU directly involved with the public lands collaboratives active in Oregon. Part of the position is Extension for providing very applied technical assistance. Prof. Davis works with several different collaborative groups largely on the east side. She has also been working with the effort in Sweet Home so can provide an overview of that. She is working to get OSU students exposure to collaborative natural resource experiences by through the intern programs at the college. These opportunities give students experiential education and exposure to real world issues. She has one research project ongoing with the PNW Research Station on collaborative governance in Oregon. Another project was looking at the Rangeland Protection Associations as a model for efficacy and safety in working for landowners.

Successes and Trends

Prof. Davis, with her focus on collaborative governance and interest in the east side projects was a natural fit for assisting the RxRitter Project. She thought it was a great success that they were able to hire Curt Qual for the project manager out of a number of really good candidates. Qual works out of the Grant County Extension Office in John Day and his early efforts have been concentrated in 3 primary ways:

a) Building relationships with the Steering Committee and landowners.
b) Engaging with all the other project partners.
c) Undertaking the Landscape Level Resource Assessment (LLRA). This tool will be rolled out under a new name that better suits the project. The Project Prioritization Tracking Tool. (P2T2). It is important to note that this effort is a social process as much as a bio-physical process.

Initial work has revealed a lot of interest in juniper, noxious weeds, access to contractors, and land productivity. On December 30 there will be a landowner meeting and invitations were sent out to all Ritter landowners whether currently involved or not. This will be the first time everyone will be sitting in the same room. It will be a pivotal moment to the Ritter Project to set the right tone and assess their willingness to work together. The 'official' name of the collaborative will be determined at the landowner meeting. RxRitter is still in the running!

- Qual is really good at translating government speak into language more suitable for landowners. The Grant SWCD is really strong with GIS and contracting. Qual is also bringing in Elaine Eisenbraun from NFJD SWCD, she and the Stewardship Forester are going to do one-on-one visits with landowners to present the Woodland Discovery Tool from the Uniform Forest Management Planning Process, which as a tool should do a good job of getting necessary data from the landowners to create plans from the bottom up. We would like to build a concept 'umbrella' forest stewardship plan and the NRCS is really supportive of this, as is ODF.

The Steering Committee are appreciative of all the work that began this. Generally, collaboratives are started from the grass roots level but can suffer from a lack of resources and capacity. This project has been fortunate to have your leadership and impetus to have the resources to begin. Now is the time it begins to go quite local, questions and concerns are part of the natural process.

- The other critical part is developing the plan of work for the contract. We have this proposal put in with the Forest Service and they have an agreement with ODF. ODF has the money, but it hasn't been

finalized yet. Both Brad Siemens and Jim Cathcart are open to making sure we are serving the local needs. We are in process of finalizing the budget within the parameters.

We've been told we have till March to provide an updated detailed scope of work itemizing the roles of the partners. The only funding that has gone out has been to OSU for Curt Qual's time.

Jim Cathcart insisted on a scholarly deliverable from OSU to an applied journal detailing the results. Davis has begun documenting ideas and creating an archive. She has also been tracking the East Face Project and the Blue Mountain Cooperative. It would be good to have a dialog between projects for common learning opportunities.

- There was a suggestion by David Ford to do a field trip to the East Face. They are both All Lands Approaches.
- Smith and Glick had discussed our having a tour of the South Santiam All Lands Collaborative.

Cindy Glick has been an instrumental force in the creation of this South Santiam collaborative. There was an undifferenciated group of concerns that needed focus. There are 3 major projects in the same general area:

a) The Cool Soda Project going on for the Forest Service was 40% USFS and 60% CTC (Cascade Timber Consultants, managers of the Hill properties).
b) Livability Initiative, selected as a nationwide gateway community to public lands which looks at options for quality of life and infrastructure issues.
c) South Santiam Community Forest Corridor (an Oregon Solutions project 2012-13) connecting the Willamette National Forest to Sweet Home (12 miles away). Issues included public access to the river, old mill sites and debris and checkerboarded private properties and shared road systems. The corridor lands had common problems and needed collaborative solutions. As an example; Cascadia Cave is in the corridor but is currently unmanaged with important cultural interest.

- Landowner interaction aside from CTC owners seemed tiny. There are other Forest Service situations where there are dozens of landowners with adjacency.
- What was the objective/accomplishments for Cool Soda?

They are at the Watershed Analysis and Assessment stage gathering information. They have held 4-5 different listening sessions for landowners and regional stakeholders to gather information. They are working with CTC and Watershed on such priorities as shared road management, elk browsing of young trees, and large wood issues. It's a continuing challenge and opportunity.

Field Trip Planning

[*Handout – USFS South Santiam Agenda]*

Cindy Glick proposed a one day tour of the Sweet Home projects and provided a draft agenda for review at the meeting.

- It would be good to look at adjacent landowner partnerships with the Forest Service, but Sweet Home project may not provide enough variety in ownership.
- Adding to what was said, we should engage Cindy and the South Santiam Watershed Council on agenda changes that might better serve the committee's needs if interested in touring there. This could be adjusted to include more private land issues.
- Holmberg reached out to David Ford regarding the AFF project on the East Face of the Elkhorn. That is a All Hands/All Lands project including public and private lands to reduce fire risk and improve forest resiliency. USFS, AFF, ODF, and NRCS, Wallowa Resources, OSU Extension and private landowners are partners. A field trip could be based out of LaGrande visiting lands to see pre- and post-treatment areas and could include Nils Christoffersen, BOF and Wallowa Resources. June would be an optional date.

Action: FYI Mark Jacques and David Ford are scheduled to present at the March meeting and will provide a report on this project.

- Other tour suggestions to consider: Tours around the riparian rule issues and pesticides as well as how e-notification is affecting small landowners.
- The East Face Cohesive Project on private lands has just begun, so putting that trip off to 2016 would make more sense. Blue Mountain would be too early to go.
- The BOF tours in April.
- It would be ideal to plan a field trip when ODF has rulemaking options to consider.

7. Riparian Rule Analysis – Peter Daugherty

a. Methods for delineating SSBT streams

We will be covering a number of topics that the BOF has asked for input on from the RFPCs and other stakeholder groups. The three questions posed to the stakeholders are:

1. What are the prescription alternatives they should consider under the following classes of prescriptions: Variable Retention, No-Cut Buffers, Plan for Alternative Practices?
2. What would the methods be for Stream Extent, where SSBT are present, or to the whole Fish network?
3. What Georegions should the rule apply to?

Science or Policy?

The Regional Forest Practices Committee's (RFPC) strength has always been on the technical/feasibility aspects of any given rule or concept. Policy choices will be challenging for the BOF and while science can inform policy, it doesn't answer the policy question. It's often unclear where science ends and policy begins.

- For the Georegions and Stream extent questions, the science to inform policy is limited.
- For the prescription's effect on temperature there is a lot more science, and that was illustrated in the Systematic Review.
- We also used the Scientific Review to study the geo-region question.
- Keep the distinction between science and policy in mind when considering recommendations. Many times people are arguing science when they should be arguing policy.
- Science has helped us to put parameters around what we do know and what we don't know.
- We are building a scientific model for analyzing the efficacy of prescription alternatives. But deciding on what alternatives to analyze is policy.
- Groups have been focusing on the strength and weakness of the model when it is not the only science available.
- Science tells us that when we affect shade, we affect temperature.
- The primary ways we affect shade in riparian areas is by removing trees.
- So, the big conclusion is, when thinking about solving the temperature problem on these small and medium streams we have to increase shade by using the metrics (tools) of stand density and buffer width since those are the metrics effecting shade.
- There are lots of other tools out there, nudge tools such as slope, aspect, channel gradient, the arrangement of trees in a buffer area and north/south slope orientation but they are pretty weakly correlated to stream temperature.

Stream Extent

Board direction was to analyze which streams that the prescriptions should apply.

- The lesser extent would be where SSBT streams are and the other extent would be ODF Type F streams. One is set by the rule analysis objective (July 2012) "establish riparian protection measures for Small and Medium Fish bearing streams; maintain and promote shade conditions that ensure to the MEP achievement of the PCW critierion." And then in the language of the PCW itself it says, "applies to all sources taken together where POMI for SSBT are present." That is the lower bookend.

- The PCW indicates that you need to consider contributing waters, which indicates upstream of the SSBT.

In considering upstream extent there are two main classes:
1. Immediately upstream in the main stem and/or
2. The effect of tributaries.

One of the challenges to delineating stream extent for this rule is if we think about what is immediately upstream in main stem, science shows a lot of variance. Graph detail shows that for the amount of temperature increase remaining at 300 forested meters downstream, there is a huge span of variation in the data. Then a policy question comes up, what would you use, the median, or the mean measures? So using the data (science) to calculate extent would be problematic.

Factors creating the data spread
- The gradient of the stream, width and depth *are* influencing factors and fit together to explain the spread in the data pretty well.
- The lower the gradient the more temperature you will lose over time/distance. It's the return to equilibrium model. The time it has between heating and measurement is what is effecting the rate of cooling along with other factors.
- Parent materials in streams can cause different recovery rates. Identifying parent material in a given population of streams could be a difference.
- Hydrologic systems are naturally extremely variable.
- In geographically, the variability within a region is greater than between regions.
- There are multiple paths returning the heat back to equilibrium which fundamentally challenges the concept that the heat travels uniformly downstream. This is really important stuff in terms of how we deal with how these systems work.

Action: Send out the paper that details the attributes.

Tributaries
What we are looking for is a conceptual measure of risk over a variety of approaches to determine upper extent or tributary contributions. If you think about the tributaries adding water, then to measure that effect you have to consider the volume-weighted average. But to try to do that across the landscape, would take years to model and there would still be uncertainty. It would be a nightmare to try to answer scientifically. But regarding policy, contributing tributaries might change the POMI to something different than the upper reach of the main stem of SSBT use. Conceptually, we would want some protection upstream, the question is how much. The challenge will be characterizing that to the BOF. Some say, go all the way up to the end of Fish to be precautionary and protective.

- There are streams that are non-fishing bearing streams that could have an impact but are not in the results. As well as intermittent streams.

ODFW current and historic distributions are where fish were present within the last 5 life cycles. ODF extends fish presence all the way up to a natural barrier. ODFW has qualified their distributions saying that you may not see fish present there at any given time but there was presence there within the 5 lifecycles by species and use. It is currently the best data set that is out there, with protocols on how they update it which need to be based upon provable study. The historic mapping is also variable related to what areas have gotten funded for study. But the general sense is we have to use the best applicable data from a variety of sources and the ODFW is the best source. NOAA, DSL, DEQ founded all their data layers based upon ODFW layers. In terms of where we would go, this is the starting point of discussion.

b) Georegion Discussion – Considerations for inclusion/exclusion – Terry Frueh
[Handout: Extent of small and medium streams: SSBT vs. ODF Type F]

Working with the SSBT layer from ODFW, the GIS staff has been doing some analysis. Draft data shows the Coast Range is dense with SSBT streams, the Western Cascades has very few. Data was buffered in 20 foot increments between 20' to 100'. Miles/acre is one measure and equals the percentage of ownership encumbered by different buffer widths. There are more streams per private non-industrial. So there is some degree of differential impact to family forestland owners that are lower in the watershed.

If you are talking about the differential effect, miles/acre. That is what the percentage number is doing to a certain degree. It is not density but a percentage of the ownership encumbered by a given width of buffer. Ex. A 20' buffer on the Coast Range on salmon streams, that's encumbering 0.3% of private industrial and 0.6% on private non-industrial. So it does show a differential impact to family forestland owners. When you get up around 100 acres you are not seeing the impact as much as those under 100 acres of ownership size.

LUNCH

8. Budget/Legislative Updates – Peter Daugherty

Governor released his 15-17 Budget on December 1. This is one of the best budgets seen lately for the Natural Resources Agencies. Increasing GF from 1% to 2%. Daugherty provided an overview of the Governor's 3 areas of emphasis for 2015-17.

a) *Working Farms and Forests* concept – this is a program that Tom Tuchmann has been leading on how to maintain working farms and forest. The concept has 3 components: A loan guarantee program, A revolving loan program and an Easement Program. Each level will require more commitment of State resources and a cooresponding expection a of greater conservation value to come with that. It seems that they recognize that land just being in farm or forest provides better benefits to Oregon than just urban use.
b) *Clean Water Partnerships* – builds on the integrated Water Quality Monitoring Program and provides a big push for solving water quality problems. (Currently, an upper Willamette watershed focus.) That program is still evolving. It is much less about regulation and TMDL, and much more on outcomes on the ground. That partnership includes NGOs.
c) *Integrated Resource Strategy* – Involves more water quantity and future storage options considering climate change and population growth.

[*Handout: ODF 2015-17 Governor's Budget*]

We do not see any big differences in FTE and Positions. In 2011 our effort was building the Private Forests Division, both Forest Health, and Forest Practices. In 2013 the effort was on the Wildfire Protection Act which required significant resources to get that act implemented. In 2014, there was a critical need to focus on State Forests and the Administrative Services.

- For State Forests, they had put forth 3 POPs in areas where we are providing services without receiving revenue. Recreation, Monitoring and our partnerships with South Fork.
- Administrative Services got funding for essential improvements in Procurement, Human Resources, Payroll, IT as they have all been operating with antiquated systems. They are looking to ODF to lead the state effort in modernizing those databases.
- Information Technology got really good additional capacity.
- The Fire Protection Program we got the Special Purpose Appropriation. As well as a POP to fully fund a position to support the Rangeland Protection Associations along with $1.2 million that we didn't ask for to support those efforts which are targeting fire protection on Sage Grouse habitat. We provide Associations the capability and access to Federal Surplus Equipment.
- We also got funding to continue Federal Forest management work in Eastern Oregon we have $2.8 million this biennium and the Governor is putting forward 6 million in Lottery funding to increase the pace and scale of forest restoration.
- Private Forest Division has gotten recommended funding for our GeoTech and Roads Engineering positions along with a Monitoring manager.

- We also got funds to continue FERNS for new work on the system and maintenance of E-Notify system, about 40% of our ask. So we will focus on workflow enhancements and improvements which have been identified. Reporting functions, and subscriber system capability were not included.
- Finally, we asked a lot more for our Biomass Program, and we got funded this year about 50% of our ask, but it will add 1.3 FTE and some policy capacity. It will create loan, technical assistance and educational program components. It did come with a message that half of what we get has to be spent on juniper removal, again a nod to Sage Grouse.

We (ODF) fully support the Governor's decisions to fund at an appropriate level. We are pretty thoughtful in our ask designing it to be scaleable as to processes. We spent time last week with the Legislators regarding our 2014 Fire Season. We had a request to the E-Board for 16.4 million. In response, several legislators spoke about our success at initial attack and thanked the Department, the approval went really fast.

There were questions regarding the Lloyd's of London Insurance policy which we maxed out two years in a row. We are going to try and maintain that. But there is a recognition that costs will probably increase to keep the policy.

We gave a hearing to the House Ag and Natural Resources on pesticide use on Oregon Forests. There seemed to be support for maintaining it as a tool for forestry. There are concepts out there, for example, a 24 to 48 hour notification of applications. Forestry is responsible for only 4.2 % of the amount of active ingredients applied and about 2% of the total applications. We receive about 5% of the complaints and about 1% of the actual exposures. So we have small relevance to uses, except in the minds of legislators or media.

So we had five Legislative Concepts and four were moved forward. The one that didn't was the After the Fire Emergency Recovery Funding. One of the issues with approval was we couldn't put a number on it. Costs could rapidly increase dependent upon severity and the number of acres especially if including treatment of invasive species. The fund concept wasn't cancelled with predjudice. It was more a matter of legislative priority than disagreement with the concept. It just may require more effort. Putting it forward regardless of success this year, puts it out there to draw out the questions and concerns, it hasn't yet been vetted by other stakeholders.

[*Handout: 2015 Senate and House Committee Assignments*]
The last thing is the new House committee assignments. Peter has been working with the Senate Environment and Natural Resources Committee on pesticides and 24 hour application notification. Chris Edwards is the new chair of that committee. Edwards brings value to utilization of Natural Resources. As this Committee reaches out to the Senate Committee and Ways and Means I felt is was important to know who you are addressing on this Committee.

Brett Brownscombe has taken on a assignment to be Asst. Director of ODFW until April. But he will be working the legislative session as well as keeping some of his duties with Governor's Natural Resource Office. His imprint will be felt on our budget, Biomass, and Rangeland Protection Assoc. and Sage Grouse. The Governor's office is looking at hiring behind Brett to fill in. There was also discussion on creating a team of Natural Resources advisors.

9. Riparian Rules Analysis continued (Georegion discussion) – Terry Frueh
[Handouts: Maps illustrating the extent of SSBT and ODF Fish Streams]
Terry gave a recap on georegions and provided maps to visualize the distribution of streams. Maps designated Small and Medium Type F streams versus Salmon, Steelhead and Bull Trout (SSBT).

- Are these new riparian rules going to cover just SSBT or all fish? It's a huge difference. Originally, these were policy choices not based upon science.

- There is a variability in the range of science, but nothing definitive to inform the geo-region discussion. It may well be just a policy decision. The Systematic Review didn't find a system-wide difference between georegions and most of the data was from the Coast Range, Interior and a little in the Western Cascades. The South Coast and Siskiyous didn't have much information.
- For RipStream of the 33 sites, 30 were in the Coast Range and 3 in the Interior.
- The original assumptions from the RFPC, was that in their experience on the ground, the stand structures and shrubbery components are different in the Siskiyous, and more alike the East side.

***Action*:** We can update CFF on the RFPC recommendations from their January meeting. There was a RFPC Field meeting scheduled on January 15th to look at how the plots would look on the ground but the Field meeting was subsequently cancelled.

- Timeframes for formulating comments by the March BOF meeting were discussed.
- One interesting fact from the RFPC presentation was that those exceeding the .03 change had both sides of the RMA harvested, but those with only one side harvested met the criteria.

***Action*:** Maryanne Reiter provided a photographic presentation of sites at the RFPC, it could be prepared for February and shared with CFF (Agenda item).

- I would suggest that science backs one-sided harvests as a way to meet the PCW standard.

My suggestion is that we can report on the January RFPC meeting as well as have a presentation of Jeremy Groom and Maryanne Reiter's work and the final model for achieving % certainty could be presented as at the February meeting.

- From a small landowner standpoint, the current stream rules make a lot of sense and have acceptance. But talking about additional buffer requirements and additions, folks don't see there is enough change in temperature to mandate landowner losses. The Maximum Extent Practicable implementation by the small landowner/operator is important in terms of long term stream management and voluntary contribution.
- Science isn't the only consideration here.
- That is complicated by the fact that the PWC criteria has no scientific support. There is science to suggest that the minor increases in temperature are beneficial to the fish.
- DEQ and EQC rules are developed seeing human caused temperatures as a pollutant.
- Landowners are thinking about performance based metrics and wanting a bigger, more wholistic focus.
- The majority of landowners already exceed the minimums. More than that is impractical.
- We don't mind going over and above but don't tell me what I can't do. The current rules do get us to that balance.

Action: A request to check Jeremy's model, when they originally said 40% of the time we exceeded the PCW were upstream changes counted in? What % of SSBT extent was winter only?

- At the policy workshop last spring, we were advised that we didn't have to confine our decisionmaking to temperature only. The BOF has discretion to look at other things as well. Beneficial use is part of the discretion.

10. Sub-Committee Reports

a. Forestland Tax Symposium [*Handout: Symposium Registration Packet*]

The planning/execution is continuing.

- OSWA has been doing the registration through Eventbrite.com. 87 people have registered to date.
- There was information mailed to 20,000 landowners of 20 acres or more in Oregon (not OSWA or Tree Farm Members). The information was sent out in those organizations through their newletters.
- ODF also will be putting out a news release on the Symposium soon.

- Bob McNitt offered to put the event out on the Seedling Network site and newsletter.
- Event information will be sent out to accountants and tax consultants as well.
- Discussion and decision was made to mail out to OSWA and AFF members right after Christmas.
- The budget, we had grants from SAF and Oregon Tree Farm System of $4000. We have a short fall of $4700. We sent out a sponsorship letter to consultant groups from $100 to $500.
- There are the sessions and then the roundtable discussions to determine what was learned or what questions or issues the participants had regarding Oregon's tax system.
- Information will be pulled into a 'white' paper that can come back to this committee on to analyze what we learned, and where the ongoing educational efforts should focus.
- We are also doing an evaluation through the Aldo Leopold Foundation with pre- and post-surveys of attendees providing actionable information.

(***Action*:** Put flyer onto website! From Mike C.)

Answering the question on whether this constitutes a public meeting or not? If there is a quorem present and there are actionable items from the symposium it would be considered a public meeting.

- Members do need to register if they are not speakers.

b. Industrial Fire Rules Review –

c. Seedling Availability

Cindy Glick had contacted the Stone Nursery manager regarding the availability of surplus seedlings. The manager sent the list to Susan Dominique and information was emailed out to all Stewardship Foresters to get word out to the field. Two replied that the information was helpful to landowners. Bob McNitt, FSN was present and offered a word of caution that the USFS throughout the Region are hesitant to put their seedlings up for sale and are cautious about competing with private nurseries. Many of the common zones of Oregon are sending requests for notifications of availability. The bareroot 1.0's got hit hard from last season's freeze. The Oregon Tree Farm seedling sale is still on but some zones were not available.

11. Smoke Management Regulations (Additional agenda topic) - Nick Yonker/Charlie Stone

As background we went through a review of 2012 – 2014 in June approved through the BOF and EQC. We heard from landowners that were inside the Willamette Valley and outside the protection districts how they needed to burn slash and were denied. ODF handles Smoke Management through our Forest Protection boundaries. As it is a forest practice and should be under the Oregon Smoke Management Plan for Forestry and not under the DEQ rules. So we looked at expanding our scope based upon FPA rules under Forest Practice planning. There are some reasons we jointly do the Smoke Management Plan with DEQ. While working on a MOU and checking rule language DEQ legal found problems with what we had done, and determined it did not have legal sufficiency to be implemented. There was an agreement that with that type of regulation it should be an Administrative Rule not an MOU as anything that regulates folks should have a public comment period and rulemaking process. So, currently, the same situation still exists with forestland out there that really should be under the Smoke Management Plan but is not in our FP boundaries. So we are in the process of cleaning up the rule so that it meets the legal sufficiency. Our goal is, if its forest land for forestland purposes in or out of the zone it should be included under the Smoke Management Plan. If its just outdoor burning it would be under DEQ. This tries to ensure against smoke intrusion within a community. Anything in our jurisdiction should require a mop-up as well. The biggest technical difficulty is that it will still be the local rural departments who have to deal with it unless local authorities give us that responsibility. If we say yes, and issue a burn permit, it still needs to be coordinated with local RFD.

Even now if there are violations they are handled as forest practices civil penalties. The FPA clearly says adopting rules and enforcing the FPA is exclusive authority of the BOF and no other agency or local government has any authority unless within urban growth boundaries. DEQ still has to approve any changes to the Smoke

Management Plan to align it with the Clean Air Act. But there is no need for any agreement. Its always been a Forest Practice Activity.

- Rural forest owners don't understand what to do. Even so burning orchard or christmas trees, that would still be agricultural. So there should be a clear definition. There would be a huge education effort involved.
- For full disclosure that means registering your burns and paying your fee.
- It will be a larger administrative workload to implement changes.

Watkins offered the committee's help if needed for outreach.

12. For the Good of the Order

a. Meetings and Agenda Topics for 2015 [*Handouts: CFF Future Topics]*

- There was consensus to cancel the January 9th meeting date. Topics will be pushed out to the February meeting.
  - February 6th: Legislative update, Doug Decker has been invited. Peter will invite Mary Scurlock to provide Conservation Community thoughts on Riparian Rulemaking. Continue riparian rules discussion. Brad to invite Tammy Cushing to coincide with a Tax Symposium debrief. Peter will focus on OWEB Focused Investment strategy. Seedling update if there is time.
  - March 6th: Mark Jacques and David Ford confirmed for Blue Mountain/Eastface Project
- FERNS (e-Notification System)
- Invasive Species
- Issues of importance to the BOF. Outreach to the Board members needs to be continued.
- Large Woody Debris? Data is not currently available but we will schedule when work is underway. (Mark Meleason)
- Tucker will keep a running list of topics, so contact her with ideas.

b. For the Good of the Order

- The 2015 PNW Forestry Leadership Academy is scheduled for January 16, 17 at the Oregon Garden.
- OSWA's Annual Meeting is June 18th will be the Day at the Capitol to visit with legislators on hot button issues. It will be a 3 day event with a woods tour. Business meeting is a Fair on Saturday. (18-20th)

Meeting Adjourned.

Action Items:

- ✓ Roje Gootee, Brad Withrow-Robinson, Mike Cloughesy, Evan Smith are to field nominee ideas. Lena Tucker to consult with Peter Daugherty and Doug Decker for suggestions for Chair.
- ✓ We can update CFF on the RFPC recommendations from their January meeting. There was a RFPC Field meeting scheduled on January 15th to look at how the plots would look on the ground but the Field meeting was subsequently cancelled.
- ✓ Send out the paper that details the attributes.
- ✓ A request to check Jeremy's model, when they originally said 40% of the time we exceeded the PCW were upstream changes counted in?
- ✓ What % of SSBT extent was winter only?
- ✓ Maryanne Reiter provided a photographic presentation of sites at the RFPC, it could be prepared for February and shared with CFF (Agenda item).
- ✓ Put Symposium flyer onto website! From Mike C.