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 November 15, 2013 hosted by Sarah Deumling at Zena Forest Products, Rickreall, Oregon.

**Committee members present:**
Susan Watkins, Co-Chair  
Sarah Deumling, Voting  
Scott Gray, Voting  
Brad Withrow-Robinson, Ex-Officio  
Rick Barnes, Voting  
Roje Gootee, Voting  
Mike Cloughesy, Ex-Officio  
Cindy Glick, Ex-Officio  
Joe Holmberg, Ex-officio  
Lena Tucker, Secretary

**ODF staff present:**
Jim Cathcart  
Susan Dominique  
Cynthia Orlando  
Lee Hullinger  
Kyle Abraham

**Others present:**
Mark Wigg, Northwest Lands Conservation Trust  
Nicole Strong, WOWnet

**Call to Order**
Co-Chair Susan Watkins called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m and called for any additions to the agenda. Mike Cloughesy requested time to present updates on the Model Eastside Private Forestlands Collaborative as well as status of a grant application to Tree Farm System. There were two guests attending the meeting, Kyle Abraham, ODF and Mark Wigg, who is working with ODF but is attending as a member of the public providing comment.

1. **Welcome, Introductions and Housekeeping**
Minutes of the last meeting on October 18, 2013 were reviewed. Brad commented that the shift in the minutes' format improved readability. Mike added that having missed the last meeting he appreciated the level of detail that remained. Rick Barnes moved that the minutes be accepted as written. Scott Gray seconded the motion. All were in favor. Minutes of the last meeting were approved.

Detailed roundtable introductions were made.

2. **Public Comment**
Mark Wigg provided the following comment/inquiry as a member of the Northwest Land Conservation Trust. The small land trust has been in existence since 1994. *(The Trust’s Mission is saving Oregon’s farmland, forestland, scenic open spaces with conservation easements as well as wildlife habitats!)* Mark wanted to start a dialog regarding conservation trusts and get feedback from the committee. The NW Land Conservation Trust has found that farm and forest landowners are getting older and less confident that their land holdings will remain intact. Landowners come to the Trust to find a way to maintain continuity in their lands and their use. The Trust accepts either agricultural or forest lands. Each easement is unique as each owner’s intentions differ greatly. Mark had noted the lack of attention on
conservation easements on this group’s agenda and past surveys and wanted to inquire if there is work planned on this topic over the next year.

Member response:
Generally agreed that the topic of easements has not been discussed in depth. Roje offered that there is a lack of landowner familiarity with resources like easements, and there was agreement that this should be brought up as an important part of the Committee’s tax discussion with respect to both estate planning and succession planning. Conservation easements are one of the ways to help prevent forestland fragmentation, especially at the point of intergenerational transfer. Landowners should understand what a conservation easement can provide in estate planning because most forestland properties can exceed the cap for inheritance tax exemptions. Taxes in Oregon may be particularly difficult because taxpayers have both State and Federal Inheritance tax to deal with. Many forest property holders don’t have enough cash to deal with that tax burden so they wind up selling land. But with a conservation easement, it’s considered a conservation gift, a charitable gift, and you can improve the prognosis and make it possible to keep the land within the family. It’s definitely something that we (as a committee) should be including in our tax discussion, specifically in regards to the inheritance tax.

Mark Wigg offered to put the Committee in touch with attorneys and accountants familiar with conservation easements and taxes.

Sarah emphasized she wouldn’t have the forestland she has without a conservation easement. The easement has been a huge benefit as it reduces the value of the property, which will make the handoff easier to the next generation. The earlier an easement is set up the better.

3. Welcome and Discussion on Ecosystem Values, Intergenerational Transfer and Technical Assistance to Landowners – Sarah Deumling

Sarah extended a welcome to the committee and guests and, as the meeting’s host, led a tour of Zena Forest’s hardwood mill and forestland. She discussed protecting ecological resources, intergenerational transfer and technical assistance.

Six years ago, the Deumling family started a sawmill operation, Zena Forest Products, to provide income for the family and utilize the property’s hardwoods, which otherwise would be considered waste wood. Ben Deumling and his crew run the mill operation. 60% of their logs are harvested from the property. Species harvested for the mill are White Oak, Big Leaf Maple and Douglas-fir. The mill and wood products are FSC Certified, which is a hugely positive factor in the market.

From their website: The Sawmill carries FSC® Chain of Custody certification, and about 90% of our logs are sourced from the FSC Certified Zena Forest. Zena Forest comprises one of the largest contiguous blocks of mixed conifer forest in the central Willamette Valley. It includes large areas of endangered Oak Savannah and Oak Woodland. The Zena Forest contains headwaters of Rickreall, Yamhill, and Spring Valley watersheds, and is home to a number of threatened and endangered species. The forest is protected by a conservation easement that stipulates that the forest will remain a working forest in perpetuity. No development is allowed, and strict harvest levels, as well as habitat preservation and enhancement are mandated by the easement. The forest has been managed by the Deumling family since 1985.

They have found a niche in the market for green certified lumber, interior architectural woods, custom products and hardwood flooring. Many customers want the “story” of the land and its products, so trees are specially selected onsite or from neighboring properties. Ben ensures that each log is checked by hand to provide the best and highest use and is treated on its own merits. Sarah shared that they want to be a model for hardwood harvesting in the Valley and do not source logs cut for land conversion. They are able to sell their products at a premium for the “green building” market from Eugene to Portland. Unlike conifers there isn't a model management plan for Oregon hardwoods.

As the group toured part of the forest Sarah pointed out that interspecies management is based upon the premise that the forest is not just the trees. She pointed out the mix of tree species and variety of habitats.
on the property. They work to maintain the drainage as a drainage. Soil protection is water quality protection so it is important to keep all species and maintain those connections. BPA holds a working land easement on their property. They got a grant from OWEB for restoration and worked with the USDA Partner Program. NRCS funded their pre-commercial thinning and brush control and enabled them to control invasive species on 90 acres. They work with the Forest Guild, which is an alternative to the SAF. The FG is more eco-forestry oriented but doesn’t provide funds or assistance. The bottom line principle of the Guild is that the health of the forest in its entirety comes first.

Sarah and her three children are all owners in the forestland, taking advantage of Oregon’s one-time 1.5 million Gift allowance plus annual amounts tax-free that can be given to the children in the LLC. All in the family support the current land use practices. The Public Trust for Lands provided Technical Assistance in understanding the real estate and inheritance issues. There was a lot of attention on this easement as it was the first working forest easement in the valley to protect oak habitat.

On the behalf of the members, Jim thanked Sarah for hosting the meeting.

**Action Item:** Susan Watkins reminded members that Sarah’s term of service to the committee will be ending in June as well as Craig’s role as member and Chair. Members were asked to identify candidates for the environmental and public representatives to CFF.

4 – WOWnet Presentation – Nicole Strong, OSU Extension Service, WOWnet National Editor

[Handout: PowerPoint presentation, Women Owning Woodlands in the United States] The Women Owning Woodlands web project strives to bring topical, accessible, and current forestry information to woodland owners and forest practitioners through news articles, blogs, events, resources, and personal stories. We support women in forest leadership, women who manage their own woodlands, and all who facilitate the stewardship of forests. [http://www.womenowningwoodlands.net/content/oregon-women-owning-woodlands-network](http://www.womenowningwoodlands.net/content/oregon-women-owning-woodlands-network)

Nicole coordinates the OSU Master Woodland Program and has an assignment to assist under-served landowners through training and also provides education for Aspen restoration. She noted that there has been a long history of women in forestry and introduced an archived document from 1927 called Forestry Programs for Women’s Organizations.

Women Owning Woodlands (WOW) grew out of a landowner survey Mike Cloughesy conducted for OFRI that showed that 40% of forest managers were women. There is generally not that high a percentage of women in primary roles in other industries. About the same time women at an OSWA meeting in 2005 discussed their experience joining in forestry gatherings with men and thought a women’s group would be beneficial. OFRI was supportive of the concept of a women’s group. The goal was not to fragment the community or replicate other efforts, but to provide peer mentoring woman to woman. WOW was started in January 2006 and now has over 350 members representing nine counties. Meetings are held locally and also sponsor an annual retreat with technical forestry classes, sharing and writing session. WOW has grown into a national program with groups in Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Arkansas and Virginia. The USDA is the current sponsor of the WOW program.

Women generally have more diverse management goals for forestlands. Research (for SAF) by Katherine Mader regarding the next generation showed that daughters of current women forest landowners want to be involved in the family forest but reflect a higher insecurity in their knowledge base. More males were involved than women, possibly because of the women’s lack of knowledge and forest industry connections. Insecurity is reinforced within the culture as women feel they haven’t been taken seriously in the forest industry because of their gender. This is where the “Ties to the Land” program comes in, in facilitating stewardship.

The Committee indicated an interest in studying Brett Butler’s data, including a new batch recently released.
Sarah agreed that lack of knowledge and her own diverse management goals have led her to be defensive in her dealings within the forest community.

The group agreed that a discussion about the acceptance of more diverse goals is important, but there is prejudice in the community about what goals are considered legitimate. WOW provides freedom to think out of the box and to be taken seriously as woodland managers. Nicole replied that WOW has always promoted making informed decisions by providing educational programs targeting a wide array of management goals. WOWnet’s goal is to give women a safe place to learn, ask questions and have an opportunity to gain basic forest knowledge in an welcoming environment.

Roje noted that, gender aside, it’s difficult to be treated with credibility if you have a diverse range of objectives for your forestland. Particularly in the NW, it is something of an ethos that if you are not selling logs, you don’t count as a person practicing forestry. Restoration forestry is not considered a valid management practice in some areas and there are a lot of people who label her as a hobby forester because of those diverse goals.

Nicole shared that men attend WOW educational sessions as well, drawn just as the women are to offerings on a wider range of topics.

Scott asked how restoration forestry is different than regeneration forestry. To him they are both regeneration management.

Roje commented that there is a difference in Westside versus Eastside forestry. Eastside practice involves uneven-aged forestry and selective management. The expectation is that you’re not a ‘real’ forester unless you are selling logs. Roje views herself as a forest manager not just a tree farm manager. She strives for a diverse range of age classes and diverse stand structure. It’s very difficult when you are asked “Why aren’t you selling logs yet?” I am working hard on the restoration of a multi-aged, multi-structured forest.

Scott replied that Roje’s style is not that different than others but the term ‘restoration forestry’ suggests some kind of damage has occurred that must be fixed. It could be an inflammatory term to older foresters who may view the terminology as saying somehow they didn’t treat the forests right and someone is coming in to ‘fix it’. Mike thinks that term may have a historical connotation of getting the forest back to how it was at some point in time. Roje replied that the restoration forestry term is being used as a catch phrase more in northeastern Oregon. Cindy said that especially on the eastside, USFS is bringing back disturbance processes in the forest that aren’t there anymore, so in a sense they are restoring a disturbance process.

Roje acknowledged that many eastsiders are concerned about the contributions to infrastructure (mills) and that concern is felt as pressure on private landowners to harvest. But harvesting for the sake of harvesting isn’t a good business model. It’s a political perception.

Sarah noted that when she hosts non-forestry group tours, she is generally met with affirmation and encouragement. When she has visits from forestry groups (other than the Forestry Guild), she generally feels on the defensive.

Nicole suggested that the landowner base will be changing and there are ways to correct these misconceptions. She thinks WOW can be a gateway to invite more women into the resource community by mentoring and education and encouraging women’s leadership in local and statewide communities.

Susan shared that she was sought out for her place on this committee partly because of her past work with WOW. CFF has become a place where women can step forward and bring their perspectives with them to the discussion. There is always a difference in objectives, with or without treating them as gender issues.
Sarah fears that those who see values other than timber in a forest are continually more marginalized and continually less likely to make a living with their woodlands as they don’t have the economies of scale that industrial forestry has. She worries that with a narrowing definition of forestry as the growing and harvesting of trees it is going to make it increasingly difficult to manage for other values while trying to make a living. Sarah believes that a reassessment of the incentives for forestland ownership should be considered.

Harvesting timber is below 40% nationally, and the priorities are increasingly changing to habitat and woodland retreat uses instead of harvesting timber for privately owned land. Landowners with a day job or who don’t fit into the current industrial model have difficulty finding support. In addition we have a fear that taxes will be onerous. Establishing management plans can address some issues regarding being considered a hobby farm and the potential for tax penalties.

Cindy answered that traditionally forestry, regardless of ownership gender, has been considered a scarcity issue (scarce funding, scarce money) and limits our options and decisions. Landowners need to get out of that paradigm and expand their vision as to how our forests can help our community. Forests can be used to address our huge unemployment problems and can help our veterans and others work their way back into society. With the forestry work that’s needed, why can’t we use some of the unemployment insurance funds to re-create the CCC work crews. This could help both small woodlands earn revenue and help the community.

Nicole will be working on veteran re-training next year. The ultimate success of WOWnet will come when it won’t be needed anymore because other resources are available and different values are accepted. Peer learning is WOW’s greatest benefit, not the identification of a gender issue. WOW has created a peer learning toolkit to facilitate these learning models.

Mike added that when Nicole started this idea and came to him, they decided it would not be a lobbying or membership organization, but a informal network. Brad said the point was to create a welcoming, educational environment, and this network has proved to be a mutual success bringing people into forestry in a welcoming way.

Jim C. suggested WOW look at Oregon Leadership Academies. Funding could be there for WOWnet to meet leadership development needs.

Nicole reminded the group to encourage women or men to attend CISPUS (interagency leadership development). OSWA will be teaching modules at CISPUS for 2014. They are an independent institute now. Many WOWnet participants also belong to OSWA and Tree Farm. Mike mentioned doing workshops, if we can get the funding, the TELE (Tools for Engaging Landowners Effectively – Yale School of Forestry) to reach out to other landowner types. TELE would help us communicate more effectively with different, diverse audiences. WOWnet is a natural platform as host for that.

“Tools for Engaging Landowners Effectively (TELE) is a project of the Sustaining Family Forests Initiative (SFFI), an ad hoc collaboration of universities, government agencies, industry, conservation organizations, certification systems, and landowners. The goal of this multiyear project is to provide a practical set of tools to help conservation and forestry professionals reach more landowners with effective stewardship messages and develop programs that serve the needs and values of the landowners.” http://www.engaginglandowners.org/about-project

CISPUS – “This hands-on workshop is designed to give today’s natural resource professionals proven, innovative communication and collaboration skills. The workshop is taught by fellow agency professionals with on-the-ground experience working with people to resolve natural resource issues. The skills you learn at Cispus will improve and enhance your ability to work collaboratively within your own agency, with other agencies, and the public.”

5 – Tax Symposium Planning – Mike Cloughesy
In Sara Leiman’s absence, Mike Cloughesy presented the sub-committee report. Sara put together a draft proposal to be submitted to OFRI for grant support for fiscal year 2014-15. The OFRI board won’t take formal proposals until January, but staff needs to turn ideas into the OFRI working group so they can prepare proposals for the board projects. Our proposal would fall under the Landowner Education part of OFRI’s budget. Quoting from the proposal, “The goal is to illuminate the breadth of taxes related to Oregon family-owned forests and forestland.” Potential partners include CFF, OSWA, Oregon Tree Farm System, OSU Forestry Extension, Assoc. of Consulting Foresters with supporters.

Sara and Joe attended OFRI stakeholder meetings in October to get feedback on the kind of programs people are interested in. We should ask OFRI to help fund the educational Symposium and have the training led by the Committee for Family Forestlands and cooperators, eg, OSWA, Oregon Tree Farm System, OSU Forestry Extension, and Association of Consulting Foresters if they are interested. We hope we would have consulting foresters in the audience and would hope ACF would support consulting foresters participation. Joe agreed that Tree Farm as an educational program would naturally be a part.

As a BOF committee, we are tasked with advising the BOF about policy. We could identify issues in terms of what people are experiencing on the ground stories and issues that come from the participants themselves.

Regarding the symposium budget, Mike assumed the symposium will cost about $25,000, $15,000 from OFRI and $10,000 from participants at $40/each for registration fees. The goal is to set the fee such that the symposium breaks even no matter how many attend. The discussion turned to scholarships, which typically are offered to 20% of participants. That would mean 50 scholarships if we expect 250 people. $40 x 50 = $2000 in scholarships. The consensus was to allow people to request scholarships and explain why they should receive one, rather than establish qualifying categories. Logistics of the training needs to be added as a budget item. When you get to pay someone to administer the conference, those conference service fees could become potential income. $20x250 people = $5000 for registrations, publications, catering. Nothing is currently in the draft for speaker fees, which normally could be up to $1000/each.

With respect to the post-symposium booklet and Statewide sessions, the lead would be Forestry Extension and the Starker Chair. Sessions can be regional workshops, webcasts and/or Tree School meetings.

The project timeline is January 2014 to reserve space, April 2014 for decisions on sponsorship, and January 2015 for the symposium. Statewide sessions March through April at Tree Schools. Advertising should go out 3-6 months before to save the date; start pushing 2 months out. Mike will reserve space at OSU for plenary sessions and break-out groups.

Rick suggested involving Portland State in planning and speaking, including accounting or business students and staff.

The final OFRI proposal is due in January. The OFRI board will meet the 2nd Friday in January. The budget meeting group will meet the end of January or February and will be making decisions in April. The CFF meeting is on January 9th and we can finalize the draft at that meeting.

The desired audience is a mixture of landowners and tax professionals who may not have a working knowledge of forests or forest taxation, as well as consultants, policy-makers and accounting professionals. We want to hear from landowners willing to share their tax stories and impacts. Jim suggested workshops on specific topics. We could do a call for topics from different audiences in advance, perhaps around the end of April 2014 tax season as issues will be fresh in landowner minds. This would enable us to construct the agenda around known landowner need.

Susan added that ultimately we need the tax structures to reflect and reward the values created on the land. Brad reminded members that we are using the symposium to chart a course; we can’t deliver it all at once. Our goal should be to teach people what they want to learn, both the audience of the landowners and audience of professionals. Good topics might include ‘hobby farm’ status, easements, and hidden or non-obvious taxes such as cost-share funds that are considered taxable income.
Cindy suggested looking at different business structures, eg, LLCs, Partnerships, collaboratives with different tax structures and different business models. Have “Timber Owner 101” for newer landowners, which could generally address the fundamental business issues. Tree Farm held a webinar on taxes. The objective would be to prepare people to have that informed conversation with a tax advisor. Topics like Establishing and Updating Basis and fundamental tax lingo, record-keeping.

The discussion turned to whether the symposium should address carbon trading options and the broader topic of ecosystem services. We have an opportunity to provide some broad understanding of how the current system influences landowner planning. We might offer a breakout regarding the tax implications of receiving incentives. Specific market opportunities might wait for a later symposium. The BOF has identified alternative revenues as an emerging issue.

**Action Item:** Jim will provide a link to the Webinar archived in Tree Farm data

**Action Item:** Finalize draft OFRI proposal at January CFF meeting

---

**6 – Water Quality, The Role of CFF Can Play In Being Proactive – Kyle Abraham**

To begin, Lena shared her notes on the big topics at the November BOF Meeting. In October CFF had a presentation by Terry Frueh on the Scientific Evidence Review (SER) process. The SER Final Report has since been sent out.

The Review identified three potentially viable alternatives for protecting the cold water standard. The BOF directed ODF to develop prescriptions for the three alternatives: no-cut buffer; a variable riparian buffer; and a plan for alternate practices (sideboards needed). Keeping the current FPA rules is also a potential outcome. The other recommendation was that we continue with the research to flush out where these rules could be applicable within the geographic regions.

[Slides/SER report to members]

Michael Newton’s paper and comments from others generated a lot of discussion at the BOF meeting. Commenters questioned whether the Cold Water criteria (CWS) was attainable, whether or not the standard was set at the right number, and whether the standard actually benefitted fish. There was a great deal of reference to the Watershed workshop held the day before that some BOF members attended. (The Watershed Research Cooperative (WRC) and OFRI put on this workshop.) The research is showing that any changes in stream temperature due to forest activities are chronic, not acute, and they are small and don’t last through time as the temperature dissipates as it goes down stream. The temperature increases are not having a negative impact on fish and only a moderate impact on macro-invertebrates.

Nevertheless, the BOF has a specific responsibility to meet the standard as it is today. The RipStream Studies show that current forest management practices don’t meet the CWS on small and medium streams on private lands. (The State Forest Management Plan is adequate in meeting the standard. The question is how we bring it into compliance on private lands. The BOF directed staff to carry on with the process and come back to the Board in March on the prescriptions for the three alternatives and analysis on the geographic regions each would be applied to. That information will allow the BOF to begin the process for determining which alternative(s) are the least burdensome to the landowner. That determination, to be made July 2014, will direct potential rule changes.

The chain of command for establishing criteria like the CWS is:

1. EQC is responsible for establishing the Cold Water Standard under the Clean Water Act. (The EPA set a standard of “no degradation”; the EQC determined the measurable standard of .3 degrees Celsius; the EPA approved the EQC standard. With input from USFWS and NOAA, the EPA determines that the standard will not be detrimental to fish.)
2. BOF is charged with implementing the Cold Water Standard
3. BOF is accountable for violations, not the landowner. BOF can ask the EQC to revise the standard through a petition process.

Sarah asked if the Department doesn’t act, what will happen? Will the EPA step in? Kyle answered that the EPA can step in with their own rules. But the BOF has been given room to act. There is no dispute on the science regarding failure of the present FPA rules to meet the existing CWS.

ODF has been tasked with bringing this rule-making to the RFPC for formal review. Lena asked, if CFF wants to be involved. Susan asked members if they want a more active role in the process. Lena added that as a group, the members are already represented through the Regional committees. We could revisit that question at the January meeting.

Rick wanted a chance to comment prior to the final formal recommendation to the Board. Southwest (Rick B.) and Northwest (Susan W.) representatives from CFF could attend the RFPC meetings where the fullest discussion on this topic will be and report back. Regional meeting dates will be set soon.

Kyle addressed ways CFF and ODF can be more proactive on water quality issues. The Mid-Coast TMDL and the CZARA lawsuit are still in process. Peter is at the meeting with EPA and NOAA discussing a settlement agreement. We are in this reactive mode with a lot of staff work going on but we don’t have an adequate way to measure that.

We have good reason to believe that family forestland owners have been responding positively by improving roads and leaving buffer strips even when not required, upgrades to roads, surfacing, culverts, fish streams but their actions haven’t been reported with regularity. All private forestland reporting has been voluntary. If we offer the argument that family forestland owners are good stewards how can we back up that statement? We have advertised the importance of management plans. But the actual number of plans is low. Is that a funding issue, a human resource issue, or an educational issue? What are ways we can recommend to improve that? That would be taking a proactive stance beginning with answers about here’s where, how we can address it, and here’s where the money is coming from.

Joe offered that the major reason management plan use is low is inertia. The Uniform Plan has been constructed so that it isn’t too daunting to put together a plan, but is just getting to that point of setting up stewardship models.

Mike C. suggested that it has to do with incentives. Landowners want incentives to do prepare (and follow) plans. The older generation does everything in their head; they don’t see the need to put their plans in writing. But that doesn’t help the next generations.

Rick sees NRCS and ODF funding as the big driver in management plans. Writing a management plan is a major task compared to on-the-ground activities and hiring a consultant is expensive.

The recently adopted Oregon Forest Management Planning Guidelines strongly suggest a road inventory. Scale, Intensity, scope and interest of the Landowners. We haven’t a quality control or quality assurance for the guidelines. The template is organized as a road inventory. But will depend upon the size of the property. Jim agreed with Kyle that the way to document what is being done is through management plans. You need the financial and technical assistance to prepare sound plans, but both have been declining.

Brad reflected that educational assistance is available. There are Roads and Sediments training going on. Education gives them the tools to do the work, but doesn’t provide documentation or incentive.

The Forest Road Indicator in the Forestry Program for Oregon has a statewide road inventory component. In the future we may be able to conduct a statistically valid sampling of landowners that will provide more information on road and water integrity. It’s one way we can help be proactive.
Members wondered if we have a sense of where the problems lie, ie, whether small forestland owners are the problem. Family forestlands are generally in more sensitive locations on the landscapes and may have greater impact than industry that is further up in the watershed. Forest fragmentation is also an issue.

Roje pointed to Washington state, which adopted a road inventory system, and required all landowners to make all road crossings fish friendly. There were a lot of people impacted on a personal level. Washington was being proactive trying to get ahead of the federal regulations because of huge problems with the Endangered Species Act and all of the implications to fisheries up there. Kyle referred to the Culverts Case; the State of Washington DOT was sued by the tribes to improve fish passage across the state on state highways and county roads.

Cindy stated that they are looking at geomorphology and the effect on water temperatures. So those kinds of results of land types could determine the capacity of the lands to provide cold water. Checker boarded ownerships are of interest to agencies and LIDAR could be used.

In addition to temperature, pesticides and turbidity are important water-related issues. DEQ is going through a turbidity rule-making. The committee noted that buffers are a big issue for smaller landowners as there is a sense that some landowners take buffers out of management completely because they are not certain of the proper buffer zone management. Also many forest owners believe that agricultural zoning has a free ride when it comes to how to treat riparian zones. People want to feel that management is carried out fairly across all uses. How can we turn that issue into something that defends forestry's contributions to water quality?

Rick suggested we tell the story about our educational programs, like the presentations being done on roads maintenance. Use the number of attendees to show that landowners are concerned and looking to be educated.

Extension is talking about doing a landowner session on roads instead of gearing educational efforts just to operators. It would be a joint process with Watershed Councils, OSWA, Extension and Starker Chair. We need to think about what inspires landowners. Many may not realize that if you have an old "legacy" road, there are risks to not doing anything.

Kyle noted that the temperature issue will be driving ODF for a while, but the turbidity issue is coming up fast. CFF has an opportunity to be proactive with that.

Roje commented that one of the prime opportunities we will have is with the stewardship planning process. We should consider how we can encourage engagement. Landowners often consider a plan as red-tape, something that keeps them from engaging in certain activities they can't do unless they have a plan. They don't see a plan as a tool for managing their lands. absence of planning keeps landowners out of programs. There needs to be a changing relationship with the land. I think a lot of owners are seeing all this as red-tape. We aren't rationalizing why planning is relevant. For many, costs are a big issue.

Roje added that there is a prejudice against landowners doing their own written plans rather than having consultants do it, but it's hard to get landowners engaged when they aren't vested in the planning. Landowners who participate in writing their own plans feel they understand their land and the relationship of the plan to their activities. Washington has a program of "Coached Stewardship Planning". The landowner writes their own plan with coaching. This way it becomes a personal statement for them. The approval rating is 95% for the Coached Stewardship Planning from participant landowners. They feel they understand their land in a different way.

The Oregon Forest Management Planning System is similar to Washington's Coached Stewardship Planning with a similar goal to get tools to landowners and re-determine the role of the resource professional in that process. CFF's Private Lands Collaborative could provide an opportunity to do that. We want landowners to embrace stewardship at every level.
Scott added that the pesticide issue will also be important to addressing water quality. Roje was interested in the turbidity issue as well. The rule on turbidity currently is an allowance of 10% above background for 2 hours NTU out of 24 nephelometric. A difficult rule to implement. DEQ has proposed a straight numeric standard, 5 imtu’s (iso-metric turbidity units) in the winter and a set amount in the summer. There is an exception for Hood River because of glacial flour in the water.

CFF wanted to hear more about turbidity.

7a -- Update on the Collaborative – Mike Cloughesy/Roje Gootee

We should find out about the federal grant by December 15th. The scoring meeting is November 18th.

Joe and Mike submitted a grant proposal to the American Tree Farm System for $10,000 to develop the framework for a Landscape Level Management Plan that would be implemented through the Eastside Collaborative. We should find out whether the proposal will be funded by the end of November, with money available in January. Mike volunteered to be the consultant to help ATFS develop the framework, which would be in place when/if we get the federal funding July 1. Caveat: The landscape plan has not been broached to the collaborative landowner participants. But to the USFS and others, having a landscape plan will make the Collaborative more attractive. Given that this is actually a ‘resource assessment’ of how landowner participants fit in the landscape and that any actions on the ground will be driven by the needs of the landowners, we expect landowner support.

Roje suggested that we develop a communication plan. Some of the landowners are absentee and will not attend face-to-face meetings, but we need their feedback. The project has been top down, but now we need to be attentive to going from the ground up. Roje has a couple of potential representatives for the landowners, both absentee and fulltime Ritter residents.

We also need to establish a leadership team for the project. Suggested members are Roje, Craig, Mike, Rob, Brad and landowner representatives. We need to hold off unless we know we will have money. We do need to move quickly at that point. NRCS and Bob Parker, OSU Extension, should be actively involved.

**Action Item:** We will need to determine how to handle the on-the-ground administration of the project.

Jim offered his assistance to this leadership committee as a staff resource so we can confirm that the grant requirements track the activities and meet the goals.

Roje has also made contact with Rob Pentzer, the John Day Unit Forester, who is very interested and on board with our goals and has already suggested additional funding opportunities for project implementation.

Roje also spoke with Loraine Vogt with NRCS. Loraine is quite intrigued by the proposal. Her recommendation is that the Conservation Innovation Grant for the on-the-ground funding is not necessarily the best fit. She recommended we look at Collaborative Partnership Funding, which is federal.

Grant County Court is interested in the project but there are philosophical disagreements internally among the commissioners. The Court’s unified support would be difficult at this time. They would like to know what we would want from them as the project matures.

**Action Item:** Roje will complete a draft of a feedback letter to landowners and stakeholders.

Liaison with the tribes is still a question. OSU Extension might be a good choice. Kurt Ausland has been offered to assist. If the grant comes through, ODF may feel comfortable increasing capacity in that to assist. Brad Siemens will still be participating as a coordinator of the grant with Jim.
7 – Starker Chair Update – Brad Withrow-Robinson

CFF is well represented on the Starker Chair search committee with 3 representatives. There are three finalists who will meet with the Dean and interviewers and also be available to meet with stakeholders, small landowners or committee members at informal 9:30 AM morning coffees. Each candidate will also present a public seminar at 3pm in the afternoon that will be web-streamed as a public broadcast. Interviewees scheduled are:
Greg Latta – Dec 6
Tamara Cushing – Dec 9
Nathan Anderson – Dec 11 – the am stakeholder meeting will be at 10 rather than 9:30.

OSU expects to make an offer to the first choice by Christmas.

**Action Item**: Brad will circulate detailed information

8 – For the Good of the Order

Agenda items for the December 5th meeting:
- Speaker: Bob McNitt, Forestry Seedling Network
- FERNS live demo – Joe Touchstone
- Tax symposium discussion
- Compliance Audit – Marganne Allen

Agenda items for January 9th:
- Turbidity issue – Kyle Abraham in January
- Riparian Rules update
- Conservation Easements – Diane Dagit (Snyder) new head of Trust for Public Lands, (OWEB) Wallowa Resources (she was keynote for the last OSWA symposium)

The topic of easements may be better in line with the SCC meeting inviting the coordinator of the Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts. There are a lot of topics that cross committees, perhaps there could be cross-invitation to members. January 23rd is the next SCC committee meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:20pm. The next meeting is scheduled for December 5th in Salem.