SFAC Meeting
Forest Grove Community Auditorium
10/29/10

In Attendance: Mike Wilson, Matthew Betts, Dave Kunert, Lisa Phipps, Denise Lofman, Rex Storm, Bud Henderson, Leslie Shaw, Michael Sykes, Fred MacGregor, Doug Decker, Ed Kamholz, Mike Bordelon, Julia Lauch, April Reece, Kevin Weeks, Tom Savage, Ron Zilli, Russ Lane, Jay Sandmann, Colleen Kiser, Andy White, Jenny Johnson, Kate Skinner, Don Everingham, Wayne Auble, Jeff Brandt, Ian Hayes, Wayne Naillon, Randy Peterson and Jason Hinkle

Housekeeping - Ed Kamholz/Mike Bordelon
- Approval of Meeting Summary 3/26/10
  o No comments or additions/changes, minutes approved as submitted
- Comments/Questions on Summer Field Trip
  o Thanks to North Cascade District for hosting and providing the tour.

Background/Policy Context: State budget/revenue situation and budget reductions - Doug Decker
- Recent changes for the Agency
  o Marvin Brown submitted his resignation as State Forester; recruitment is underway and expected to be finalized early 2011.
    ▪ Nancy Hirsch is the Interim State Forester
    ▪ Doug Decker is filling in behind Nancy Hirsch
- Significant General Fund cuts in Private Forests and Protection programs
  o Changes in Executive Staff to help address these funding challenges
- ODF Funding Coalition Workgroup
  o Other funding possibilities
    ▪ 30 innovative ideas
    - Included municipal water tax
    - Lift ban on log exports
    - CSL consolidate with Board of Forestry Lands
    - Voted to move forward with 12-15 ideas to the legislature
    - Longer term ideas
      o Protection of BLM lands on the west side
      o Protection of USFS lands; additional acres
    - Private Forests administration is near impossible with budget reductions
  o Public/Private Partnership - Rex Storm
    ▪ Foundation for Protection and Private Forests programs
    ▪ Funding must be shared
    ▪ General Fund has been decreased gradually over last several years which has put the burden on private landowners
    ▪ Coalition agrees that the private landowners should not have to contribute additionally to make up for General Fund reductions
    ▪ Natural Resource Agencies (statewide) receive less than 1% of General Fund overall

Board of Forestry: State Forests Policy Development - Doug Decker
- Overview (FMP, GPV, Planning Rule)
In June 2009 BOF asked the Department to review the definition/rule of GPV (Greatest Permanent Value)

4 Questions posed to the BOF regarding GPV
- Who are the beneficiaries of Oregon’s state forests, and how are they emphasized?
- What are the main elements (resources/values) that should be specifically named in the rule as products or deliverables?
- What are the standards for these elements (protect, restore, maintain, enhance, etc.) and how should the standards be met?
- How do these elements relate to each other: is there a hierarchy, interdependence, equity, etc.?

Board has finished reviewing
In January ODF will present to BOF a narrative of their interpretation of the BOF’s direction
Rule language will be adjusted to better describe the BOF’s direction
BOF wants to address two main items:
- Climate change
- Economic stability

Review Planning Rule
Questions asked of the BOF
- Are there pieces of the planning rule missing?
- Process wise, does the State Forester have the appropriate flexibility?
- Does the Board have an appropriate role?

Currently the Board makes decisions about stewardship principles and the State Forester is responsible for creating the FMP, IP, and AOP.
BOF will state whether they want to be more involved in operational planning
GPV is done and the BOF is reviewing
Planning rule will be finished next week

Housekeeping continued... - Mike Bordelon
- FY11 AOP – SFAC and Public Comments
  Handout
- ODF received a total of 105 comments on the 2011 AOP of which 102 are specific to Coos District and 1 is specific to Klamath-Lake District.

Organizational Changes
- Dan Goody is the New DF in Tillamook
- Retirement effective for North Cascade; Gregg Cline, District Forester
- Julia Lauch is filling in as the Assistant to the Area Director for the next 6 months from Pendleton to learn more about State Forest Management (career development)

Background/Policy Context continued... - Mike Bordelon
- State Forests Revenue Projection (updated)
  FDF Balance Projections
  - Historically try to retain 1 year of expenditures in bank account
  - Significant decrease in expenditures due to budget cuts, layoffs, etc.
  - Downward trend in account balance requires the Agency to decrease additional expenditures
  - Next Tuesday the agency will be discussing strategic planning regarding expenditures
  - This is only a projection and as market conditions change so will the chart
Board of Forestry – State Forests Policy Development continued...-Mike Bordelon

- NW/SW FMP Revisions
  - Revised plans were distributed to the SFAC members
  - No HCP (Habitat Conservation Plan)
    - It will not be pursued
  - Species of Concern (SOC) strategies will be developed in lieu of HCP and included in the implementation plan
  - Desired Future Condition (DFC) targets were changed from 40-60% to 30-50%; due to budget reductions
  - BOF’s direction is to increase revenue by 5-15% on the Tillamook and Clatsop State Forests (performance measures)
  - Target for habitat is 17-20% achievement in CFS in next 20 years
  - Landscape design target is 30%
  - There were no changes to Appendix J
    - Bud asked why there were no changes when there is not an adequate supply of downed wood in Alder/Hardwood dominated riparian areas (according to monitoring studies)?
    - Mike said there are still opportunities for changes.

Implementation Plan Revision Process-Mike Bordelon

- IP Revision deadlines are not aligned between the Districts
  - Forest Grove and Astoria will be completed in June 30, 2012
  - Tillamook District is targeted for a year later in 2013 due to the available acres piece
  - West Oregon, Western Lane, North Cascade and Southwest Oregon districts are also targeted for FY13.
- There are a number of policy decisions associated with revising IP’s. Inter-related issues include:
  - Establishing district complex structure targets
  - Determining the need for additional SOC strategies
  - Landscape design considerations
  - Determining harvest levels and flows
  - Determining implications of potential IP strategies for Division revenue flows and investment opportunities
- Some increase in harvest is assumed
- The IP’s will undergo an internal review process. Based on an FMP requirement, they will also be available for public review and comment for 30 days.
- Last time ODF went through this process there were local “focus groups” for public input into the plans.
- Mike would appreciate input from this group regarding the major change elements by district.
- In 2003 the IP process was built from scratch, this time around there is a foundation for it.
- Bud feels that with the right facilitator 2-3 meetings could accomplish the review process with public comment/input.
- Rex suggested having the Districts host the general public “open houses” individually in addition to the SFAC input and County Commissioner involvement.
- Lisa Phipps would like to have an opportunity earlier on than the required 45-day public comment period for input from local constituents and interest groups.
- Role of SFAC in IP revision process
  - What role do the SFAC members want to have in this process?
    - Workshop in January/February (Doodle Poll)
  - Provide input back to State Forester
Ed asked Mike how to get everyone to a common reference point. He suggested having the old plan vs. the new plan with a one page summary/reference sheet.

Orientation for new SFAC members in December
- Doug said he could do a 20 minute presentation from a historical perspective
- Reading materials to be provided in advance

Materials hyperlink to State Forests:
- Oregon Department of Forestry District Implementation Plans

Implementation Monitoring Final Draft Report-Jeff Brandt/Ian Hayes
- Q&A
  - Status Update
    - Implementation Monitoring workgroup development started back in 2001
    - 2 phases included quantitative field sampling and qualitative questions/contract administrative review
    - Pilot project sampling started in 2005
    - IM Report has been finalized
    - Developed a 3 phase approach to sampling
      - Contract administrative review
      - On the ground sampling and direct District input from managers
      - Pre and Post sampling occurred
    - Upland Sampling results
      - Trees per acre, snags per acre, and down wood volume targets established by the FMP were met and in some cases exceeded across the landscape. Some individual units fell short of landscape level targets, but combined weighted averages were at or above minimum requirements.
      - 5 green tree retention patches were omitted from the sample.
        - Future communication and attention to these areas will occur prior to future sampling.
    - Riparian Sampling results
      - Mature forest conditions have not yet developed in the Inner zone of any of the sampled streams.
      - Outer zone conifer retention was met on 22 of the 30 sampled streams. Those with deficits were hardwood dominated areas with low numbers of existing conifers. It is not known if management actions contributed to this deficit or if the deficit exists solely from pre-existing hardwood conditions. Further guidance on Appendix J standards may be needed.
      - Quite a bit of variance across districts and “why” that is will be investigated.
      - Monitoring efforts have raised some questions about the targets and how to apply them in mixed hardwood conifer stands where desired targets for mature forest condition cannot be met with or without active management.
      - Opportunities to learn and improve and build recommendations into next year’s AOP exist.
  - Bud feels there are opportunities to enhance environmental benefits and increase revenue by following the Forest Practices Act to actively manage Alder/hardwood riparian areas. Why isn’t the Agency doing this if there is the flexibility Mike speaks of in Appendix J to do so?
  - Ron explained that some of these stands, through policy choices been excluded from real active management opportunities with the draft HCP policies. Now with the recent changes to the FMP
they are much more accessible. There are additional areas in South County that were previously occupied by Northern Spotted Owls. Surveys (which take two years), and market conditions are all part of the considerations for the planning process.

- Reforestation in RMA’s in significantly greater.
- Rex would like to see the group focus on the result of the findings that can be implemented on the ground that will make the biggest impact and not split hairs on minor details.
- Jeff asked Rex to send him his suggested prioritization list.
- Over the last ten years there has been priority given to preservation and retention of hardwoods.
- The stream database is maintained by ODF in GIS. It is adjusted based on ground-truthing.

- Next step is to distribute the report Agency-wide and will likely become part of the annual research and monitoring report to be presented to the BOF.

Tillamook District Available Acres Project-Kate Skinner/Colleen Kiser

- Overview – Those acres available for sustainable harvest over time given current laws and policy.
  - 2009 there was a District tour that had an available acres component
  - This project has moved to the top as a priority for Tillamook District
    - The rugged topography of the Tillamook District and wet climate make the district inherently prone to landslides, more so that any of the other districts in NWOA. 43% of their acres are 60% slope or more.
  - The capability of the land has been divided into three broad categories of potential restrictions related to terrain features and/or characteristics.
    - Physical Factors
    - FPA Requirements
    - FMP Requirements
  - Why are they doing this now?
    - Better information available now
  - LIDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) – exploring avenues to combine information collected to expand current SLI sampling.

- Landslides and Public Safety Analysis
  - Planning process has posed the question of where the risks are associated with landscape and what the issues are.
  - Started identifying locations in the district that had structures that might be at risk
    - Found 2,687 structures within the area identified
    - Risk Levels were identified for the basins
      - 22,831 acres fell into the intermediate/substantial category and are therefore either not harvestable or limited based on age (over or under 10 years) of the stand
  - Will be meeting with County Commissioners to discuss critical decision points

- Methodology and Process
  - Wind firm buffers protect the trees on HLHL (High Landslide Hazard Locations). It was determined to use a 50 foot radius.
  - LEI data vs. new LIDAR data

- SFAC Input and Discussion
  - Final product to be completed in time for use in the Tillamook District’s H&H model runs, which will then influence 2013 IP revisions and the subsequent FY13 AOP harvest objectives.
  - Ed asked what their deadline is and Kate said December 31st of this year.
Interim Recreation Visioning Process-Andy White/Tom Savage

- Draft Divisional Policy
  - Early 90’s is when the Agency got some funding to manage some recreational areas on the forests
  - Programs have grown
  - 2005 Second –party assessment evaluation made recommendations to ODF
    - Action plan based on the recommendations finalized in May 2008
    - Spring 2009 budget reductions put things on hold
    - Have been running on interim guidance since then
      - Priority is to maintain what agency already has in existence
        - Facilities
        - Trails
      - Recreation work has to stay in alignment with budget and staff capacity
        - Meeting in August to determine if the Recreation Program
        - Policy development based on interim guidance
        - Recreation components will be worked into the upcoming IP’s for Astoria and Forest Grove Districts. Tillamook’s IP will contain even more since they have the largest chunk (2/3’s) of the area.
        - Additional information regarding District IP’s and the recreation policy piece can be provided at the February workshop.
  - Policies and procedures will not only be for Astoria, Forest Grove and Tillamook. Other districts feedback and criteria are being incorporated.

- SFAC Input and Discussion
  - Bud asked about State Parks providing funding to the motorized portion of the recreation program? Specifically he was asking about the Nicolai OHV area.
    - Tom explained that under the budget cuts, ODF received funding through State Parks and other grants.
  - Bud asked if there was any other type of funding stream available to assist the local fire department acquire the necessary equipment (i.e. atv’s) to rescue injured persons in that recreation area?
    - Tom said there are discussions in motion.
  - Leslie asked why planned trails have been put on hold when there are user groups/volunteers that would do the work for free?
    - Volunteer work still has to be supervised and coordinated by ODF staff.
    - Volunteer work is being prioritized to maintain existing trails etc.
    - Offers are evaluated by each District
  - Leslie asked why motorized trails are at the top of the priority list when they are the most costly to maintain and deteriorate the environment?
    - In the Astoria District, ATV use had to be addressed because the use was occurring without administration.
    - The grant received in the Astoria District was specifically for motorized recreation.
  - Wayne Naillon asked for ODF’s approval to move forward with building some trails in the Larch Mountain area that have already been approved instead of postponing it. Their user group received a grant to get the equipment to do the project and will maintain it without ODF resources.
  - Fred noted that an additional benefit would be to have two separate areas of this type of riding and recreation use to abate the conflict of hunting and active timber sales.
Good of the Order - Ed Kamholz

- **Next Meeting**
  - Workshop in February / Additional meeting
  - Meeting in March
    - Date to accompany poll with February workshop

- **Action Items**
  - Orientation for New Members
    - Lisa Phipps, Leslie Shaw, Ed Kamholz, and Denise Lofman
      - Tom, Andy and Dan to lead
    - Schedule in next couple months
  - Schedule workshop date for IP (one day)

- Rex asked about the land exchange in West Oregon District and how it relates to the FMP.
  - The FMP contemplates a land exchange policy that would consolidate the land base (generally a desirable thing to do) and the districts create a plan and map that is reviewed by the BOF.
  - Each land exchange package includes an analysis based on components such as recreation opportunities, biological concerns, as well as financial benefits.

Adjourned