

MEETING SUMMARY

WESTERN OREGON STATE FORESTS HCP SCOPING TEAM

Tuesday, June 4, 2019, 10:00 am – 1:00 pm

Oregon Department of Forestry, 2600 State St, Salem, OR

ATTENDEES

Participants: Julie Firman (ODFW), Jim Muck (NOAA Fisheries), Ken Phippen (NOAA Fisheries), Nick Palazzotto (ODF), Mark Meleason (ODF), Rich Szlemp (USFWS) – *on phone*, Brian Pew (ODF), Rod Krahmer (ODF), Ryan Singleton (DSL)

Technical Consultant: Troy Rahmig (ICF), Melissa Klungle (ICF) – *on phone*

Facilitation Team: Cindy Kolomechuk (ODF), Debra Nudelman (Kearns & West), Sylvia Ciborowski (Kearns & West) – *on phone*

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Deb Nudelman (Kearns & West) welcomed members. Meeting participants introduced themselves.

Deb reviewed the agenda, which includes: 1) Agency updates from Scoping Team (ST) members, 2) Update on stakeholder engagement, 3) Report out on May 29, 2019 Joint Steering Committee and Scoping Team Meeting, 4) Present and Review Chapter 1 of the HCP, 5) Review ODFW Stream Assessment, and 6) Biological Goals and Objectives Workshops.

Members approved the May 7, 2019 Scoping Team Meeting Summary.

Deb reminded members on expectations around alternates. If members cannot attend Scoping Team meetings, they should let the Project Team know in advance if they are sending an alternate, and make sure to bring that alternate up to speed to promote informed discussion. Members are also encouraged to share documents with one another; and when doing so, they should send documents to the entire group or to Kearns & West for distribution.

Troy reviewed the process for reviewing documents on SharePoint. He encouraged members to provide comments on how to best communicate information in draft HCP chapters. There are also opportunities to set up conference calls to review documents as a group in-between scheduled Scoping Team meetings.

AGENCY UPDATES

Members had updates relevant to the Western Oregon State Forests HCP process:

ODF: Provided an update regarding Gordy Reeves' development of a brief description of deliverable, cost, and expected timeline for delivering an assessment of riparian and aquatic features on state forestlands sensitive to climate change.

WESTERN OREGON HCP STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT UPDATE

The next meeting open to the public is scheduled for June 12 from 1:00 to 4:00 pm at Broadway Commons in Salem. A livestream option is also available. The meeting will provide updates on HCP technical topics, review of the HCP Mission, Vision and Goals, and review of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan. The meeting will be followed by an informal meet-and-greet from 3:00 to 4:00 pm.

Members and the facilitation team reviewed the expectations around Scoping Team member engagement during public meetings.

ST members were asked to indicate whether they plan to attend the meeting.

Members discussed the level of participation by stakeholders at the meetings open to the public. The project team noted that the desire to have a high level of attendance at the meetings, and it is likely that attendance will increase when the topics of the meetings more closely match their interests.

Members asked questions around the level of interest by the media in the process.

Cindy Kolomechuk (ODF) added that the intent is to engage stakeholders more deeply after each meeting open to the public. That stakeholder engagement will depend on the level of interest and the topics that stakeholders are interested in providing feedback on. The Project Team will communicate stakeholder feedback to the Scoping Team for their consideration.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT OUT

Deb provided an overview of the May 29, 2019 Joint SC-ST meeting. The meeting provided an opportunity for legal counsel for the agencies to be brought up to speed on the HCP process and have discussion around legal context of the HCP.

Members reiterated the importance of appropriately documenting decisions made along the way to keep the HCP process moving forward productively.

Members encouraged legal counsel attendance at those meetings that include topics that would benefit from legal counsel discussion.

Cindy provided an update on an HCP training that will be offered in the coming months to ST members, SC members, agency support staff, and legal counsel.

Deb announced that the next joint SC-ST meeting will be held on October 24, 1:00 – 4:00 p.m. at ICF in Portland, OR.

Members discussed practices to continue to promote effective communication and trust-building among HCP process members.

REVIEW OF WESTERN OREGON STATE FORESTS HCP CHAPTER 1

Troy Rahmig (ICF) walked through the first draft of Chapter 1. He noted that ICF developed the chapter based on discussions with ODF and the Scoping Team. ODF has taken a first review of the chapter, and the Scoping Team is now seeing that reviewed version.

Troy noted that the intent of the chapter is to provide a brief overview of concepts that are later described in more detail in later chapter. The chapter also includes relevant history and context, and scope of the HCP.

Troy provided an overview of the chapter contents, which includes:

- Mission, Vision, and HCP Program Goals
- State Forest Management and Programs
- Plan Area, Permit Area, and Permit Term
- High level overview of covered activities
- High level overview of covered species and species selection criteria
- Regulatory setting, including summary of relevant state and federal laws
- Overview of the HCP process including roles of ST, SC, and stakeholder engagement

Troy requested comments and input on the chapter, particularly to indicate whether concepts are clearly and sufficiently described, there is enough level of detail, and that the chapter overall makes sense.

Troy reviewed the process for developing the chapter and asked ST members to provide their comments and feedback by Friday, June 28. ICF will update the document based on ST feedback. Members will get a chance to look at the updated Chapter 1 at a future Scoping Team meeting (likely in August). The ST will again get a chance to review the draft in context of all HCP chapters later in the process.

Members should let Troy know if they cannot provide edits by the June 28 deadline. If ST members do not have comments or input, they should let Troy know that they have no comments.

Discussion

Deb asked members for their reflections on Chapter 1 and the review process. Members discussed and made the following comments:

- Members discussed the opportunities to provide comments later in the process. The assumption is that members should review the draft and provide comments as early in the process as possible so that the team can work through any issues. At the same time,

there is an understanding that some comments will come in later in the process, for example if other agencies are reviewing the HCP as a whole rather than being engaged in chapter-by-chapter review, or if there is new data to consider..

- Members discussed logistics for how to provide comments within the working draft. The preference is to include comments and proposed edits in comment bubbles on one joint document within SharePoint.
- Suggestion to include watershed restoration within the list of covered activities.
- Cindy provided an update on OSU participation on the Scoping Team and role in chapter review. OSU will not participate at Scoping Team meetings, but ODF will work with an OSU reviewer to receive input on chapters between meetings. The role of OSU is to provide their thoughts and ideas, but they are not conducting a science review. ST members noted that the expectation is that the ST will take OSU comments into consideration.
- Suggestion that someone from ODF's HCP Project Team be more engaged in the Elliott process to reduce inefficiencies and serve as a liaison.

REVIEW ODFW STREAM ASSESSMENT

Troy and Mark Meleason (ODF) reviewed ODFW Stream Assessment results and explained how the data will be used. The stream assessment provides additional data to consider when developing the biological goals and objectives. The key points of the presentation included:

- ODFW initiated an aquatic inventories program in 1998 to understand trends in habitat function of Oregon Coast coho. ICF and ODF worked to pull information from the inventory that is relevant to Oregon State Forests.
- The two main questions asked in the review were: 1) how do habitat trends on State Forests compare to other ownerships, and 2) how do habitat trends in the northern-most state forest districts compare to other ownerships?
- Land ownership was mapped according to ownership type (agriculture, federal forest, private forest, and state forest). Coho salmon populations are layered on the map.
- The assessment analyzed trends for select stream habitat variables. Additional habitat variables are also available (including substrate, channel morphology and pool habitat, wood, and riparian factors).
- Presented various ways that the data can be represented. A box plot was developed showing winter parr capacity in the various forest districts.
- Presented examples of a series of trends analyses that were developed. Additional representations of the data are included in the report.

- The analysis compared habitat trends across ownerships in state forests. The report goes into further detail on changes of various habitat factors across federal and state lands. Troy reviewed high level results on how things have changed over the past twenty years. The report provides additional detail.
- Key takeaways are that the ODFW stream habitat data is the best available data, despite some limitations. The assessment found some differences between the entire coast as compared to the northwest forest districts. State forest lands are trending in a similar fashion to other lands on most metrics. Similarly, comparison between trends on all lands and Tillamook, Forest Grove, and Astoria are similar for most metrics.
- Other analyses are possible with other stream habitat variables.

Troy noted that the stream assessment information should be viewed as background information for consideration in development of the biological goals and objectives.

Discussion

Deb asked members for their comments on the Plan Area and Permit Area. Members discussed and made the following comments:

- Questions around why the habitat trends were compared to other ownerships, rather than compared to benchmarks of what is desired for the species. Troy and ODF staff noted that data sets were compared to one another for purposes of the assessment; the benchmarks can be considered in development of biological goals and objectives.
- Discussed the selection of certain stream habitat variables as a basis for the assessment.
- Comments on how to use and interpret the stream habitat assessment data.
- Over the course of the HCP permit term, there are opportunities to use monitoring and adaptive management strategies to improve stream habitat.
- Discussed various factors that impact wood as a variable to improve stream habitat.
- Questions on how biological goals and objectives would be developed for species, and whether the metrics will be same across species.

BIOLOGICAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES WORKSHOPS

Troy provided an overview of the purpose of biological goals and objectives in the HCP context. The key points of the presentation included:

- Chapter 9 of the HCP Handbook is a good overview of biological goals and objectives, and members are encouraged to review that chapter.
- Review of key terminology:

- The *conservation strategy* is the collection of all biological goals, objectives, conservation actions/measures, and monitoring.
- *Biological goals* broadly describe the desired future conditions. They should specifically articulate the envisioned future. There may be goals for each species in some cases, and in other cases, goals can be habitat based and apply across species. It is difficult to set goals for populations that have limited data; in those cases, habitat-based goals that apply to a broad range of species may be more appropriate.
- *Biological objectives* are measurable targets that support the goals and measure the effectiveness by which the HCP will be judged. They represent the incremental steps that will be taken over time to achieve the goals. The number of objectives per goal varies. Objectives should be SMART: specific, measurable, achievable, result-oriented, and time-fixed. They can be set at the landscape, community or species level. The intent is to make the objectives achievable by the end of the permit term. The monitoring program will be directly linked to the objective, so the specific words of the objective matter. The objective should include those matters over which we have control.
- *Conservation measures* describe the specific actions that the permitted will implement to achieve the objectives. Multiple conservation measures can be associated with each objective; and some measures will cross objectives. Conservation measures are also often referred to as conservation actions or conservation strategies. The conservation measures include the full suite of mitigation, restoration, enhancement, preservation, and other actions.
- Provided example goals and objectives language from Chapter 9 of the HCP Handbook, as well as provided examples for how goals, objectives, and conservation actions could be written for covered species under the Western Oregon State Forests HCP.
- Reviewed the purpose of the goals and objectives workshops. The workshops are focused on developing goals and objectives, but it is likely that some discussion of conservation measures will also take place.
- Reviewed the format and objectives of the biological goals and objectives workshops. The workshops are working style meetings. ICF and ODF will develop discussion draft goals, objectives, and actions for each species, and work through each for “live editing” with the ST at the workshops. Ideas for actions and monitoring mechanisms will also come up during the meeting, and these will be logged in a parking lot for future discussion. Following the workshops, ICF and ODF will provide a revised version of goals and objectives for ST review. The biological goals and objectives will be reviewed again as part of Chapter 4: Conservation Strategy.

- If members have documents, data, or background science they would like to reference during the workshops, they should provide those suggestions to Troy in advance of July 12.

Discussion

Key comments, questions, and discussion topics included:

- Members appreciated the aim of developing SMART objectives, but also noted the difficulty in setting specific objectives in cases where the natural environment can be unpredictable.
- Members discussed preferred terminology for *conservation measures*. Several preferred using the term *conservation actions* or *measures*, and to avoid *conservation strategies* as this could be confused with the overall *conservation strategy*.
- Members had clarifying questions on how the goals, objectives and actions will be organizationally represented in the HCP.

CONFIRM TOPICS FOR SC UPDATE

The project team will relay discussion from today's ST meeting to the SC.

NEXT STEPS AND SUMMARY

Cindy thanked members for their time and participation.

The July 2, 2019 ST meeting is cancelled. The next ST meeting is scheduled for August 6, 2019 from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. in Salem

Deb reviewed the dates for the biological goals and objectives workshop and members confirmed their attendance. The workshops will be held:

- July 12 – 9:00 am – 4:00 pm (*Salem*) – Workshop to develop goals and objectives for all species
- July 16 – 9:00 am – 4:00 pm (*Portland*) – Workshop to follow-up on goals and objectives for wildlife species.
- July 23 – 9:00 am – 4:00 pm (*Salem*) – Workshop to follow-up on goals and objectives for fish species

Members should bring their lunches to the biological goals and objectives workshops.

ACTION ITEMS

The following action items were identified throughout the meeting:

- Jim Muck – Follow up on who to include when getting in touch with legal counsel.
- ST members – Provide any edits or comments to Chapter 1 of the HCP by **Friday, June 28**. If a ST member does not have comments or input, let Troy know that they have no comments.
- ICF – Update Chapter 1 of the HCP with ST comments and feedback.
- ST members – Provide suggestions of documents, data, or background science to reference during the biological goals and objectives workshops to Troy before July 12.
- Rich Szlemp – Reserve a meeting space at the USFWS office for the July 16 goals and objectives workshop.

RECORD OF AGREEMENTS AND GUIDANCE

Updated 5/14/2019

This record tracks agreements, guidance, advice, and levels of support of key milestones and elements of the Western Oregon HCP. It includes major outcomes and guidance provided by the HCP Steering Committee, HCP Scoping Team, and Board of Forestry.

Date	Group/ Body	Action	Relevant Milestone/ HCP Chapter
November 8, 2018	Board of Forestry	Unanimously voted to move forward with Western Oregon HCP Phase 2: Strategy Development and Stakeholder Engagement	Phase 1 Completion
February 7, 2019	Steering Committee	Expressed support for the Western Oregon HCP Phase 2 Scope of Work and Work Plan	Phase 2 Beginning
February 13, 2019	Scoping Team	Provided support for the proposed covered species list	Covered Species List (Chapter 1)
February 13, 2019	Scoping Team	Agreed that the current data on the covered species is sufficient to move forward with developing an HCP, and there is not a need to collect additional data at this time. Expressed support for ICF's approach to identifying best available data for each species.	Approach to Gathering Best Available Data
April 2, 2019	Scoping Team	Provided support for the covered species list presented by ICF, including an agreement to drop Lower Columbia steelhead. They also recommend not including Southern DPS red tree vole but revisiting that species when more information is available in fall 2019.	Covered Species List (Chapter 1)
April 22, 2019	ODF and DSL	Decided to include Common School Forest (CSF) lands in the Western Oregon HCP Permit Area.	Plan Area and Permit Area (Chapter 1)
May 2, 2019	Steering Committee	Adopted Western Oregon HCP Operating Principles by consensus.	Process
May 2, 2019	Steering Committee	Adopted the Western Oregon HCP Mission, Vision, and Goals by consensus	Mission, Vision and Goals (Chapter 1)
May 2, 2019	Steering Committee	Expressed alignment with Plan Area and Permit Area (with direction to ST to review inclusion of Santiam Forest area)	Plan Area and Permit Area (Chapter 1)
May 2, 2019	Steering Committee	Provided consensus support for the proposed covered species list	Covered Species List (Chapter 1)