Elliott State Forest Research Advisory Committee  
Meeting Number Seven  
University Place Hotel and Conference Center  
310 SW Lincoln St, Portland, OR 97201  
September 25, 2019

Advisory Committee Website: https://www.oregon.gov/dsl/land/pages/elliott.aspx

Advisory Committee Members present: Steve Andringa, Paul Beck, Chris Boice, Eric Farm, Geoff Huntington, Mike Kennedy, Michael Langley, Mark Stern, Bob Salinger, Vicki Walker (by phone - just for start of meeting), and Bob Van Dyk

Department of State Lands and Oregon State University Staff: Meliah Masiba, Ken Armstrong, Ryan Singleton, Jennah Stillman, and Bill Ryan.

Oregon Consensus Facilitation Team: Peter Harkema and Amy Delahanty

Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circulate draft September 25 meeting summary to AC members for review and comment.</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU to schedule a conversation between Dr. Katy Kavanagh and interested AC members regarding the definition of extensive and intensive and their related prescriptions.</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First step.</strong> Circulate draft set of local economy, conservation and education guiding principles for AC member feedback</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second step.</strong> AC members to provide suggested edits to guiding principles doc</td>
<td>AC Members</td>
<td>10/10/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Welcome, Agenda Review and Process Overview
Facilitator Peter Harkema welcomed the group then invited members to do a round of introductions. Peter noted that Oregon Consensus (OC) did not receive any edits from Advisory Committee (AC) members on the draft August 22 meeting summary. There being no further proposed edits, the group formally approved the document.
Updates

**Department of State Lands**

Department of State Lands Director Vicki Walker briefly addressed State Treasurer Read and Secretary of State Clarno’s letters to AC members. Director Walker then shared the Land Board’s direction and charge to her and DSL staff that was approved by unanimous consent at its December 2018 Land Board meeting *(see partially-transcribed December 18 Land Board meeting for additional details)*. This direction was for Director Walker and staff at DSL to commence work with Oregon State University (OSU) and other agency partners on developing a plan to transform the Elliott into a research forest; include a timeline for submitting a Habitat Conservation Plan; and outline for engaging stakeholders on the range of public benefits including recreation, access, conservation, and working forest research. She noted it was her understanding the Land Board’s direction has not changed, nor do they wish to change the direction at this time.

Director Walker then briefly spoke to Treasurer Read’s letter. She shared the Treasurer highlighted his desire for the AC to address issues of governance, climate change, carbon, and tribal involvement throughout this process. Director Walker said the AC has addressed several of the Treasurer’s aforementioned issues, and will address the remaining ones throughout this process. Finally, Director Walker shared that OSU and DSL will be meeting with the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians on Tuesday, October 1. She shared there is an open invitation to other tribes and consultation will continue throughout the process.

**Public Meeting:**

DSL held a public meeting in Portland on Tuesday, September 24th. DSL provided a history of the forest and OSU shared information about the proposed research design. ICF and DSL were also in attendance to answer any questions related to the HCP. The meeting was well attended.

**OSU:**

Geoff Huntington (OSU) provided the following updates to the group:

- **Engagement.** OSU conducted two listening sessions in Reedsport on the topics of local economies and conservation. OSU has met with local economic interest as well as conservation groups, watershed councils and land trusts. The University will be meeting with Douglas and Coos Bay County Commissioners in October.

- **Consultation.** There is a scheduled consultation with CTCLUSI October 1.

- **Carbon.** Geoff shared the carbon work has been a large undertaking and hopes to have numbers in late October to share with the group.

- **HCP.** OSU has met with both NOAA and USFWS twice. They are on target to have something in writing to NMFS that reflects the research design and HCP conservation measures in November.
Following Geoff’s comments, there was a question related to what OSU is hearing from the federal agencies in their conversations about the HCP. Geoff shared they are interested in the notion of a research forest and that there is a sense that OSU is on the right path. Bill Ryan (DSL) stated the agencies haven’t highlighted any red flags to date, but would like additional detail before they commit or come to a predecisional agreement.

Recreation Guiding Principles
Geoff reminded the group that OSU had convened a Recreation and Public Access focus group to provide input on the preferred recreation aspects of a research charter for the Elliott. Geoff shared the focus group met in September and provided feedback to OSU. OSU then incorporated the focus group’s feedback and presented an updated version for AC member review and input at the meeting, which were the following:

- **Ensure Public Access Into the Future.** The forest will remain accessible to the public for a variety of uses from multiple established entry points, by both motorized and non-motorized transportation, but not all places at all times.

- **Optimize Recreational Access that is Compatible with Research and Ecological Integrity:** Public access will be managed to optimize public use of the forest for different recreational opportunities consistent with forest management activities that support ongoing research, harvest, and conservation of at-risk and historically present species.

  *Suggested Change:*
  - Strike “optimize” from the title and description.

- **Support and Promote Diverse Recreational Experiences:** The Elliott Research Forest will seek to accommodate multiple and diverse recreational uses to provide a range of user experiences within the context of a working forest landscape. Recreational planning will not favor any one recreational type over another, but will seek to insure high quality experiences on the forest by managing to minimize the potential for conflict between users and research objectives.

- **Partner with Stakeholders and Manage Locally:** Elliott State Research Forest recreation programs should be managed by local staff who live in the community and work with stakeholders to enhance and protect the identified values of Elliott recreationists.

*Comments and Questions:*
- What does manage locally mean?
- Hope that the governance structure for the Elliott would include setting expectations around stakeholder engagement and conflicting recreation user groups.

- **Conduct Research on Sustainable Recreation Practices.** An Elliott State Research Forest should pursue relevant research on recreation, with the goal to advance scientific
knowledge and inform the general public on the opportunities and impacts of balancing multiple interests within forested landscapes.

- **Cultivate Multi-Generational Respect for the Forest.** Utilizing a collaborative approach to partner with schools, organizations and volunteer groups recreation planning and management will seek to create more opportunities for engagement and a more widely informed forest-user community that is vested in the future of the Elliott State Research Forest.

**General Comments and Questions:**

- Suggestion to include wildlife viewing somewhere in the principles.
- Are you anticipating motorized recreation activity on the trails?
- Does a research forest give the opportunity to limit certain types of recreation opportunities? There is a spectrum of impacts on ecological and management values. Likely a management plan would address this and help manage expectations.
- The Elliott is a regional asset that is tied to recreation and tourism on the coast. I see this as an opportunity to connect with the Chamber of Commerce to promote economic opportunity.
- Consider additional agency connections e.g. Oregon Parks and Recreation Department.
- Are recreation and education activities part of the HCP? Depending on how much recreation you have on the forest, there could be impacts to species.

**Education Guiding Principles**

Geoff then reviewed the draft educational partnership foundational principles with the group. The principles, as gleaned from a meeting with education advocates, were as follows:

- **Seek and Incorporate New Educational Partnerships.** An Elliott State Research Forest will offer opportunities to leverage and integrate existing local educational programs and institutions that support and generate forest-based research and knowledge.

- **Expand Accessibility to Forestry Education.** An Elliott State Research Forest will provide and promote a diversity of values, and in doing so will leverage efforts by OSU’s College of Forestry to engage students with diverse social, economic, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds in forestry education programs.

- **Serve Students at All Levels of Education Through Programs on the Forest.** OSU should endeavor to foster and establish a programmatic link with K-12, community colleges, and educational programs at other Universities so that the forest becomes a resource for students at all educational levels.

- **Integrate and Demonstrate Elements of Traditional Knowledge in Educational Programs on the Forest.** Through active partnerships with local Tribal Governments, the Elliott State Research Forest will seek to provide demonstration areas that use traditional forest management practices and focus on Traditional Ecological Knowledge outcomes for use in educational programs.

- **Foster Public Awareness and Understanding of Sustainable Forest Management.** All management and research actions should endeavor to promote broader understanding and
awareness of the role of healthy working forest landscapes to local economies, resilient ecosystems, innovative competitive products, and healthy communities.

General Comments and Questions:
- Suggestion to include opportunities for building partnerships and cross-collaboration research in different departments within the OSU.
- Include both traditional knowledge, as well as ways to incorporate Bob Zybach’s work.
- Somehow “working forests” feel a little OFRI-like. Suggestion to include something more than what working forests do within a landscape e.g. language that captures climate change, ecological values, etc.

ACTION ITEM: OSU will circulate a draft set of local economy guiding principles following the meeting.

Carbon Analysis Presentation
Tom Tuchmann, US Forest Capital
Tom Tuchmann provided an overview of the draft carbon feasibility report that was distributed as a pre-read to AC members. Presentation topics also included a brief review of the carbon sequestration market and considerations for exploring a carbon strategy on the Elliott State Forest; OSU’s eligibility for a carbon project; implementation plan overview; estimated carbon stocks associated with OSU research scenarios; and financial values of carbon credits.

Tom highlighted key takeaways of the preliminary report, which were:
- OSU is eligible for registration;
- Governance and decision making structure are likely to have an impact whether the “private” or “public” protocol is used;
- The structure and timing of potential conservation easements can have significant impact on the baseline calculation;
- The structure of an HCP will have an impact on the carbon project baseline calculation;
- Forest management eligibility requirements may limit research flexibility or be inconsistent with research design.

Following Tom’s presentation, several questions and comments by AC members were related to the relationship of a carbon project to the HCP; conservation easements; cost of a carbon project; and sequencing; and SFI/SFC certification requirements. It was noted that a small group may wish to get together to dig more deeply into the particulars of the carbon, easement, and HCP considerations. Any insights or suggestions gleaned from such a meeting would be brought back to the full group for consideration.

Modeling Scenarios:
Geoff Huntington and Tom Tuchmann shared an update on OSU’s financial modeling efforts with Committee members. Geoff stated in August OSU committed to providing members with an
update on the progress of their efforts to model harvest revenue from different management scenarios on an Elliott State Research Forest. The spreadsheet *(distributed as a pre-read to AC members)* was a “back-of-house” framework that will go into the model runs. Geoff shared for the first run, Forest Capital currently anticipates running up to four modeling scenarios (Scenarios A, B, C and D). Geoff emphasized the different prescriptions are placeholders / starting points and are not reflective of a management plan the University is pursuing. Following Geoff and Tom’s review of the spreadsheet, the AC provided several comments and questions related to the approach to modeling steep slopes; quantity of stands included in the model; the definition of extensive and intensive and related prescriptions; and the value of modeling hypothetical scenarios.

**ACTION ITEM:** OSU to schedule a conversation between Dr. Katie Kavanaugh and interested AC members regarding the definition of extensive and intensive and their related prescriptions.

**Governance Discussion**

Geoff provided an overview of OSU’s preliminary thinking regarding governance and shared three governance options for AC member feedback and input. Geoff shared one goal for OSU would be to have a framework that provides certainty, but that doesn’t undermine or impact longevity. Following this, Geoff solicited feedback from AC members on the three scenarios members’ values and suggestions regarding effective collaborative governance components they would like to see reflected in an Elliott State Research Forest governance structure.

**Key themes and questions that emerged from the discussion:**

- Transparency *(e.g. ability to submit public records requests, who sits on the Board, how to contact the Board)*
- Accountability
- Involvement from diverse stakeholders *(similar to the Committee)*
- A structure that can’t succumb to political pressures.
- Who will the employees be employed by?
- Important to have tribal representation on the Board
- The scenarios seem to be structured around whether there will be a carbon deal. Would prefer the structure be created and have carbon be part of the suite of considerations rather than the primary consideration.

Following Geoff’s presentation, there was a brief discussion about next steps. Advisory Committee members generally agreed that any governance proposal will first need to work for OSU. As such, it was suggested that OSU draft a preferred governance option for the AC to react to and provide any additional feedback.

**ACTION ITEM:** OSU to create a draft governance proposal for AC member feedback and input.

**Next Steps**

Peter thanked the group for their work and reviewed the meeting’s action items. The next meeting will be held **October 24th and 25th in Coos Bay.**
AGENDA ITEM 7
(Partial transcript of proceedings beginnings at the conclusion of public testimony)

At the conclusion of Treas. Read’s motion to approve the declaration, the Land Board commenced discussion on the topic of how to proceed with the Elliott State Forest (2:19:28)

TREAS. READ: Are we on to general discussion then?

GOV. BROWN: Yes, general discussion.

TREAS. READ: Thank you. I’d like to – this will take a few minutes because I’ve been thinking a lot about this as I’m sure you and the Secretary have, so let me run through some thoughts.

First, I’m really grateful for all the presentations that we heard today. I think the Oregon Consensus Report, and the expressions of interest and the testimony that we heard gave us a lot of good ideas, a lot of useful information about how we can achieve decoupling.

But as I was thinking about it today and preparing for it, I was worried about two potential consequences of what we’ve been up to lately. First, I was worried that to many observers this conversation might feel like we were going back to square one, returning in some ways to the conversations that the Land Board has been having for years, if not decades. Any my staff and I have been asked on a number of occasions in the last little while, “Didn’t we do this already?”

I’m also aware, aside from that confusion, that there are a lot of parents and organizations who are representing education stakeholders who are anxious about the Land Board’s ability to successfully decouple the Elliott from the Common School Fund. They’re, I think, looking for momentum, a sense of progress from us. And I think it’s fair to say that their patience is probably not infinite.

There are obviously, also, a lot of people who are anxious about how the forest will be managed after decoupling, and how the state will protect the conservation elements of the Elliott and ensure that the public will continue to be able to access the forest for recreational purposes.

All of this is to underscore my strong feeling that I think is consistent with what you said, Governor, that we need to continue narrowing the options that are in front of us, particularly, in my view, to those options that meet our core assumptions of public ownership and access, full decoupling, strong conservation features, and of course meeting our obligations to the Common School Fund.

In short, I think we need to keep moving forward.

The second thing I was worried about was that we were somehow creating the impression that we were approaching the future of the Elliott as some sort of auction, as if we were simply asking “Who has $120 million, I guess with some conservation elements with which they could buy the Elliott?” I’m worried that we’re creating the impression that the only thing we are concerned about is the dollars.
From my perspective, this is not an auction. Of course, we have to meet our obligations to the Common School Fund. But, as much as it might feel like we are selling the Elliott, I think the reality is that what we’re talking about is a whole lot bigger than that. I think we’re talking about the future of the Elliott as a whole, and how it fits into a much broader set of public interests.

As we settle those questions, those fundamental almost existential questions, then we can start to answer the practical questions that follow: What would it take to transform the Elliott from a Common School asset into a different type of forest, with a different mandate and a potentially different ownership structure? It seems to me that what we really need is a conversation like those that stem from a trust land transfer process. That’s one of the reasons I’m really glad that the legislature and the governor were able to refine and enact the concept that I introduced as a legislator because that puts that process into place, and I think it’s going to be very helpful to us as we proceed.

Now, I want to be clear about something else: I am really excited about the vision that Dean Davis and OSU articulated today. It seems to me that that vision is entirely consistent with what the Land Board has already articulated as a direction.

OSU, it seems to me, sees value in a contiguous 80,000-plus-acre research forest that provides for public access and recreation. They see a strong conservation component on that landscape. And what I think distinguishes it from a lot of positive aspects of the other things we heard, they see a strong research component that will inform not only the future of timber management, but of climate change, adaptation and response, significant potential for tribal partnerships, and of course support for rural communities.

Madam Chair and Mr. Secretary, I think this is a really big opportunity for us as a state to answer some really big questions that will define who we are in the decades to come, and I’m ready to endorse that vision of a research forest on the Elliott.

From where I sit, I see that potential in the research, and I’d like the staff at DSL to begin working with OSU to sketch out a work plan that would inform the questions that need to be answered. It seems to me that embracing the vision of a research forest with OSU leading that conversation would also allow DSL to move forward with its HCP contractor and federal agencies. And we’ve already heard very articulately how important that’s going to be to the Elliott’s future.

I would ask, Madam Chair, that the work plan include a process for stakeholder engagement – we’ve talked about that already – including the involvement of local and tribal governments. I think it needs to begin answering the questions about the governance structures, how to engage the legislature and other potential funders on how a financing package might come together, maybe using the trust land transfer process that’s recently been enacted. I think it should include support for OSU to help DSL put together the habitat conservation plan and to help build public support for a research forest.

I know there’s a lot of work still ahead of us when it comes to the Elliott, but I’m really excited about this direction, this momentum, and hoping that a year from now we’re going to be sitting here looking at a fully developed plan that will position us with the Elliott Research Forest as a national and global leader as the president said well.

So, I have a motion. I’m happy to pause or make that motion as your preference.
GOV. BROWN: Why don’t you hang onto your motion --

TREAS. READ: Okay.

GOV. BROWN: -- and we’ll see if Secretary Richardson has any comments or questions.

SEC. RICHARDSON: Well, I’d like to see a partnership of OSU, the counties and the tribes without further general fund bonding. In my opinion, this would be best for the schools, for the economy and for the taxpayers. Those are my comments.

GOV. BROWN: Thank you, Secretary Richardson.

I very much appreciate the time and energy that a number of parties have put into these proposals. I think for me I’m very interested and intrigued by the vision laid out by OSU and the forestry center there. I do think it’s an opportunity – and I heard from a number of folks that they want to keep the forest for the children. And I do think we can move forward on this path and keep the forest for the benefit of Oregon school children, probably in a different way, maybe less of a financial resource and more of an educational resource for the next seven generations.

I also – I probably differ a little bit from Secretary Richardson. I think the counties certainly should be involved in, and certainly be a part of the engagement process. I don’t see the tribes as stakeholders but as sovereign nations, and believe that not only should Coos and Cow Creek, but Coquille be part of this conversation moving forward. I suspect that Grand Ronde and Siletz will also want to participate in the conversation as well, and that seems appropriate to me.

But I do think we have an Incredible opportunity to set a path for the future that recognizes the challenges we are facing due to climate change on our forests. I think, Anthony, you articulated really well that this will be a unique opportunity for Oregon to lead, not only the nation, but perhaps the entire world in terms of research on this particular forest.

I think given what’s happening with climate change, and with how we have managed our lands – and I’ll pick on the federal agencies since they’re not here, I don’t think – but clearly --

DIR. WALKER: They’re here.

GOV. BROWN: Oh, they are? Okay. We’ve got a few folks here. So, I’ll just talk about federal management of public lands generally, that certainly we are at the perfect storm in terms of federal management of public lands and what’s happening with climate change. And I do think we have an opportunity to provide – to create a new path forward, and I think OSU really has the ability to deliver on that vision, as well as ensuring that our children have an opportunity to learn from and engage in that. My recollection is that the Oregon Outdoor School program is housed at OSU as well, and so this might provide a different type of perfect storm in terms of educational opportunities for our students.

So, I want to continue to support where we’re going and narrowing the focus and I look forward to hearing your motion, Treasurer Read.

TREAS. READ: (2:29:45) Thank you, Madam Chair. I think it’s very consistent with what we both just said.
I move that we direct Director Walker and staff at DSL to commence work with Oregon State University, and other agency partners on developing a plan to transform the Elliott into a research forest, to include a timeline for submitting a habitat conservation plan and an outline for engaging stakeholders on the range of public benefits including recreation access, conservation, and working forest research.

GOV. BROWN: Thank you. Secretary Richardson, comments?

SEC. RICHARDSON: I second the motion.

GOV. BROWN: Great. We have a motion that is seconded, and hearing and seeing no objection that motion is approved. Thank you. (2:30:30)

AGENDA ITEM 7 CONCLUDED.