****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 convened on January 22, 2019 in the Santiam Room of the ODF Operations Building, 2600 State Street, Salem, Oregon

**DRAFT**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***CFF Committee members participating:*** | ***ODF Staff:*** |
| Kyle Abraham, Deputy Chief ODF Private Forests Division, Committee SecretaryEvan Barnes, Committee Chair, SW Landowner Rep. (Voting) John Peel, EO Landowner Rep. (Voting)Gilbert Shibley, Landowner-At-Large (Voting)Bonnie Shumaker, Landowner, NW Landowner Rep. (Voting)S. Mark Vroman, Industry Rep. (Voting) Hampton Family ForestsKaola Swanson, Environmental Rep. Ex-Officio (Pacific Forest Trust) Rex Storm, AOL/OTFS Ex-Officio Forest OperatorsJulie Woodward, OFRI Ex-OfficioJim James, OSWA, Executive Director Ex-OfficioGlenn Ahrens, OSU College of Forestry Extension Ex-Officio | Susan Dominique, Committee Administrative SupportDanny Norlander, Forest Health Survey & Monitoring Specialist/Food Plot Rule Process Coordinator & PF Bills Manager!Thomas Whittington, Water Quality SpecialistJim Gersbach, Public AffairsMarganne Allen, Forest Health & Monitoring ManagerTerry Frueh, Monitoring CoordinatorGreg Wagenblast, Policy and Civil Penalties CoordinatorNate Agalzoff, Incentives Coordinator |
| ***Members not attending:*** | ***Guests:*** |
| Linda Lind, USFS State & Private Forestry Ex-Officio  | Kirk V. Cook, Dept. of AgricultureKevin Masterson, Dept. of Environmental QualityMcKenzie Bowerman, Family Forester in Lane CtyMeriel Darzen, Representing 1000 Friends of Oregon |

**Call to Order 9:10 am**

1. **Welcome and Review of Agenda – Evan Barnes, Chair**

Evan Barnes, Chair called the meeting to order and welcomed guests.

1. **Introductions/Roll Call**

(See participant list above) Roundtable introductions were made.

1. **Approval of the November 2018 Minutes**

Barnes asked if members had an opportunity to review the minutes from the November 2018 Meeting and then called for a Motion to Approve the Minutes. John Peel made a Motion to Approve and Bonnie Shumaker seconded the Motion. Barnes opened the vote and all were in favor of approving the Minutes from November as presented.

1. **Public Comment**

Barnes invited Public Comment for the record but commented that the members are flexible to receiving comments more directly tied to the agenda topics. Two members of the public were in attendance and introduced themselves.

“*McKenzie Bowerman, I’m a family forester out of Lane and Douglas Counties and I am a sixth generation Oregonian. My family has been on the farm since 1948 and hope to manage it for several generations to come. I didn’t know until a few days ago that the Board of Forestry cared about family foresters so, I am encouraged to see a body like this. Thank you*.”

“*I am Meriel Darzen, I work for 1000 Friends of Oregon. And I will be giving a presentation shortly about fire*.”

1. **Private Forests Division Update - Kyle Abraham**

Kyle Abraham, Deputy Chief of the Private Forests Division provided the following Division update:

The Governor’s Recommended Budget was released early in December and the Legislative Session began in January. The ODF Budget will be talked about with some interest downtown throughout this session. The Governor’s Recommended Budget for ODF was $388.7 million total funds, which is a 22% reduction from 2017-19. In the end, what the Governor’s Budget is recommending for about a 5 % reduction for ODF. Some of that will come from closing of 9 vacant positions; and a slight reduction in funding for Services & Supplies. So overall we are looking at staying at our current service level in the 2019-21. He reminded members of the discussions and presentations on the Agency Strategic Initiative which talked about $26 million dollar General Fund request, with about 50 FTE for the Agency to help support Large Fire prevention and mitigation activities. The Initiative ask was not included in the Governor’s Budget. Instead, addressing the intent, the Governor included funding for the convening of a “blue ribbon panel” to discuss further what the impacts are to ODF and potentially other agencies as well especially ODOT and the State Fire Marshall’s Office and State Police. The Initiative effort specifically came up with a package that talked about fire impacts to meeting our core business and what we needed as a sustainable organization moving forward. He reported that the timeframe is pretty short for the panel to complete their work and provide a report with recommended changes work that will be occurring during the 2019 Fire Season where we obviously have some significant constraints but nevertheless, it’s important for us to get that completed. I have not heard specifically who is on the Governor’s panel or whether it had been convened yet. The Governor provided $400,000 to support that effort in the budget but any recommendations that come from the panel wouldn’t be funded until 2019-2020 or 2021-2023 Sessions. That the panel is charged with taking a broader comprehensive look at wildfire’s impact around the entire State and all of its agencies and programs to see what that number is going to look like across the broadest range. He assumed that the Initiative work that ODF did and the Secretary of State’s Agency Audit should well represent us to the panel.

Ahrens noted that OSU Forestry Extension had a Policy Option Package sent to the Governor as well. He assumes didn’t get in the budget either. A pretty big proposal for the College of Forestry/Extension Forestry to work on landscape scale assessments, planning and partnerships addressing landscape scale forest management and fire preparedness and all partnering with everyone else on that landscape by landscape where it makes sense. The College of Forestry’s ($30 million dollar proposed) fire program package was buried in the statewide request for several other things at the same time. But for Extension this is number one on their list ~~is~~ to do. The ask is expanding on what Daniel Leavell, Extension Forester is doing for southwest Oregon and beefs up Extension’s capacity to pull together partnerships and providing the GIS tools needed for the ground work. He offered to bring the information to the next meeting.

James thought the members might be interested in hearing about that program package and possibly may be in a position to recommend that the Board support Extension’s package which could be politically helpful in the Legislature. Jim reported that OSWA is supporting that initiative. [Abraham noted that as a potential agenda item.]

James added that ultimately the Governor’s Budget was only that and the Legislature ultimately makes the decision on what’s going to be supported. Abraham shared that ODF has to stay neutral with the Governor’s Budget, supporting it as proposed. The Committee can go and testify in front of the Legislature for or against whatever they feel is important to have those legislators hear and support ODF’s budget ask or the OSU/Extension Policy Option Package. Staff’s responsibility is to support the GRB and can provide members with information on what was proposed but it is the Committee’s purview to provide testimony and input to their legislators. Abraham added that the Committee’s responsibility to the Agency and the Board is to keep him apprised of their intentions. Abraham shared that the Session is scheduled to be over by July 1st and the ODF Budget Hearings are usually in late May. Swanson noted that a lot of the analysis done by OSU would really also support some of the positions that were in the ODF Budget Initiative so if members could get a briefing on each they can strategize about merging support efforts. Shibley offered himself and Bonnie Shumaker as eager to share what they have learned about the role of Extension with small family forestland operations.

Abraham continued the update on a couple more things with the Governor’s Recommended Budget. Two changes that he thought pretty significant for this Committee are proposed changes in the fire protection funding scheme. The first $20 million dollars of the Forestland Protection Fund is basically 50/50 between landowners and General Funds. The Governor’s Recommended Budget had changes to that that would make that first 50 million dollars split 50/50 between landowners and General Fund. So ~~a~~ from a $10 million dollar liability to a $25 million dollar liability. The landowner share would come through Forest Patrol Assessments and the Oregon Forestland Protection Fund. James added that currently money for the Emergency Fire Fund is funded by property taxes, which is the main way that family woodland owners participate, as well as some Harvest taxes. So this change should be of concern for family woodland owners. There’s a reason why the split has been what it is. And it’s because of all the human-caused fires. So basically, OSWA’s position on this is the Governor is suggesting that the forest landowners now pay for problems caused by the general public and we are frankly opposed to that happening.

Abraham reported the other proposed change is to the Harvest Tax and General Fund split that we have in Private Forests funding which has been 40% Harvest Tax, 60% General Fund. The Governor’s Recommended Budget has that at 50/50. So 50% Harvest Tax, 50% General Fund. Again he emphasized that the Agency and staff support the Governor’s Budget. But those are two pretty significant changes to the way that we’ve done that. Swanson asked if there was impact analysis done on shifting from 40% Harvest Tax to 50% Harvest Tax and observed the potential uncertainty that creates in a budget.

Abraham announced that Lena Tucker, Private Forests Division Chief has been selected to be the Deputy Director of Operations. She will continue in the Chief role till July 1st and then she will assume the position of Deputy Director of Operations (which is currently filled by Travis Medema on an interim basis through the Legislative Session). He reported that the intent was for an open recruitment for the Chief role to go out soon before some changes in our State hiring process are in place.

In closing the update, Abraham announced that at the January Board of Forestry Meeting, Kaola was confirmed to be the Conservation member on the Committee. So there is only one representative spot left to fill was the ‘At Large’ position. Barnes offered that could be someone from anywhere in the State. Having a person with some level of forestry interest or a public policy person would be ideal. It was noted that the past ‘at large’ members were professors or retired legislators, someone that has some general knowledge but not directly tied to the family woodland owner community.

1. **Family Forestland Dwelling Allowance - Discussion**

Abraham introduced Meriel Darzen from 1000 Friends of Oregon. Members were provided a link to the 1000 Friends Wildfire Vision Planning Policy that was just released. He wanted to start with Meriel talking about what they have and what the 1000 Friends view is then have a discussion about Family Forestland Accessory Dwellings legislative concept now HB 2469 introduced.

Darzen provided her personal background in forestry assuring members that she has a level of empathy for forestry issues and has worked on public and private lands issues in her role as attorney for 1000 Friends she works on all covering some 30 million acres of rural lands. She handles land use cases mostly on conservation of farm and forest lands, conversion issues, rezones. 1000 Friends of Oregon have been around since 1974, an organization established by Governor McCall and Henry Richman right after Senate Bill 100 established Oregon’s land use system. 1000 Friends was set up as the watchdog group for the land use system. And for the last 45 years has been working on both urban and rural issues. They have affiliate groups in 11 different counties. Those groups are all volunteer so she assists them by working on legal issues facilitating interface with county commissions. They provide legal advice on land use issues promoting advocacy for land use protections, protection for farm and forestlands, working landscapes with a lobbyist in Salem all the time. The policy paper they published (a work done by their summer intern, Ashley Fox) was on the intersection between wildfire and land use because everyone has been aware of the increase of catastrophic wildfires in the west. But there has not been a lot of conversation or coordination between fire risk and land use planning in other States. She lauded Oregon’s State Land Use System on the great job protecting working landscapes, farms and forests but wildfires are definitely an issue that’s disrupting our landscapes. She pointed out that as members were probably aware Oregon has been spending a lot of money fighting wildfire and costs go up when you are near homes or infrastructure. 84% of the wildfires in the Wildland-Urban Interface were human-caused. So what’s at stake is more than 107,000 homes, or 8% of the total housing supplied, worth 12 billion dollars are at high or very high risk from wildfire. Nationwide 60% of the homes built in the last 10 years are built in wildland-urban interface (WUI). In Oregon, the vast number of dwellings being built in the WUI are second homes not primary dwellings. Vacation homes being built out in the middle of forestland in high wildfire risk areas. She expressed her concern that with the FireWise designations and landscape treatments sometimes there is a misperception that a community is safe and you can put in more dwellings and structures. It’s important to do treatments to protect your working landscapes but what you don’t want to do is treat areas and then say okay we can build there. She referenced the State’s 19 land use goals. Goal 1 is citizen participation; Goal 3 is the farmland protection goal; Goal 4 is the forestland protection goal. All very strong goals. Goal 7 is the goal that deals with natural hazards: a planning type goal telling communities they need to think about natural hazards. Wildfire is one of those but it really hasn’t been activated as a goal to get communities to plan for wildfire. So one of the outcomes of our paper is we would like DLCD to start working on planning for wildfire and interfacing with ODF and the other agencies. Meanwhile the other fire planning efforts you are familiar with like FireWise and Community Wildfire Protection Plans~~, those~~ are voluntary. Counties in the State have a Community Wildfire Protection Plan~~s~~ but they are not updated regularly and don’t really interface directly with a county planning process. So in the case where there is a push for subdivision, frequently they don’t consider any fire issues. What 1000 Friends wants to do is actually make that link between planning for growth and planning for wildfire so we can avoid what happened in California. They believe you can still build livable communities and support growth but also avoid a lot of residential development in the wildland urban interface. The 1000 Friends policy recommendations are further explained in their policy paper.

The first recommendation is to create an official map of wildfire risk for planning purposes. She mentioned that the Oregon Explorer Tool on wildfire has really good information. The problem is it’s not a *regulatory* tool for planning purposes. So, when DLCD, our planning agency is helping communities how to map or plan there is no tool for them to look at that to determine the highest risk wildfire areas. There is a need to create or adopt a map tool now to be used by counties in their planning processes so the State can avoid unnecessary development in high risk areas. We can minimize structure permits to only those necessary for working lands use. We recognize the need to have farm and forest working structures on the landscape but not a bunch of urban level residential development. Where you need to put some residential development, you can mitigate some of the risks by having more defensible space, and more fire resistant building materials but that is somewhat cost prohibitive. Right now, there is SB 360, the ODF Bill around forestland urban interface and something on the books called Forestland/Urban Interface that intended to get at some of this but it’s not enforceable at the moment and not systematically applied by all communities. She considers that it is great data but not intended to be used for planning. They have been going through this legislative process around rural accessory dwellings and their argument has always been that you do need to test for wildfire impacts of putting that extra dwelling out there but we don’t have tools to assess that risk. She recognized OSWA’s legislative concept on that topic.

1000 Friends has a legislative concept as well and does recognize OSWA’s legislative concept around dwellings on forestland. Continuing she stated that she doesn’t believe the two concepts are at odds with each other. She hadn’t had a real long chance to review the OSWA concept and CFF members had never seen the 1000 Friends concept so she was happy to talk about it with the group. She went on to describe their bill to be in response to what they have seen as a result the template dwelling legislation (ORS 215.750) which was intended to get at the areas of forest zoning that were already a bit parcelized and allow people a little bit of a break on siting homes where they may be close to residential development. In her opinion the problem with that legislation is that it was not very well written and 1000 Friends stand is that there are template dwellings ~~are~~ going up in areas where they shouldn’t go.

She then introduced McKenzie Bowerman who has worked on some of these in Lane County. Managing his family’s forestland he recounted that he has seen some attorneys and land use consultants are able to take advantage of the Template Dwelling Statute by reviving older parcels and counting them and moving lot lines around which can wind up as rural sub-divisions. They’ve seen a big proliferation of dwellings being built in areas that are in high risk fire areas, and working landscapes. So they are trying to address this by closing the current loopholes with their bill concept HB 2225 or allowing the Template dwelling statute be sunsetted. But they completely recognize the need for succession planning for working landscapes. As an example, she had worked closely with Sarah Deumling, Zena Forest Products. They have a continuing family forest operation with a succession of family members. (Sarah is also a former CFF member.) In her experience template dwellings are not helping succession. They are actually causing problems by proliferating dwellings for folks that are not interested in maintaining working landscapes. HB 2225 gets at keeping additional template dwellings out of the fire risk areas and so consequently gets at the issue of fragmentation of forest landscapes. Oregon has fewer structures in the Wildland/Urban Interface than other states due to our land use laws minimizing rural development but the population increases is putting a lot of pressure on working lands outside of urban areas.

Discussion:

* Barnes noted with his background as a firefighter, and builder, he knows that a number of homes could be built FireWise safe. Structures can be built economically and still address fire safety. He agreed that he has also seen communities not adhere to any Community Wildfire Plan in their planning processes.

Darzen continued that one of the things they have wanted to incorporate is Building Codes Division Attachment ‘J’ on fire preventative building codes which could be tacked on. But to mandate that you must adhere to those codes the State needs to ensure any potential regulation wasn’t too cost prohibitive.

* Barnes added that concerns regarding the width of the road; bridges and ensuring stream crossings support H2 loading, whatever a Type 1 Engine is. You have water on hand with a standardized hose fitting that matches with the department responding to your location.
* Swanson was wary of unintended consequences, even with the OWSA bill as she worries if you allow any kind of accessory dwelling you end up with very similar issues. Perhaps including a sunset on that preemptively would help maintain the intent so those dwellings will actually support ongoing forest management and not create forest fragmentation. And fire risk is a big reason to think about that carefully. How can you safeguard against short term rentals of the dwelling by parties not engaged in maintaining forest conditions?
* Shumaker reminded the group that the OSWA bill doesn’t involve fragmentation of a parcel. The accessory dwelling would be on the same parcel as the primary dwelling and under the same ownership so it is a big commitment to maintain the family’s interests in the forest. Darzen agreed that it is far different from template dwelling applications and similar to placement of a secondary farm dwelling.
* James reiterated that the property first has to qualify to be able to have a primary dwelling, which is in most cases 80 acres and then the second dwelling has to be within 200 feet of the primary dwelling. His sense from the internal conversations within OSWA, is that there would be a few landowners wanting to take advantage of having additional family members on the land but not many.
* Bowerman had a question regarding parcel sizes vs contiguous tracts on the acreage minimums as the primary dwelling may be on a smaller parcel out of the larger ownership. James offered that there would be the ability to do lot land adjustments so the property size could be different if requested. Darzen was encouraged that it may aggregate and consolidate forest parcels which would tend to protect against future fragmentation of working lands. What they wouldn’t want to see happen is one generation down the road wanting to partition back to a minimum lot size.
* Regarding any future vacancy of the second dwelling and it being unused at any point, the primary landowner should be allowed to rent that property, especially if available for a property manager to the operations. Or a second income to the landowner to remain financially viable in working those lands. But the sense is over time that it will be more environmentally valuable to have the property remain under one ownership and the land condition not be degraded but continue to be managed for fire risk.

Darzen agreed she’s already seen that happen. One solution may be to require if you are providing a short term rental you have to have an owner present on the property. She offered also that there is another ADU bill that has a square feet limitation on an Accessory Dwelling Unit. They also have had discussions on in those cases, whether a short term rental is actually appropriate permitted use on resource lands, especially considering the trends for Airbnb rentals.

* Members agree that the requirement sideboard to have a forest management plan would document the long term intent and need for the ADU to keeping the property ~~is~~ as a working forest.
* Swanson noted OWEB has an Oregon Agricultural Heritage Program recently formed to help working agricultural owners access funding. She believed that Forestlands could be included in that program if an effort was made.
* Vroman included that having auditable criteria associated with the ADU waiver would illustrate the landowner’s intent. Requiring management plans and functioning activities on the property would provide a sense of continuity. James remarked that the Oregon Tree Farm System requires inspections every five years for member properties. In that program landowners could provide 3rd party certification that a property is managed well. And being motivated to join OTFS through this kind of legislation means there will be more management being accomplished on the ground keeping Oregon forests healthy, working and resilient to wildfire.

Answering a member’s question regarding mapping, Darzen shared that currently there is no mapping that has legal status regarding wildfire risk. It’s just informational and scientific. The Oregon Explorer Map is out there created and frequently updated by ODF and USFS for many different parameters looking at fire intensity, frequency as well as what infrastructure is available to the landscape. Layers can be manipulated to tell the story on different fire issues. She shared that they don’t know what the right combination of layers inform land use planning and believed that would take an effort by ODF, DLCD and OSU to determine what would be the most useful for county planners. But having a tool that will say, this is what the fire return interval is, and this is what the intensity is…to determine where development should be so as mitigate any more ignitions. So 1000 Friends are really interested in the fire mapping process and believe that DLCD working with ODF and the Institute for Natural Resources could come up with a really good product. Woodward thought that admittedly mapping could be a resource for the counties, however it may be a push to get counties to use it. That’s where she saw OSU Extension Agents might have expertise in that at that landscape level look. County Planners would need to be educated and brought onboard have this be successfully used statewide for county planning purposes. Darzen agreed that they would rather see fire considerations front-end loaded in the planning process but it’s just not integrated in with the land use process right now. She shared that there are a couple of legislators that think it is a good idea to put some legislation into place that requires funding DLCD and ODF to coordinate on creating a fire risk map and writing some rules governing the planning process about when they have to consider wildfire risk. ~~But~~ She clarified that they are just looking at this point to start the conversation but shared that there are some legislators really interested in the map concept and wanting to kind of talk with the agencies more about it and see if we can find what it would cost, etc.

* James thought the concept has a lot of merit and surmised that as a Committee it would be good to learn more about it.

Darzen continued that HB 2225 is the bill number regarding the Template Dwelling language. She added they would really appreciate having the conversation with you folks and OSWA about whether it makes more sense to shelve template dwellings completely or go down the road with a second timber dwelling with sideboards on it like you are talking about as it is really difficult to apply the template dwelling concept and easier to apply what CFF and OSWA are talking about. She would much rather be applying something like a second forest dwelling.

Bowerman offered his perspective on what is going on in Lane and Linn Counties with template dwellings and the pressure on farms and forestlands for development. As being part of a family forestland operation, he saw one of the biggest barriers to continued succession is the valuation of forestlands and where it relates to these permitted uses. The more permitted uses that are allowed in these forest zones the more valuable the land becomes and so instead of it being just forest use, its starts to become residential use which makes it too expensive for the price of new admission for people that want to become foresters or in the case of families that own large tracts, and want to preserve that forestry heritage the Estate tax becomes a real issue to consider in the next generations.

James explained that OSWA did get a successful tax credit passed, the Natural Resources Tax Credit. It provides credit if the party agrees to manage the land for that natural resource for so many years prorated by the value you can get up to $6 million dollars of asset value. Darzen added that if you are adding a dwelling to these values you are increasing your tax base, so that is something to consider. As some members shared their personal experiences with tax valuations some agreed that there is work that should be happening on changing the code. Darzen repeated her suggestion that forestry should be put back into the Oregon Heritage Program so it can be used by both Ag and forestry, but not too many are aware of that possibility. She offered to send the updated bill language. James expressed his willingness to make changes to the OSWA bill to be consistent with the template test bill.

Abraham was in favor of continued discussion between the CFF and 1000 Friends. James reaffirmed that members would like to collaborate and find a solution that meets everyone’s needs. In response Darzen offered that they have a ‘Farmers Advisory Committee’ made up of ranchers, farmers and forest land owners that meets twice yearly. Basically, an advisory committee of working lands owners that advise us on what kinds of policies we should work on to promote working landscapes. The next meeting is in March. Sarah Deumling is on it. We’ve got some other forestland owners from the east side. She offered to the group if anyone wanted to come present your concepts, they are welcome and we can talk more about it. 1000 Friends connect working landowners with their legislators. You come to our meeting and then you go and have meetings with your legislator and talk about your issues. It’s mostly about making those connections. She will forward the information when the date is set.

Bowerman thanked ODF for having this Committee as a public body.

BREAK

1. **Legislative Update – Danny Norlander**

Abraham shared that Danny had graciously accepted the assignment of Private Forests Division Bill Coordinator, so he will be providing regular legislative updates as a high priority item during this session.

Norlander began by reminding members of the Wildlife Food Plot rules which were part of the last Legislative Session. Providing a timeline he reported that the 8th of November is when staff are going to go to the Board for final approval of rule language and if approved they would go into effect next January 2020. He plans on coming to the Committee with draft rule language in April for feedback and then schedule public hearings in September to prior to reporting to the Board.

The 2019 Session has had up to about 1500 bills that have been introduced currently. Staff have reviewed the bills and those seen as pertinent to the Agency’s work are assigned to various positions to do analysis on. ODF is currently tracking about 480 bills and the Private Forests Division is looking at 77. Those include a wide variety of things from Harvest Tax to Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) issues, water stuff and fish passage and pesticide bills. He mentioned one in particular was SB 88 one of the ADU bill concepts really keyed in to wildfire survivability for a dwelling. That is being watched through the Protection Division. It places size limits of 900 square feet and it is tied into SB 360 to a degree with some of the other requirements. There are two OSWA bills. So HB 2468 is the liability bill and we’ve talked about that in the Committee before and HB 2469 is the Accessory Dwelling on forestlands bill. So staff has currently flagged 5 bills as high priority and in the process of indepth analysis. Private Forests has one on Sudden Oak Death which contributes monies for eradication efforts on SOD in Curry County. And then there are a variety of pesticide bills which could be interesting. One of those limits a whole lot of stuff, harvest, pesticides, fertilizers all kinds of stuff on forestland and and one addresses aerial application of pesticides specifically to the forests in the Santiam and McKenzie River Watersheds. At that point Norlander referenced the Legislative calendar which represents the full 6 month period of the Session. The Session was convened the same day as the CFF Meeting which is a little bit earlier than normal to make their targeted finish date of June 21st. The Calendar outlines important deadlines for movement of introduced measures. The previous Friday was the last day that people could get in Legislative Concept drafts of what they wanted to introduce. They have a month to amend the bills and then the 26th of February is the last date to introduce bills. The next calendared date is March 29th and if a bill has not been assigned or scheduled for public hearing by that date it’s considered dead. (There are different ways a measure can be brought back to life but that’s essentially the drop dead date for bills.) He shared that if a measure is not in a Work Session by April 9th about 10 days later that bill is dead. So they have a month to get to the first Chamber floor and to the next. The same thing applies for work sessions and public hearing assignments. When things wind up either in Ways and Means or Rules Committees they may wind up in limbo until the end of the session.

Barnes asked for clarification on the original bill owners. Norlander replied that HB 2469 is the OSWA bill on secondary forest dwellings that the Committee had worked on. And the 1000 Friends concept became HB 2225 regarding the Template test. He suggested also looking at Senate Bill 88 which is also addressing Accessory Dwellings on rural/residential zoning and wildfire risk. That requires over 2 acres and building not over 900 square feet and no further than 100 feet from the primary dwelling. There are details in the measure regarding wildfire, building codes and the protection statutes so is being tracked by ODF Protection Division. He suggested that was addressing rural/urban areas but could definitely have an impact on forestlands. He reported that bills are starting to be assigned to committees now. HB 2469 is assigned to Ag and Land Use and HB 2468 regarding landowner liability has been assigned to the House Judiciary Committee.

Swanson requested a list of the Bills ODF is tracking that pertain to Private Forests as Pacific Forest Trust are also tracking bills that relate to private forests or forest management, Danny will work on that for her. Other bills include the Harvest Tax Bill HB 2073 which sets the tax rates and is pretty standard. Another changes to the 50/50 split change in the Governor’s Budget and creates a whole new fund for wildfire suppression statewide which will increase the current funding for the Wildfire Protection Fund. There are some pesticide bills that will be an interesting watch going through changes after Hearings. He shared that interested people can actually remotely watch Committee Hearings through the legislative webpages. They are all streamed live and recorded and there are alerts you can set for specific bills for changes or new assignments. Norlander offered to send out just the assignments. And then under each of the Senate and the House tabs the committees are listed in there also. He also referenced a bill on placing limitations on exploding targets and other fire starting devices on public lands. Some others are just ‘statement’ bills that are there for the exposure. As well there are some historic water ones, pertaining specifically to us because sometimes landowners will put in ponds for drafting for fire helicopter operations things like that. And some tax credit stuff specifically for catastrophic fire events and creating a mechanism for tax relief for replanting. There are some other wildlife measures like bringing back dog hunting for cougars and protections for salmon and native fish. ~~d~~

James mentioned one bill that OSWA is focusing on. HB 2152 which proposes to take away all of the special tax assessments. It’s a large bill with every special tax assessment there is including those around forestlands. If that bill is successful, one thing it would do is add the value of your timber to the value of your property for the purposes of tax assessments. All the rules that it would impact would add up to about $650 million dollars’ worth of additional taxes to forestland owners. He reported it was currently assigned to the Committee chaired by House Revenue. It would take away all the incentive for forest owners to have any timber on their property because they will be taxed to death on that value of their timber. He recalled that there was a similar effort in 2017 but they were able to get all the natural resources pulled from the bill. This one does not include Ag but includes a lot of special tax assessments besides forestry but primarily focuses on forestry as a way to generate more revenue. A lot of the money would go to counties because its tax related but Jim’s guess is that whoever controls the bill plans to have more General Funds available than currently go to the Counties so it could be spent elsewhere. Its current intent is to sunset all special tax assessments in 2026.

1. **Siskiyou Streamside Protections Review – Marganne Allen/Terry Frueh**

Terry Frueh, Private Forests Monitoring Coordinator started off the update on Siskiyou Streamside Protections Review. He provided a handout on Key Messages pertaining to the Review. He provided some background noting that they began this effort in November 2016 when the Board of Forestry directed the Department to include Siskiyou and possibly Eastern Oregon in a new monitoring project looking at stream side protections. They asked staff to prepare some proposals on what we could do looking at things related to stream temperature, stream water quality, Large Wood, streamside forests. The Board wanted staff to work extensively with stakeholders and tribes throughout that process to come up with a set of options for the Board to decide on what we should monitor and where. Last March, the Board directed the Department to conduct a Literature Review of stream shade, stream temperature and streamside forest goals, also known as Desired Future Condition for Small and Medium fish streams in the Siskiyou Region and also provide some contextual information on fish status and trends and water quality evaluations. The Siskiyou region is in the southern part of the State and includes the Upper Rogue Watershed so includes much of Jackson and Josephine Counties. When they bring this information back to the Board the Board members will decide if the FPA rules are working as designed; may not be meeting stated objectives; whether additional study is warranted; or no further action is necessary. At this point staff recommended that Eastern Oregon be a separate study because the region is different enough from the Siskiyou and Western Oregon to be considered separately. He shared all the outreach efforts they did and points where they asked for input during the process. He then described the process of a Systematic Review, which is like a literature review but with more structure and rigorous protocols on what types of literature are relevant and what criteria is used to include them. That protocol was sent out for review and feedback and they incorporated that feedback where it made sense and addressed all feedback in a document to the Board. The literature that met the protocols was also sent out for feedback. All efforts/comments were reported. There were discussions by the Board on the scope of the review and how we determined what ‘relevant science’ is. Staff will return in June and bring their findings. ODF&W will be on the agenda to present contextual information on fish status and DEQ on water quality evaluations. The Draft Report of the Systematic Review should be ready to send out in March. The draft report will be a synthesis of the information pulling information directly from the publications. (Some of it metadata, where was the study done, when, etc. that type of thing). The ideal is that we pull information and figures, directly from the publications and provide a narrative set of conclusions to inform the Board. So the direction from the Board was to look at these particular topics through the lens of the Forest Practices Act’s ability to meet water quality standards to the maximum extent practicable. And whether the FPA is effective in creating the Desired Future Condition in the Siskiyou.

Abraham offered that from the Board’s remarks regarding the Review’s scope and the Board member’s desire to include Climate Change aspects, he had one of the Board members provide him with his comments and requests for the Agency to make strategy and develop a policy around climate change. He offered to send that to the Committee if members were interested. Kaola remarked that there is a summary of work that ODF had done from 2005 to 2013 on climate change and she advised beginning with what work they have already done. Not everyone was aware of the past efforts. Continuing with the Review process, they will present a final report and contextual information in June to inform the Board’s decision on the FPA relating to the Siskiyou georegion and the rules and statutes adequacy providing those protections. And in lieu of setting up a formal study, and data collection like RipStream, the Board decided that staff could review existing literature first to make a similar decision without having to put boots on the ground if the work has already been done.

Allen clarified that is really where this is at. Trying to establish what data exists, the science right now. We have the Water Quality Standards and part of that is in Statute. We have 527.714 criteria that talks about evidentiary information that you have to have in order to change rules that increase protection standards on the ground. And that has to do with having science to back what you are talking about, science that is relevant to the question being asked and that substantially relates to whatever it is that you are trying to address. So those are some other dynamics that folks might be aware of and thinking about as well.

Peel reminded staff that the crucial thing to the Committee prior to offering testimony is to have an opportunity to review the draft report so they have a basis for input.

Ahrens asked about the input from the Forest Practices Advisory Committees on this topic because as another advisory body they would be weighing in real heavily on this and their opinion could really inform CFF’s response. Allen assured them that the Regional Committees were receiving the same updates as were given at the meeting and noted that the east side is watching this process with great interest because the process may be replicated in Eastern Oregon at some point in the future. She admitted that the details of the process sound dull but whether or not you like the outcome, the process should be fair and transparent.

Abraham reiterated that they keep all the Regional Committee members in the loop so that they know where we are in the process and are able to provide input to the Board and ODF throughout. Ahrens agreed that those committees have a lot of expertise with the FPA and it would benefit the effort if the RFPCs share their recommendations with CFF to create a more cohesive effort. Storm agreed on those points and suggested that this is the time for both to provide good counsel and advice to the Department as it is appearing that the Board members have some conflicting opinions on this issue and the more we can provide input consistent with the Department’s position when addressing the Board the better.

Swanson shared her perception from the BOF meeting that staff are reviewing current data relating stream temperature to vegetation and the potential for that vegetation based on what it is today. Adding climate change planning is not related to the FPA but maybe related to ODF day-to-day decision making and how you want to shape the incentives. There is a place and a conversation for that but conflating the two seems like a challenge.

Ahrens agreed and stated that as these literature reviews continue for different issues, climate change and its impacts will come up as scientific input and context at some point.

LUNCH

1. **Pesticide Stewardship Partnership – Kirk Cook, ODA/Kevin Masterson, DEQ**

Kirk Cook from the Department of Agriculture began with a background on the Pesticide Stewardship Partnership. A decade or so ago the State of Oregon decided the way to deal with pesticide issues relating to water quality was to bring together the agencies that had statutory authority for water quality protection. ODA is the ‘pesticide agency’ with regulatory responsibility. DEQ has water quality authority. ODF’s authority over the Forest Practices Act. The Oregon Health Authority for human health issues relating to pesticides. OWEB through grant funding for streamside rehabilitation. All of these state agencies comprise the Water Quality Pesticide Management Team (WQPMT) providing basic oversight for issues related to pesticides and water quality. They also provide guidance and direction to our watershed partners comprising the Pesticide Stewardship Partnership (PSP). Generally that is the group that authors final and biennial reports and also review and give final approval for water quality monitoring plans in cooperation with our partners at the watershed level. So PSP facilitates management solutions. Work is accomplished through outreach and educational activities working with local partners. The Partnership goes through and evaluates pesticide monitoring results which are given to our local partners, or results in the production of the biennial reports or reports on efforts such as South Yamhill. PSP operates under the State Pesticide Management Plan for Water Quality, a plan approved by US EPA in 2011. And so all the activities that the Water Quality Pesticide Management Team and Pesticide Stewardship Partnership do is under that umbrella.

In order to address some of those pesticide concerns, he cited that there are two ways the effort could go, either the regulatory route or a voluntary route. In the Plan they have a table of Response Categories and Management Options one table for groundwater and one for surface water. The first three options are the voluntary mechanisms that are triggered by water quality results or some other activity that may arise. So they are focused right now on voluntary measures and have never reached a point where they had to consider regulation. The activities are really focused on three elements: Problem identification through monitoring; Working collaboratively to develop possible solutions; and monitoring to see if those solutions were effective.

The value of this program (and the voluntary part of it,) in many of these instances is if pesticide levels in water could trigger what they call a TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load). But Oregon has a narrative criteria which could invoke a voluntary solution rather than a very prescriptive and regulatory approach like a TMDL. So the agencies on the Team got the EPA to agree with the PSP’s voluntary efforts as able to achieve their goals. And as long as the State keeps achieving those goals the hope is that the EPA will let us continue implementing what we consider to be a really successful program.

Next, Kevin Masterson, for the Department of Environmental Quality implements this program. He explained that the Pesticide Stewardship Partnership pre-dated our statewide interagency collaboration by almost 7 years. The whole basis of the program was to have watershed partners drive actions on the ground based on the data that we generate and is really to ensure the program is consistent. This way we have common guidance and people are interpreting the data in the same way from one watershed to another. So at the watershed level they want to empower the local stakeholders to implement customized solutions in response to the data. So, it is important to have that statewide consistency, but still support localized control over the solutions. The voluntary program is pretty basic. Focused primarily on doing monitoring (primarily on surface water but we are starting to do more ground water monitoring) and then identifying streams and stream segments and the pesticides of concern or high interest in those areas. That allows us to focus the voluntary assistance and outreach where pesticides are a problem. He stressed that they often tell growers and other pesticide applicators that data can be your friend. Oftentimes people make assumptions that we are going to find things and we often don’t. And if they see levels above a benchmark once in a while they can work with people in those areas to get those levels down. They focus on those areas where the data drives us to implement those practices. So as part of that process it is important to have people there on the ground to respond to that data, groups able to provide that assistance. Then they conduct follow-up monitoring over time to be able to identify hopefully improving trends. He mentioned this started in Hood River back in 1999 – 2000 where they were doing some monitoring there as part of this TMDL process. They were looking for things like sediments and temperature, some of the conventional parameters that we normally look at, especially in agricultural areas that are part of the Ag Water Quality Plan. They used the Hood River area as an example of an area where they had detection levels above the Water Quality Standards in some areas but a single land use type, tied to the fruit orchards. Growers approached them, the Columbia Fruit Growers Association and OSU Extension as well that they could solve this problem quicker implementing improvements to their practices voluntarily. The results were fairly quick in Hood River. It started to really expand in 2005 and 2006 in other areas of the State including the North Willamette where we have 3 watershed based projects. But all this effort was funded by in-kind contributions from the agencies, extensions and some of the local groups. The effort was not funded through consistent stable funding. But in 2013 the Legislature ended up funding the program half from pesticide registration fees and half General Fund so there now is stable funding for the program for not just the monitoring and technical assistance but also pesticide waste collection. He then spoke about detections and program results for specific pesticides where they implemented improved application practices and integrated pest management. A current addition~~s~~ to monitoring efforts is to monitor the flow as well to calculate actual total loading. And then promoting pesticide waste collection. That service helps us create trust in the growers’ community and stable funding allows us to have 5 different collection locations every year keeping some of the 410,000 lbs. of collected pesticides out of the water. There are also technical assistance grants, enough to provide groups like OSU Extension or SWCD, Watershed Councils some money to follow up on the data.

Cook remarked that it isn’t just farmers but pesticide applicators, aerial applicators for forestry treatment. If you have out-of-date material it should always be taken in to the pesticide collection site. Masterson added that some of the material collected has been around 70 or 80 years! Some people have just inherited those old containers left in a barn, and they are just happy to do the right thing with them.

Currently, the Pesticide Stewardship Partnerships Projects ongoing are 3 in the Columbia plateau fruit growing areas, the North Willamette Watersheds, Yamhill and Pudding and the Clackamas on the South Yamhill Watershed. And then started in 2011 to focus on urban areas because even though we started with agriculture we recognize that pesticides are used across landscapes and a variety of different land uses. The Middle Rogue is their newest long term project and that has a number of different land uses pretty evenly represented. Forestry, Ag, and urban and rights of way. There are also two pilot projects one in the Deschutes primarily agricultural area with the seed products. And the South Umpqua which has a lot of forestry lands but other land uses as well. So that’s where they are now. They want to see a mix of practices implemented. He showed members the general list of activities that have been implemented. A lot of spray drift reduction especially in those areas where we have aerial applications and use of weather stations. Weather station reports help by providing daily wind speed so applications can be re-scheduled if the wind speed is over 12 miles/hr. Other activities focus on use of biologic controls and integrated pest management sometimes switching to less toxic pesticides or different combinations of chemical controls and maintaining buffer strips near streams. Those are the broad categories of things that we see implemented.

Continuing he wanted to brief members regarding benchmarks versus standards. He stated that there are quite a few pesticides that don’t have standards. In fact the vast majority don’t have Clean Water Act Standards. The EPA has much more power over the label of the pesticide now and how the pesticides are being used and how they are going to be restricted.

Cook continued the discussion stating that the current challenge that they have is linking water quality trends to the PSP data especially when looking at cause and effect it gets a lot more complex when we are dealing with areas like North Willamette Valley where you may have 40 to 50 different crops growing in a watershed and have other uses such as rights-of-way, urban lawn and garden use. It’s more difficult to evaluate the data and where detections are coming from. As part of a solution they are looking at reducing an area down to the sub-watershed level so reducing the number of pesticide applications that take place where they can draw better correlation between the data and the management measures implemented. What they want to do as much as possible is tie the timing of their monitoring to when the pesticide is applied or within a relatively short period of time. As there are a lot of pesticides that are being applied now that have a relatively short half-life so they don’t exist very long in the environment but do have some detrimental effects on aquatic life. They are working on some innovative ways to making all of our data available to anybody who wants to see through the internet soon. Also communicating the positive trends in this program rather than just pointing out where a problem exists. He noted that 70 to 80% of the stories have positive messages and we need to do a better job of balancing how to communicate that. They are actually going into water terrains and finding decent results that don’t warrant the type of concern that may had been generated by other entities. They are developing strategic plans and working more closely with partners to be develop a more comprehensive road map of how to conduct this program on a local basis and make it much more transparent for the general public and pesticide applicators to easily understand.

Next up Thomas Whittington representing ODF on the Water Quality Pesticide Management Team (WQPMT) presented results from the South Yamhill sub-watershed of the Yamhill Basin. Cook interjected that the latest biennial report can be located on the Department of Agriculture website on the Pesticide Stewardship Partnership. He wanted to focus on that as it makes up 140 square miles of forestland in NW Oregon. Along with 2 other sub-watersheds in the Yamhill. To link up the FERNS data to when and where to collect samples from forestry applications in the spring or late summer/fall when they would most likely catch those applications notifying for pesticide application. The samples were analyzed for approximately 130 different pesticides for detectable amounts. There were indications and detections of 6 different herbicides or herbicide degradants that would break down and what they would break down to. But key was there were no detections above the EPA and Aquatic Life Benchmarks.

Masterson noted that the lab analysis costs can differ by chemical tested and can become very expensive with costs running up to $350 to $500/sample. To stretch their funding they try to limit the number of sample sites using monitoring to pinpoint likely detection locations.

Returning to the report Whittington tied in that for the timeframe 2010 to 2016 there were 54 samples to inform each location. They use the Aquatic Life Benchmark ratio for the lowest benchmark for a particular pesticide. They graph out the frequency of detections. Some were detected at very low concentrations, the highest just above at .16 or so (of the Aquatic Life Benchmark). He walked the members through the overall results for each of the three sub-watersheds in the project. Working off of mapped notifications during the study period, Agency Creek was the largest at 16,000 acres 96% forest land. Gold Creek, the smallest watershed 3470 acres 95% forest land which had a few more below benchmark detections of different herbicides. Masterson added that the monitoring data was correlated with the harvest and spray activities for a 6 or 7 year period. Continuing on the last sub-watershed and second largest was Rogue River (not the “Rogue” in southern Oregon). Very little concentrations and very few detections for the watershed. Towards the end of the report, there are some recommendations based on the monitoring that has been concluded. So one of the recommendations was to continue with another large forestry land use area, he recommended the South Umpqua which is currently a pilot area. They need to identify the different land uses to isolate out areas of forestry application. He also wanted to share that another recommendation which came out of the South Yamhill report is that we need a clear definition of what constitutes a ‘water quality baseline’ for all land uses.

Cook wanted to point out that the Partnership takes great pains not to identify any specific landowner. That becomes an issue with forestry land use as there are a lot of very large forestland tracts which could wind up with only one or two landowners. So it takes a real cooperative effort with forestry as a land use to be able to protect the landowner we monitor. The intent of this program is not to look for problems. They’re looking to see if the land management practices going on are working to protect water quality, but our assumption is that they are. Masterson provided an example of a watershed with multiple uses and commodity groups illustrating that each watershed has different needs in terms of the communication around monitoring.

Abraham emphasized the obvious need to get permission to do any sampling on private forestland and that communication with landowners is really important to us and also the ability to share the information as it develops so we can further refine how the sampling is being conducted. We want to make sure that we invest the right amount of resources in the right locations to get the information that is valuable to the team and the State.

Masterson provided a timeline and specific phases of the South Umpqua Project. Phase 1 was started in late 2014/early 2015. During that time the first Phase of the pilot monitoring they did find higher levels relative to the benchmark of some of these herbicides that are used in forestry but also rights-of-way, but because we were down lower in the watershed, they assumed there were probably multiple contributors, just in terms of types of land uses. But it was notable that 7 of the 12 pesticides detected were herbicides that also had forest use registrations. They are going to reconstitute the local steering committee, the Partners for Umpqua Rivers, a very active organization who are collecting the samples and shipping them to us. They have proven to be a forum for everybody, forestry interests, Ag interests, and conservation groups. So they are a great convener and the Stewardship Foresters actually helped us pick that North Myrtle Creek site because it had multiple landowners rather than just 1 or 2 large landholders. They were able to present to the Regional Forest Practices Committees and were happy with that engagement. Cook noted that at least what they are seeing so far indicates that forestry as a land use is a continuous story of fairly low detections and fairly low concentrations.

In response to a question on what happens when any illegal activities are discovered in the course of the data collection, Cook emphasized that the purpose of this program is not regulatory BUT if something were to happen and we see something in our data that just looked really strange and really indicated to us that there was illegal prolonged application then what we would do would be to refer to ODA’s compliance people and present them with the data and then they would the decision on whether they should do an investigation in the area. We really, really, really take our commitment to the public and the applicators seriously as to this not being a regulatory program. But ODA does have the regulatory enforcement capability to address something like that.

Ahrens had a question regarding how Extension should be answering the public’s questions regarding exposures. Cook fielded the answer referring to the membership of the WQPMT. The Oregon Health Authority is part of our management team and their representative is a Human Health Toxicologist. Oregon’s Health Authority has been more and more a participating member if you will in our discussions. They are there because of the human health implications of what we are talking about. Through them we have their full informational assistance with some good people available to us on request per the issues. So the resources are available to us and we’re beginning to access that expertise more and more within the management team. Whittington added that if there are human health concerns that come to our Pesticide Analytical Response Center (PARC) we can address their specific issue or complaint. They can also help direct them to resources, and provide information as well. So if somebody called with an actual concern or exposure it goes to PARC and they will match to the appropriate agency to get involved, OHA or whoever, ODA as well.

Masterson concluded that they are focusing on the non-point sources and the data the vast majority of the time is indicative of non-point source. But water is the final resting place.

1. **Operator of the Year – Greg Wagenblast**

Abraham introduced Greg Wagenblast who coordinates the Operator of the Year Program as well as coordinating Civil Penalties administration. Usually at the March Board of Forestry meeting they recognize the Operators of the Year for each Area. As one of the nominees this year was nominated by a CFF member, Kyle thought it would be good for this Committee to see what we’ve been talking about when we mention Operator of the Year and solicit nominations from the public.

Wagenblast presented the basics of the program and brought videos of each of the winners. The goal for the Operator of the Year Program is to recognize forest operators out there that are doing great work, and promoting good forest practices as regulated through the Forest Practices Act. There are still misperceptions out there about working lands and caring for the environment. Promotion of these awards may help bridge some of that misunderstanding.

For ODF the State of Oregon is divided into 3 administrative Areas. And there is a Regional Forest Practices Committee for each of those Areas, NW Oregon, SW Oregon and Eastern Oregon. So each one of those Forest Practices Committees may receive nominations for the award to evaluate and vote on. An Area may not have any nominations for the year. But this year Eastern Oregon came in with a total of 3 nominations! John Peel put in a nomination for an operator/operation in Wallowa that worked on his property. Greg stressed that anyone can put in a nomination and are encouraged to. We love having multiple nominations in an Area and sad when there isn’t even one. We know the good work is being done but sometimes fire season or other factors cause nominations to miss deadlines. With that only one can be chosen Operator of the Year but an Area may want to recognize the other nominees with a Merit Award, or a Letter of Commendation from the District. A Merit Award is typically presented at a local District or Area event like an Operator Dinner or Breakfast to get all the operators in to talk about prepping for fire season that kind of thing and present the awarded operators in front of their peers.

He then emphasized that the nomination process was simple and if anyone had a good experience with an operator they can contact the District who will provide the forms. The process asks, what did the Operator do that you felt went beyond normal expectations and rule? What hardships were involved, weather, terrain, financial investment, complicated resource protection, public considerations? Just a summary of why you are nominating the operator. Once the nominations are received they are screened under the award criteria. Consistency of operations? We check the operator’s history there can’t be any violations of the FPA within 2 or 3 years. Difficulty, what risk to protect resources? How was the risk mitigated? Was the operator innovative or taking extra efforts? What was the result? Was there any financial risk? So after the nominations are screened they are pushed to the Regional Forest Practices Committee for that Area.

RFPC members are given Area Operator tours of the nominated operations and an opportunity to review the notifications, and nominations. Members can talk to the Operator, and the landowner. Sometimes ODF&W has been involved so they’ve been out there as well. Different folks supporting it may be there to talk address the members. We video the nominees to use in promoting the program and to provide a visual representation if there are Committee members unable to attend the tour. Soon after the tour, a RFPC meeting is scheduled to discuss the merits of the operator and their grading around the criteria and then put the nominations to a vote. Once selected, Public Affairs works on the videos, gets them posted out on YouTube and coordinates the media releases. There are announcements at the Associated Oregon Loggers and one at the Oregon Logging Conference, but the big recognition is by the March Board of Forestry Meeting where the Board personally and publically congratulates the operator with a celebration for him/her at that time.

We ended up with two Merit Award winners this year. One is Butch Tanzey from Tanzey Forest Improvement and that was John’s nominee out of Wallowa. The other one was Dave Harmon Logging over in Eastern Oregon as well. And it was for an operation halfway between Bend and Klamath Falls. Both Butch and Dave are kind of tailored to that specialty niche of working with the small landowners and providing those services and helping educate and promote forest activity and planning for the long term for their clients. There was another Merit Award winner in Northwest Oregon, Rick Gwin from Gwin & Sons Logging up out of the Vernonia area was the Merit Award winner. Then videos of the 3 winning Operators were shown.

* Eastern Oregon Operator of the Year 2018 was BM Timber.
* NW Oregon Operator of the Year 2018 was JM Browning Logging.
* Southwest Oregon Area Operator of the Year 2018 was Dave Wilkerson.

Greg announced that he is getting ready to start up taking nominations for 2019 now and reiterated that if any members want to put in a nomination he can you them the necessary paperwork.

Shibley wanted to comment that he noticed that most of those Operators of the Year are getting up in years and he saw that as a good sign. They’ve been good salesmen for their work by what they do! They are keeping business because they are good.

Answering a question whether there were any restrictions on the type of operator that can be nominated, he said that they have had nominations for herbicide applicators, consultant foresters, those other contractors directly involved with a forest operation.

1. **For the Good of the Order**

Confirmation on the next meeting scheduled for February 12th.

Potential agenda items:

* Bark Beetle infestation and potentially a general overview of forest health threats.
* Additional discussion on the Siskiyou Project
* Legislative Updates
* Carbon Policy/potential Carbon Legislation/Cap & Trade
* Smoke Management rules update/EQC
* Forestry Extension fire program policy options package

Arhen’s mentioned for the Good of the Order that the Tree School catalog is published for the Clackamas Tree School and should be arriving at the ODF offices and they mailed 14,000 copies out to woodland owners in the North Willamette Valley counties and also we sent it to offices and promoted it online. Registration opens on the 28th.

Barnes adjourned the meeting.