

**Draft Board of Forestry Planning Retreat Minutes**  
**OREGON STATE BOARD OF FORESTRY**

**October 12, 2016**

INDEX

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Page #</u>
Agenda Overview and Meeting Objectives.....	1
Board Discussion and Values .....	2
Wrap up and Next Steps of Values .....	7
Review Agency Planning Timeline .....	7
Discussion Board Work Plans for Calendar Year 2017.....	7
Self-Evaluation and Board Staff Working Relationships .....	10

In accordance with the provisions of ORS 526.016, a meeting of the Oregon Board of Forestry was held on October 12, 2016 at Chemeketa Business and Services Center, 626 High St NE, Salem, OR 97301

Chair Imeson called the public meeting to order at 10:13 a.m.

*Board Members Present:*

Sybil Ackerman-Munson	Tom Insko
Nils Christoffersen	Tom Imeson
Cindy Deacon Williams	

*Board Members Absent:*

Mike Rose

Attachments listed below are available on the web at [www.oregonforestry.gov](http://www.oregonforestry.gov)

*Items listed in order heard.*

AGENDA OVERVIEW AND MEETING OBJECTIVES

Chair Imeson introduced Peter Daugherty as his first meeting as State Forester.

State Forester Peter Daugherty mentioned how this was only his fourth week as State Forester. He summarized his transition into the State Forester position so far, and indicated that it has been a positive experience. In the future he would like to report to the Board on meeting expectations that he set during the interview process.

One of the things promised during the interview process was what he would do in the first 100 days, which included a transition with previous State Forester Doug Decker. He completed that and is now in

focusing on work and relationships in his new position, and will be developing a plan for the new Private Forest Division Chief. An announcement is to run for that position for three weeks and will be a competitive and national recruitment. He is looking to possibly include the Board on this review process. Another goal of his was to establish a relationship with the executive team and work through this change of leadership. He set up an offsite retreat for November 7, 2016 to go over his management style and expectations going forward. He also has a goal to establish working relationship with the board, key government officials, and natural resource offices. Lauri Aunan and Richard Whitman will be our contacts and there will be some shifting decisions down to the agency director.

Chair Imeson mentioned that Richard Whitman will become the Acting Director for Department of Environmental Quality.

State Forester Peter Daugherty stated that he was reaching out to key partners and his first talk was at the Oregon Forest Industries Council (OFIC) annual meeting. He commented that he is doing what he said he would do in the first 100 days.

State Forester Daugherty moved to the retreat agenda and described the goal to discuss Board Values. He would also like the Board to take special note at the role science plays in making policies and to think about how science informs decisions. He wants to look at policies that will engage more in collaboration.

Recent effort by the governor equity and leadership forum was discussed. This included integrating equity into the implementation of State Policy. Participants will embed equity into their leadership approach. This value is very important to the governor. She sees it a way as thriving Oregon. Demographics and race will be changing as we go forward and will possibly affect the work force, policy decision, and inclusion practices.

#### Board Discussion: Values

Chad Davis presented the Values discussion to the Board, indicating that this conversation about values is an emergent property for them to own and use. He reminded the Board that they cannot make decisions today and this discussion is a follow up on the conversation from April. He asked that the Board take some time to look over the values piece of the document and decide if they need changes or rewriting. Things to think about:

- What of these are still enduring?
- What needs to change or be removed?
- This is just a discussion and no actions on this topic.
- Look at next steps and some report out and who carries this and owns it going forward?
- These values need to be the Board's and by extension Oregon Department of Forestry's.
- How does the Board use these values?
- What are the expectations for staff on this?

Tom Insko asked Chad Davis about ownership of the values and how they should be the Board's, but the Board is here to represent the citizens of the state, so by default shouldn't values be a representation of that? Is that accurate?

State Forester Daugherty: Do the collective values represent all citizens of Oregon? There will be a public review of values, so we will have public input to shape those values. The values also serve as a compass that guides standards and goals, objects, and values.

The Board and Oregon Department of Forestry members looked over relevant values:

Chair Imeson: what struck me in reading through these, is that you could take one value in itself and it could take you to different places, so keeping in mind that thought, it is the totality of all of these things together that really make up all the overall values and ideas.

Chad Davis: What ones are good as is?

Sybil Ackerman-Munson: All are good as is, except one.

All looking at the values options:

Nils Christoffersen: In looking at your guidance, these should create a compass, does that actually provide a compass a not? Does this actually direct us? How does it all fit together?

Tom Imeson: Do these values take you someplace? I only have one that is not as reflective of the times.

Chad Davis: What requires some discussion?

- Tom Imeson: #10 Informed public participation: Appreciate consensus based decisions, but looking at this there are times we don't have consensus. He thinks that as he values this idea, it shouldn't be at the cost of making good decisions. In relation to the politics that we now face in country and Oregon. Suggests further discussion to look into it more.
- Sybil Ackerman-Munson: #4, in wanting to keep active management: we talk about a lot of things in active management, now we are entertaining lots of different models, but looking at context of what we are trying to think through today.
- Tom Insko: A question mark of #9, where different landowners play different roles, not sure how that integrates into our processes or values.
- Chair Imeson is not as ok with the wording on #4, 9, &10.
- Cindy Deacon Williams: #4, 9, & 10, with minor tweaking on #1 where it would make sense to integrate climatic change issue in, #3 always hated the term enhancement and would prefer to think in terms of restoration. Doesn't think we can make it better, but more restore it. #8: did not like the way that it relegated fish and recreation jobs to a secondary tier. Feels that they are all important, and do a tweaking to reword it a bit.
- Nils Christoffersen: #1,2,3,4 would want to break them down and figure out what they meant and how they are relevant. Felt these had ambiguity and complexity. You could add one more clause that decisions should be made in a timely manner for #10.

Chad: focused on value #4,9, &10 concerns in discussion:

- #10- Chair Imeson: Tom Insko's amendment would be good. Add into it the value of transparency. We do value public involvement and make sure our decisions are as clear as possible. We strive for consensus wherever possible, but in the absence of that, decisions will be made in a timely manner.
- Do we need to define "informed".
- Do we need to integrate the science piece of it there?
- We want people to be informed but there may be different aspects, but we value if people are the most knowledgeable as possible.
- As a predicate of decision making and you must be knowledgeable of what risks you are taking.

- Redefining the consensus based phrase is what we will be focusing on this going forward in regards to these values.
- Looking at the idea of integrating the change of demographic changes.
- Staying relevant and reaching out to broader populations would be very important in this value.
- Transparency is key.
- #4 is a point of the department leaning toward the type of forestry combined to work toward goals. The Board feels that value #4 could look more closely on the mission and look at how we can achieve the mission rather active management then sustainable management.
- Where is the resources to manage the landscape? And from a cost effectiveness approach can we accomplish some of these goals through passive management? We want to reach these things quickly, but passive management may need to be an integrated option into this value.
- Sybil Ackerman-Munson felt if we change #4 around, she doesn't think we need to change the goals, but 4 would not need to change any other pieces.
- What is the meaning of active management? Does that wording need to be altered?
- There is an implication that means that people need to be actively doing something. This is more of the question.
- If you look at restoration literature, active management is actually getting out there to do something.

Tom Insko: As he read through the list and as he heard most people, much of what is on the list doesn't strike him as values. It intertwines with it, but thinks that values should be more fundamental... something like sustainability. It would then be important to build goals and objectives around those values. Values should be enduring. Active management seems odd as a value. That is how you accomplish a value possibly, but not a value in and of itself. The problem is that is sort of starting over.

Nils Christoffersen: He appreciates what Tom Insko says, also feels this is sort of a different list of values then what he is used to looking at.

State Forester Daugherty: There is a deeply held value in understanding where we are at in our role in nature when it comes to active vs passive management. This shows we need to be interacting with nature in this way. This is not the only tool we have.

Nils Christoffersen: This could be stated as a value around stewardship that doesn't hold the baggage of active management. A value around stewardship is more open ended, like we believe we have a role in this landscape.

State Forester Daugherty: Framing this in the framework of stewardship: active management should perhaps be framed as stewardship about rational choice to integrate in these types of activities.

Sybil Ackerman-Munson: What is missing in this is bullet #2 in the mission and bullet #3, is forest sustainability. Stewardship is a piece of it, but how do we talk about it in context without a direct nod to those bullets. Active management doesn't really address this as fully.

Nils Christoffersen: if we look at things this way, we may be able to end up with a shorter and more concise list. The reason why something that affirms our role and responsibility how we influence landscape use and patterns is essential. Indirect influence and unintended consequences can be as significant as direct active management of the forest.

Chad Davis: On to #8 phrasing seems to be unnecessary relegating healthy rural Oregon to a secondary status. Was almost mirroring the urban rural divide and forests have values that cross the traditional divide? It would be good to not see that separated. Sounds like a second tier citizens based on how it is worded. So this could be solved through re-phrasing.

Nils Christoffersen: This goes back to a values statement. Looking at equity, and not just about gender, race ect. but is also about benefit and other aspects. We need to fundamentally keep forests forests.

State Forester Daugherty: we can't have a Healthy rural Oregon if you don't have a healthy rural environment. We need to look at sustainability and the question of social economic opportunities for rural Oregonians. We don't want to make economic social and environmental as separate of sustainability.

Nils Christoffersen: Understanding what the equity issues in our conservation policy programs, how does this influence things?

Cindy Deacon Williams: Trying to incorporating these three pieces of conservation, use, and equity of use into this value. State Forester Daugherty says this may work better on #5 value.

Tom Insko: #9 addresses different land ownerships and how they play different roles. Is that a value?

Cindy Deacon Williams: #9 feels this gave a compass in her values. This gave her a baseline for understanding why some decisions are necessary regardless of science and pure environmental needs. Expects there may be different needs and addressed social responsibility of it.

Nils Christoffersen: Is there a principle aspect or a value?

Tom Insko: There are different values driving the decision on the ownerships, but is that an actual value?

Sybil Ackerman- Munson: one of the things in the 90s is that the NW forest plan was really intense and a lot of the Forestry Program for Oregon (FPO) was a reaction to that. It has been revised and Governor Kitzhaber was focusing on how we can log more on federal land support local lands and be environmentally responsible. Not sure it would be valuable to stop pushing certain responsibilities on federal vs state vs private and look at it in different way.

Nils Christoffersen: Finding the balance not only with the role, but with policy and programs to make things a reality and you can't solve one without looking at the other one. We need to make all the pieces work together.

State Forester Daugherty: this is saying we are going to respect different values of different landowners, or are we going to treat them the same? The base of this is looking at if the board thinks this is a good idea? Keeping working forests working.

Nils Christoffersen: Keeping forests as forests. Looking at it through economic pressure and through climate change and what that means to land use.

Chad Davis: Looking at this as is this a real value? Will it be better somewhere else in the document?

Cindy Deacon Williams: It is not realistic to expect that we will get the same sense of values from each of the ownerships. She feels that the different ownerships need to retain the idea of different expectations and pressures for each ownerships.

Chair Imeson: Where is the value? We don't expect the same things across the board from different ownerships.

Discussion on this...

Sybil Ackerman-Munson: Equity, #7 human wellbeing will want to think how we are responsible of those needs and on the job side that may talk about and look at track records and feel like that is something that the board should discuss at some point.. Looking at metrics on how we look at things. Equity piece and then also the indicators attached to fpo to check in how we are doing on these thing.

State Forester Daugherty: This is where FPO has struggled in having a metrics

Nils Christoffersen:#11 we are not really living up to it. How do we practically process and translate that into continuous learning for us. If the current matrix is too complicated then we need to adjust and do something maybe simpler as a continuous process and then delve deeper at longer intervals.

State Forester Daughter: Looking at measurable ways to do this.

Nils Christoffersen: Maybe we do want to come up with a simpler set of metrics.

Sybil Ackerman- Munson: in the vision #5 might be linked to all of this in a way of connecting values and implementation

Cindy Deacon Williams: Looking at equity in process as well as equity in outcomes we need to understand how both are important. Also looking at conservation and sustainability.

Chad Davis: what is missing from this list of values is the concept of partnering and partnerships, in terms of all the aspects of ODF, didn't get addressed.

Liz Dent, goes back to breaking up the silos and looking at those relationships.

State Forester Daugherty: another thing missing is the importance of forests, but they are important to rural areas but not the cities, may need to be addressed in the urban side a lot more. Where does urban come out here?

Sybil Ackerman- Munson: Also people are going out to the forests from the city.

Nils Christoffersen: Agrees there is a lot of values to having trees in urban areas, this does need to be incorporated in there somewhere.

Cindy Deacon Williams- Alluded to in #8 phrased in a way that could include the urban landscape.

Chair Imeson: Discussion on Urban, rural, and the divide and values.

Chad Davis: Two things to address: Climate change and the role of science.

State Forester Daugherty: did we ever say that wood is good? As a value of a renewable resource. Intrinsic value addressed, but not the direct use value.

Nils Christoffersen: Agrees that in #1 and #3 there is an economic frame, climate change and global context that we have a highly productive natural forest. We are then shifting the burden to other costs and we recognize this in Oregon. We have produced a ton of wood in Oregon and we need to understand the implication of that. Looking globally, when we don't understand that value, then we are shifting that to other parts of the world.

Cindy Deacon Williams- looking at different natural resources everything is changing worldwide, in a global context we need to look at the future we are facing in all of this.

### Wrap up and next steps of Values Discussion

Some of these value statements may not be values at a deeply held value level, but transparency, equity, continuous learning, and adaptation were mentioned. Core values on how we think about forests and forest values in Oregon including social and ecological wellbeing. Looks like there is a need to revise these statements as starting point based on this conversation. Maybe the highest core values listed first. He didn't hear objecting to any of the values, but perhaps reevaluating how these could be revised. Will be looking to discuss this further in the November meeting. One of the questions that will come up is are we revising the policy in Oregon. Looking at values is the next step. What do we want the Forestry program for Oregon to be? How can we incorporate cores and values into that process? Strategic planning has been on the table and we are looking accountability, equity, integrity, and excellence. It should be dynamic and changing all the time as the process and needs will change. We need to be looking at this as a living guide. We will be looking at next steps at November meeting.

Board agrees these would be good next steps.

### Review agency planning timeline

- We are about to head into legislative session and outcomes of that session will come into play with development of work plans and reset that two year planning window.
- Internal discussions have been manifesting themselves and we can see it in this way and include in the work plans.
- This is our guide post of where we are in the fiscal year process, unless it is significant changes for the plans then we are pretty well set on where we are at for now.
- The Board has curiosity around implications of budget outcomes based on state revenues. How has Oregon Department of Forestry thought through the potential outcomes?
- State Forester Daugherty: We are in an odd sort of planning situation from a reduction to a possible enhancement. It is skewed to the left a little on potential reductions. Even in a 6% reduction scenario we are looking at a potential loss to jobs at ODF. Discussions and plans are being looked at. First reductions will come out of Private Forests. This is an Oregon issue rather than a larger issue. We are looking at getting hit by this sometime in June. Being thoughtful in our approach.
- Satish Upadhyay: Potential budgets are affected by Ballot Measure 97 passing or not on the ballot. Two places where general funds are used, Private Forests and Protection. Right now Protection is still a priority.
- Discussion about Policy Option Packages.

### Discuss Board Work Plans for Calendar Year 2017

Work Plans:

Satish Upadhyay: Administrative: We are looking at how other agencies are doing it and are trying to clean up the process.

Board question: To Be Decided item, is there a reason why it is not more specific? On Human Resources part. Strategic workforce through the audit for incident management teams are being looked at and addressed. May be options to report more on this as we go. Satish says the timing is also coming into play.

State Forester Daugherty: The human resource on the workforce management is very important as well as successional management.

Chad Davis: Emerging issues: Looked at the trends, there is a lot of TBD and mostly informational. There are some things that may be included and we need to look at what are the next set of issues, and how to plan them out.

Wood harvested should qualify for some green building then also qualifying a custom approach to that to implement in the manufacturing agencies. We are looking to see if this has any kind of marketability.

Work on CLT that OSU is leading and there is no decision point there that is mostly informational. The Timber product census piece that is an upcoming thing for them. Is this something we need to maintain? We need to monitor the utilization capacity of it.

Cindy Deacon Williams: Wants to see how we can bridge from the operational level to the on the ground parts of Climate change. She is wanting to look into a way to look on an operational level and a survey to see what things people are worried about in regards to this issue up and coming in the next few years. Wanting to go beyond the general science and start to prepare for and intersect with our operations.

Nils Christoffersen: Under the mapping and recording the dynamics of operational forests, climate change should be a part of it. In talking with nature conservancy and trying to assess the restoration need for Oregon, that is mostly about forest stand structure map. Looking at increased severity and frequency of fire maps and trying to think about how to integrate them and also bring in the Climate change issue. There was a discussion of Jennifer Allen's presentation, and what happened with the report she was working on. How does this tie back in to wood products, etc. Want to try to tie that in a thoughtful way. Fascinating analysis on CLT to address affordable housing in England. Might be worth looking into for the relevance of that since this is an issue in Oregon.

Chair Imeson: Some sense about whether the things we have done and what impact that may be having and getting a sense of the value. Often when in public presentations looking at the mill infrastructure focus is on, what has been shut down, rather than including the range of log utilization and capacity of the mills that are left. This is important for jobs, but we need to know the full picture.

State Forester Daugherty: Taking in these reports: astm should have been moved to the private forest work plan. There won't always be a case to take action with the Board, but that once you have a report to have that discussion there are implications, where do they end up and what work plan do we put those things into? Looking to have the board incorporate some of this into the work plan.

Doug Grafe: Update on Fire protection. One major change to the work plan is the removal of firefighter defense since they finished it in June. The review is an ongoing update of progress, now changed into implementation and now joined with the Secretary of State audit. Joint meeting with EQC and will be starting at the next meeting on some of the protection issues moving forward.

Fire prevention is now focus on industrial fire rules program. Looking to be done before fire season.

Liz Dent: State forest work plan we are looking at is 2016. Achieved objectives on framing up business improvements. We have gone through recreation rulemaking. Upcoming year, they will focus on Forest Management Plan process. Have been implementing some business improvement policies. They added some money to the funds and did not create deficit this year. The projection is still suggesting a long term decline in financial viability. Looking to frame-up some pathways to resolve this issue.

State Forester Daugherty: There may need to be a reset or a rethinking on exploring potential pathways forward and will meet with Board members to look at key issues and see how we can move forward with on this policy topic.

Chair Imeson: we do need to take a look at this. We have looked at the land allocation process. No we need to look at landscape and see where we want to take this. We owe people more clarity than they have now.

Liz Dent: Still working on strong focus on business improvements and working on conservation needs and implementation.

Sybil Ackerman-Munson: Work plans for the Elliot, if there is no buyer, what does that mean for them.

Liz Dent: Department of State Lands (DSL) is in charge now of this. As of July we will be out of the picture. They will be using a private contractor any reassessment of the decision for land transfer will be DSL's and State Land Board decision going forward. We will still be managing the remaining land base and we can do that under several different mandates.

Private forest:

Lena Tucker: We took a look ahead, and changed some things. The riparian rule analysis is now entering the public outreach and public hearing process. We will bring it back to you two more times.

Rip stream analysis and results we will bring to you in September.

Strategic monitoring plan is taken off because we will bring it to the Board next month. Pending Board decisions we will move forward with this plan.

Meeting at EQC. Pesticide partnership may be brought up at some point at a future joint meeting.

Have a few topics on hold for now.

Sybil Ackerman-Munson: Mentioned the intense meeting in April about the issue on Siskiyou.

State Forester Daugherty– strategic monitoring plan will be looked at in November. Looking at reassessment.

Lena Tucker- Monitoring strategy will be brought to the meeting and the Board can decide at that point what that might be moving forward. Oregon Department of Forestry will develop and present options to discuss and consider at the November meeting. The Board will decide if we will move forward on that or not.

Bald Eagles, in July was looking at moving forward on rulemaking. Let's pause on bald eagle and bring that to you in March with a final in July.

Cindy Deacon Williams suggested that we should have an informational briefing on some of the topic on hold, such as the landslides and public safety rule making process

In July you appoint people to the committee for family forestland. When people term out on those committees then it is pretty easy to get them changed out. Recruiting the chair takes some time.

Self-evaluation and Board-Staff Working Relationships.

All Board members completed the survey, and went over results Found in Handout.

Chair Imeson: makes a suggestion to have staff that works with the Board and stakeholders to give some feedback on Board performance like this kind of survey in the future.

State Forester Daugherty: We need to bring it back and reach a decision by the board and give staff the time to respond to address the work load and work plans.

Sybil Ackerman Munson suggested an anonymous survey from the staff and perhaps from public and indicated it would be good to have a review.

No decisions were made during this meeting.

With no further business before the Board, Chair Imeson adjourned the public meeting at 3:00p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Peter Daugherty

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "P.J. Daugherty", is written over a horizontal line.

Peter Daugherty, State Forester and

Secretary to the Board

JN