

Committee for Family Forestlands Annual Report to the Board 2017



*Annual Report presented to the Board of Forestry July 25, 2017
by Edward P. Weber, Chair, Committee for Family Forestlands*

The Committee for Family Forestlands (CFF) is pleased to provide a report of its activities over the past year (July 2016 – June 2017). This report outlines accomplishments of CFF and discusses progress made on a forward looking agenda that addresses key issues for Oregon’s family forestlands.

The CFF is a standing committee established by the Oregon Board of Forestry to assist the State Forester and the Board of Forestry on issues relevant to some 70,000 family forestland owners in the state, including the formulation of policy and evaluation of effects that changes in forest policy have or will have on those lands. The Committee provides recommendations to the Board and the Department of Forestry (ODF) regarding strategies and actions to improve services and provides an avenue to raise public awareness of the role that family forestlands play in maintaining an economically, socially and ecologically healthy forest environment.. In giving advice to the Board and State Forester, we are mindful of, and strive to be consistent with, the objectives of the Forestry Program for Oregon and the Oregon Indicators of Sustainable Forest Management. The CFF gives a voice to small forest landowners.

The 2016-2017 membership of the Committee for Family Forestlands included:

Edward P. Weber, (Citizen at Large) Chair, Voting Member
Kyle Abraham, (Deputy Chief ODF Private Forests Division) Secretary (non-voting)
Evan Barnes, (Southern OR Forestland Owner) Vice Chair, Voting Member
Bonnie Shumaker, (Northwest Family Forestland Owner) Voting Member
Gilbert Shibley, (Landowner At Large) Voting Member
Scott Gray, (Forest Industry Representative) Voting Member
Evan Smith, (Environmental Community Representative) Voting Member
John Peel, (Eastern Oregon Family Forestland Owner), Voting Member
Janean Creighton, (OSU College of Forestry) Ex-Officio
Scott Hayes, (OTFS, Small Forestland Owner Group Representative) Ex-Officio
Meg Mitchell & Brad Siemens (Public Land Management/USFS State Liaison) Ex-Officio
Julie Woodward, (OFRI Representative) Ex-Officio
Rex Storm, (AOL, Forestry Interest or Consulting Group Representative) Ex-Officio
Lena Tucker, (Chief Private Forest Division, State Forester Representative) Ex-Officio

CFF Membership Items

- In October 2016, the Chair led the members through the new member appointment schedule to be voted on by the Board in November. Gilbert Shibley was appointed to be the new At-Large member. John Peel shifted his representation to become the Eastern Oregon Representative.
- In February 2017, Meg Mitchell of the U.S. Forest Service informed the group that she would be doing a four month assignment for the Washington D.C. office. Brad Siemens, is going to be filling in the

Public Land Manager ex-officio position. Siemens is also the representative for the USFS State and Private Forestry program on the State Stewardship Coordinating Committee.

- This year was the end of Scott Gray's term as the industry representative and voting member. The Committee is in the process of seeking a replacement.

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge the support we have received from the Oregon Department of Forestry and its Private Forests staff. We appreciate the access to, and support from Peter Daugherty, State Forester, and members of the Board of Forestry.

We would like to specifically acknowledge the contributions of our partnering organizations. Much of the CFF's outreach work would not be successful without them:

- Oregon Small Woodlands Association (OSWA),
- Oregon Forest Resources Institute (OFRI),
- Oregon Tree Farm System,
- American Forest Foundation (AFF),
- OSU College of Forestry and Extension.

We are also grateful to those ODF Division employees who keep us informed on issues and/or upcoming rules affecting Oregon's Family Forestlands. In particular, we would like to recognize invited guests on a variety of topics:

- **Nicole Maness, Willamette Partnership** presented information to the members on the components of a successful payment for ecosystem services program.
- **Brian Kittler, Western Region Director of the Pinchot Institute** who was invited help members understand what the carbon market potential is for small landowners.
- **Ron Graham, Deputy Chief of the ODF Protection from Fire Division** for providing members with a recap of the 2016 Fire Season, review of the Fire Program and in a second engagement with the Committee provided an update on Prescribed Fire and Smoke Management.
- **Katie Morrison, ODF Program Specialist**
Jason Pettigrew ODF Stewardship Forester, gave an overview of the Federal Forest Restoration Program (FFRP), and how that Program is coming together at the Klamath-Lake District.
- **Brian Pew, Deputy Chief of the State Forests Division** for briefing Committee members on the State Forests Division lands and responsibilities.
- **Marganne Allen, Interim State Forests Deputy Chief** for her leadership ensuring the transparency of the Department's rule making functions to all landowners and interests.

The Committee is gratified that its work is important to the Board, the Department and the forestland owners we represent.

Introduction

The report starts with the 2015-2016 Work Plan Outline and a list of letters to the Board of Forestry or other agencies are listed in the appendix. Summary text is provided that describes CFF accomplishments. Finally, prioritized topics are identified for the 2017-2018 year.

For additional information, please visit the CFF [website \(http://www.oregon.gov/ODF/Board/Pages/CFF.aspx\)](http://www.oregon.gov/ODF/Board/Pages/CFF.aspx) hosted on the ODF site under the Board of Forestry. It contains greater detail regarding committee structure, agendas, meeting minutes, and all formal recommendations, letters, reports and memos authored by the Committee for Family Forestlands.

2016-2017 Work Plan Outline

The Committee's Work Plan for 2016-2017 prioritized and directed the Committee's effort for the past year. Some issues were added by direction of the Board of Forestry or in response to the agency's need.

Tier 1 Issues

- Water Quality
- Ecosystem Services
- 1.3 Ritter Land Management Team Collaborative Project
- 1.4 Forest Health
- 1.5 Fire
 - Landowner Readiness and Capacity
 - Prevention and Risk Reduction
 - Prescribed Fire Liability
- 1.6 Forest Chemical Use
- 1.7 Seed/Seedling Availability
- 1.8 BOF Directed Issues
 - Riparian Rules
 - Specified Resource Sites
 - Wildlife Food Plots
 - Monitoring Strategy
 - Landowner Viability

Tier 2 Issues

- 2.1 Forest Taxes and Forest Business
- 2.2 Educational needs for family forestland owners/engagement
- 2.3 E-Notification
- 2.4 OWEB Focused Investment Program/NRCS RCCP
- 2.5 Inter-generational issues
- 2.6 Wildland – Urban Interface (WUI)/All Lands Approach
 - Good Neighbor Authority
 - ODF Federal Forest Restoration Program
- 2.7 Climate Change

Tier 3 Issues

- 3.1 Entry/Barriers to Forest Ownership
- 3.2 Conservation Easements
- 3.3 Land Use

Standing Topics

- 4.1 Legislative Updates

- 4.2 Board of Forestry standing invitations to members
- 4.3 Agency Budgets
- 4.4 Fire Season Updates
- 4.5 Compliance Audit Reporting/Support

Accomplishments

Tier 1 Issues

1.1 Water Quality

Water quality continues to be a top priority for the Committee. At the November meeting, members were provided with copies of the [Survey of Forest Landowners' Engagement in Voluntary Practices in the Oregon Coast Range](#) which was completed in June 2016. The emphasis was on the importance of Voluntary Measures under the [Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds and within the Forestry Program for Oregon](#). That plan describes the [Oregon Watershed Restoration Inventory](#) documenting voluntary projects. The current survey was created to get an understanding of reporting voluntary projects and to identify any real or perceived barriers affecting reporting. Increased documentation of voluntary measures could support the concept of ecosystem service financial opportunities over time. Management actions that are regulated are not compensable. Information provided on the survey process, questions and target audience was provided.

The committee discussion referenced a comment from the survey, "Projects that we used to report have become best practices, so we don't see them as extra or beyond what we should be doing," which suggests the Department emphasize this change in culture.

Other suggestions were to reduce the complexity and time involved in the reporting process as well as helping to distinguish what best management practices (BMPs) would be reportable as voluntary measures. The concern was that without measured verification of actual practices it is difficult to incentivize actions which would be considered a public service, and that value should be captured and rewarded. Monitoring could report both regulatory compliance *and* voluntary accomplishments. Others noted that even the act of collecting the data communicates to the landowners that 'this is important to us'.

The Department staff also provided updates as available on the Agency's status with the EPA and NOAA on the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments (CZARA) and the ongoing rulemaking on Riparian Management Areas.

1.2 Ecosystem Services

Committee members have a vested interest in finding alternate revenues from forested lands as increasing regulations are reducing forest income.

At the December meeting, **Nicole Maness, from the [Willamette Partnership](#)** presented information on ecosystem services. The Partnership is a conservation-based non-profit whose mission is to increase the pace, scope and effectiveness of conservation. They work primarily in the Pacific Northwest and are focused on developing investments in conservation and to engage private lands. Conservation can be part of the landowner's business decision if revenue is tied to restoration.

Maness started the discussion with a brief review of ecosystem services payment programs. She described the components of a successful ecosystem services payment program. Her example included the cost of treating water using "gray" infrastructure water versus paying landowners to restore the natural stream ecosystems to

provide better water quality. Society is recognizing that incentives can improve ecosystems. To be successful, this program requires ways to identify demand and to verify measurable services. The idea of green infrastructure producing cost savings is a win-win for multiple stakeholders and the environment. Maness offered the following key elements to build an effective and successful ecosystem or watershed services program:

- Identify the potential beneficiary;
- Quantify that service into a unit of measure;
- Make a financial case for payment; and
- Quantify and track benefits over time.

Most ecosystem services require the landowner to go beyond any regulation. Maness suggested that the Committee could discuss how forestland owners might exceed the Forest Practices Act by defining 'above and beyond'. It is important to clarify what is eligible and ineligible.

At the February meeting, **Brian Kittler, Western Region Director of the [Pinchot Institute](#)** described the potential carbon market for family woodland owners. Although family forestlands hold a lot of carbon, the current carbon markets are inaccessible for many. Mr. Kittler reported that the Institute is working on ways to connect family forestland owners with carbon markets to incentivize conservation. Challenges include risk mitigation during inter-generational transfer of lands in long term carbon contracts, complex market rules, and an undeveloped small woodland owner market. Most carbon contracts are on lands over 10,000 acres. The Institute is trying to find ways of scaling down the acreage size for carbon market opportunities.

The Institute is interested in helping create an Ecosystem Services section in the Oregon standard forest management plan template. When a baseline carbon stocking inventory is developed under a landowner's management plan, additional carbon stored over that baseline through improved forest management creates carbon credits.

Kittler provided an overview of the [Regional Conservation Partnership Program \(RCPP\)](#). He explained the program is a way for NRCS to partner with states, conservation districts, and non-profits to leverage resources and expertise. Typically, this is a cost-share grant opportunity for broad partnerships to address high priority resource issues. The Institute is making use of EQIP funding for initial carbon assessments and helping landowners develop a stewardship plan.

- **Ritter Land Management Team Collaborative Project**

The Ritter Collaborative has proved to be a huge success story for CFF. Members maintain interest and are looking to define any attributes that could inform successes elsewhere. Gordon reported that the Collaborative just received 501c3 status and ODF just allocated the final amount of money left in their grant to ferry their management through the rest of this year. As a 501c3 they are eligible to apply on their own for a number of grants through OWEB and other agencies. Gordon suggested they should focus on building partnerships that give them access to grant opportunities. As part of this, they now have an agreement directly with ODF to accept those funds so that they can manage them on their own.

The Ritter Team, is exploring additional funding for projects and operations from OWEB and Meyer Memorial Trust, among others, while also moving forward in a partnership with Sustainable Northwest to market Ritter's sizable supply of "juniper." Key to this plan is funding for the construction and operation of a new sawmill in the Ritter area, which is expected to provide over a dozen full-time living wage jobs.

In early May 2017, Emily Jane Davis, OSU, led a Private Lands Collaborative Peer Learning Workshop in LaGrande. The event brought participants together from three private lands collaboratives in the northeast Oregon area, including the Ritter Collaborative, to share lessons learned and best practices.

1.4 Forest Health

Not covered in 2016-2017

1.5 Fire

- **Prescribed Fire Liability**

In November 2016, Ron Graham, Deputy Chief of the Protection Division to addressed members on Prescribed Fire and Smoke Management. He reported there were discussions going on in the Smoke Management Advisory Committee about a joint public outreach campaign between ODF and DEQ on smoke issues. The plan is to have all involved agencies on board with consistent messaging coming out of the Five Year Periodic Review. The CFF discussion offered support for this joint effort and would like to make sure small landowners are well represented to ensure their voice, concerns, and issues are respected if policy changes are proposed. One participant noted the largest barrier to prescribed burning for small landowners is liability. Mitigating liability would point to having landowners get together across a watershed or in partnership with public lands to get a prescribed burning plan. Actual burns would be completed across a landscape using naturally occurring fire breaks rather than holding the fire to landowner parcel boundaries.

1.6 Forest Chemical Use

Not covered in 2016-2017

1.7 Seed/Seedling Availability

Seed and seedling availability is a long-standing issue for small woodland owners due to irregular and/or unplanned harvesting. This year's CFF effort was in reaction to the lack of seedlings available for reforestation following wildfires in Grant and Baker County. Sen. Wyden's office offered support in finding a solution. Jen Gorski and Glen Ahrens at OSU Extension were interested in making it an OSU Extension priority in the coming year. CFF members, Bonnie Shumaker and Rex Storm put together an Executive Summary Seed and Seedling Availability for Family Forestland Owners which outlined the issue, resources, stakeholders and solutions.

Ryan Gordon established The Seedling Work Group which met in December. Members include OSU Extension, USFS, NRCS, ODF staff and industry. Solutions may require resources or coordination of current resources. Education was considered essential. Areas of need require a statewide analysis of available resources which takes time, resources and funding. Rex Storm stated CFF should have an ongoing relationship with this issue since reforestation is a core part of our business and emergency demands require strong data.

The OFRI Board is partnering with OSU to do a Reforestation Conference in Oregon in 2018. CFF could work on this and other topics to push at the conference.

The Western Competitive Grant application dealing with the seedling issue wasn't awarded. However, the USFS included \$50,000 in their allocation to ODF dedicated to seedling needs. ODF is working on the narrative and budget on how to put that to use.

1.8 BOF Directed Issues

- Riparian Rules

After the adoption of the proposed riparian rule prescription package in fall 2016, ODF's Private Forests division staff attended the October 2016 meeting to do a practice run through of the public hearings presentation in order to elicit member feedback.

- Specified Resource Sites
 - Marbled Murrelets

CFF has been briefed on the marbled murrelet issue and is aware that ODF's Private Forests division has prioritized this issue and is in the process of discussing next steps with stakeholders, landowners, State Forests, ODFW, and other Natural Resource agencies. At the direction of BOF, ODF is also developing a Technical Report on marbled murrelets that should be completed in the next 18-24 months. CFF will continue to play a role as this process moves forward.

- Bald Eagles

CFF has been briefed on the proposed rule revisions to bald eagle protections. ODF will continue protections for Bald Eagle nest sites and develop modified rules under the sensitive resource site rules. Private Forests division has presented this information and also a reference sheet on the rule analysis process. Members were given an opportunity to review and provide feedback on this topic.

- Monitoring Strategy
 - Eastern Oregon/Siskiyou Region Streamside Protection Review

Marganne Allen, Forest Health and Monitoring Manager and Daniel Olson, Monitoring Specialist attended the November 2016 and February 2017 meetings to ask members for support in the outreach efforts. In November 2016, the Board directed staff to immediately start reviewing streamside protection in eastern Oregon and Siskiyou geographic regions as a tie in to what has been happening with the Riparian Rules on the Westside. The Board asked Private Forests staff to develop a list of monitoring questions focused on the eastside, and to scope out methods that would be used in answering those questions to provide recommendations to them at their July 2017 meeting. The Board asked that stakeholders be involved throughout the process. This outreach was part of that process to help form the questions that best addressed the issue for analysis. CFF provided input to the process for designing the monitoring questions.

Tier 2 Issues

2.1 Forest Taxes and Forest Business

Not covered in 2016-2017

2.2 Educational needs for family forestland owners/engagement

Coordinated public and stakeholder education was considered a key effort under a variety of topics. In particular, working with partners like OSU Extension on:

- Training for Stewardship Foresters, Extension Foresters, and Consulting Foresters about the seedling resources that are available.
- Education of landowners on the importance of advanced planning of reforestation needs.
- Public training on the new public Subscription process. Members suggested that training should begin with some basics of the Forest Practices Act. Training sessions are planned in May and June of 2017.
- Woodward mentioned in follow up to the Seedling Availability issue that the OFRI Board approved partnering with OSU and others to do a Reforestation Conference in Oregon in 2018 similar to one

in northern California. She believed there is a lot of opportunity to partner on the Seedling Availability as a topic associated with the conference.

2.3 E-Notification

In March 2017, Joe Touchstone, Business Analyst for Private Forests Division updated members on FERNs development. The FERNs automated process was successfully launched with public outreach and has continued to work well. Software updates quickly added mobile capability for field applications and fire inspection reporting. A third launch was done in September 2016 with added features and enhancements like a more advanced search function. Release 4 will add an online Subscriber function to be available June 2017. This will enable citizens, municipalities, marketers and other agencies to enter specific areas they want to be alerted on when notifications are received for forest management activities in those subscribed areas. This service is provided free-of-charge.

2.4 Incentive Program Updates

Ryan Gordon provided updates on the Incentives Program throughout the year. Updates to the Oregon Forest Management Planning System to bring the plan in compliance with new standards. ODF also developed a charter for a working group that will meet annually to review and maintain the template, as well as continue development and outreach around the Forest Management Planning System.

The Department's statewide agreement with NRCS helps fund Stewardship Foresters to provide technical assistance for family forestland owners interested in NRCS incentive programs – most notably the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP). The ODF-NRCS relationship continues to grow and increased funding on the ground has led to more demand for assistance from ODF Stewardship Foresters. In response, ODF and NRCS are working to establish a much larger agreement with significantly more funding for technical assistance.

USFS funding for the Stewardship Program continues to be consistent. This program provides cost share for forest management planning, as well as time for Stewardship Foresters to provide technical assistance to family forest landowners. The Farm Bill authorizes many of the NRCS and USFS programs that help support family forest landowners. The Bill will be up for renewal in 2018 and there is a concerted effort among State Agencies as well as a number of NGOs to encourage continued Congressional support of these programs in the new Bill. The Farm Service Agency (FSA) Emergency Forest Restoration Program (EFRP) provides cost-share to landowners interested in re-establishing forest following a natural disaster. The program continues to be used in Baker and Grant Counties for wildfire, and has seen increased use in Western Oregon for both storm and drought-related damage.

2.5 Inter-generational issues

Not covered in 2016-2017

2.6 Wildland – Urban Interface (WUI)/All Lands Approach

Katie Morrison, ODF Program Specialist, gave an overview of the Federal Forest Restoration Program (FFR), followed by Jason Pettigrew, ODF Stewardship Forester in Klamath Falls, who explained how elements of FFR are playing out on the ground.

Morrison explained that FFR leverages state funds to increase the pace and scale of restoration on Federal lands. The impetus grew from the need to support rural economies while improving the health of nearly 16

million acres of federal land in Oregon. State and federal partners have focused on a collaborative approach to landscape scale projects, and finding efficiencies in the Federal project planning process. The Good Neighbor Authority (GNA), authorized in the 2014 Farm Bill, allows the State to work as a contractor on Federal lands – it enables ODF to administer timber sales on Federal lands. The hope is that this authority will allow ODF to complete projects more quickly.

The Klamath-Lake Forest Health Partnership was held up as a potential partnership model that could do a good job of engaging private forestland owners in larger scale forest and restoration treatments that stretch across public and private lands. This partnership focuses most of their efforts on federal landholdings where NEPA-ready projects have already been vetted, and then look to include adjacent private forests that can also benefit from the treatments. The key message to CFF, is that this is a unique business model that is probably the way of the future because it leverages different kinds of funding opportunities, authorities and resources to work on a landscape scale and address critical management and ecological issues on both public and private lands.

Pettigrew spoke about the Klamath-Lake Forest Health Partnership, which began in the early 1990s with a mission to facilitate restoration projects on private and public forest lands in Klamath and Lake Counties. He explained that it is difficult for Klamath and Lakeview forest landowners to provide any sustainable yields when balancing slow stand growth against the threats of drought, catastrophic wildfire, insects, disease, and local economies. In Klamath and Lake Counties the majority of lands are in Federal ownership, so there are large landscapes prone to severe wildfire. The Partnership has worked to focus on federal ground where NEPA ready projects can be moved forward through GNA, and they can leverage NRCS funds to complete work on adjacent private lands.

He gave an overview of the North Warner Multi-Ownership Project, which was recently awarded Joint Chiefs funding for work on both federal and adjoining private ground through the USFS and NRCS. These efforts are being combined with other potential treatments and timber sales made possible through GNA. Using GNA, timber sales move forward on NEPA-ready ground – ODF follows federal guidelines to layout a timber sale, but it moves forward through State processes using ODF staff. The ODF-NRCS Agreement is also an important component of delivering an all-hands, all-lands approach to forest restoration. ODF provides direct technical assistance in support of landowner engagement with NRCS cost-share programs. This includes completing inventories, developing layouts/prescriptions, and ensuring project completion. The result is a coordinated approach to forest restoration on both public and private ground.

ODF staff engaged with the FFR program must be well-versed in Fire, Stewardship Forestry and Timber Sale Administration – an all lands all hands approach to managing that portfolio. Responding from a ‘boots-on-the-ground’ perspective, Pettigrew believes that Oregon’s investment in its Federal lands is paying dividends. It’s a new business model that leverages different kinds of funding opportunities, authorities and resources to work on a landscape scale and address issues on both public and private ground.

2.7 Climate Change

Don Kaczmarek, ODF Seed Geneticist presented information on forest resiliency to climate changes. He shared factors affecting forest survival and growth and potentials for mitigating climatic effects over time. He presented information on temperature change and the effect on a tree’s respiration rates and what happens with high CO₂ concentrations which can influence growth rates.

He suggested one weapon to combat climate change is actually our tree improvement programs. Seed Improvement Programs look for a variety of traits like: growth, disease-resistance, drought tolerance. Landowners can also mitigate some climate change by modifying silvicultural regimes. They may want to thin more heavily, carry less trees to compensate for drought. We can also change genetic deployment strategies to mitigate some of these changes by switching species. One of the areas being considered is 'Assisted Migration'. Moving seed from an existing zone to new areas based on what you think the future climate could be. We can specifically design studies, put stress conditions on our orchard materials to understand which are the most resistant.

Potential Shared Meetings with State Stewardship Coordinating Committee

In February, a discussion on sharing a meeting platform between CFF and the State Stewardship Coordinating Committee (SSCC), a subcommittee of the Oregon Technical Advisory Committee (OTAC) occurred. Collectively, Private Forests managers envision potential synergy between the two groups. The CFF includes broad landowner representation and considers primarily issues that impact family forests. The SSCC, on the other hand, provides input and direction for the Department's Stewardship and Forest Legacy Programs; its membership includes a broad group of state and federal agencies. From the perspective of addressing landscape-level needs, it seems natural to bring leading landowners together with key agency leaders. Additionally, both committees have similar interests and objectives, and often receive analogous staff reports. Committee members agreed on the value of working together, suggesting one joint meeting per year with an eye toward opportunities for other shared sessions. Possible concepts for future collaboration included:

- Tree seedling availability
- Identification of geographic areas ripe for an All Lands approach.
- Adding value to the Klamath-Lake Partnership by finding funding for administrative direction.
- Looking at areas with threatened drinking water supplies coinciding with high wildfire risks.
- Determining the capacity in a given community for collaborative governance. (Finding local leadership potential.)
- Promoting use of prescribed fire.

2017-2018 Work Plan

Considering the progress made in gathering information in the past year and Board of Forestry priorities, the members propose the following prioritized Work Plan for FY 2017-18.

Tier 1 Issues

1.1 Water Quality

1.2 BOF Directed Issues

1.3 Forest Health

1.4 Fire

- Landowner Readiness and Capacity
- Prevention and Risk Reduction
- Prescribed Fire Liability/Smoke Management

1.5 Forest Chemical Use

1.6 Seed/Seedling Availability

1.7 Family Forest Homestead

- Zoning equity with farmland
- Intergenerational character of resource/land
- Urban/rural interface and link to stewardship opportunities

Tier 2 Issues

- 2.1 Forest Taxes and Forest Business/Succession
- 2.2 Educational needs for family forestland owners/engagement
- 2.3 E-Notification (schedule Subscriber module update)
- 2.4 Inter-generational issues/Barriers to Forestland Ownership
- 2.5 Climate Change
- 2.6 Ecosystem Services
- 2.7 Entry/Barriers to Forest Ownership/Landowner Viability
- 2.8 Conversion of eastside forestland
- 2.9 Specified Resource Sites
- 2.10 Wildlife Food Plots

Standing Agenda Items

- Legislative Updates
- Board of Forestry standing invitations to members
- Agency Budgets
- Division Updates
- Fire Season Updates
- Compliance Audit Reporting/Support
- Incentive Opportunities/Conservation Easements
- OSU Extension Updates
- Private and Federal Interface/WUI

Appendix

- A. Seed/Seedling Letter (Modified)
- B. EOA/Siskiyou Streamside Protection Review
- C. CFF Testimony to Joint Sub-Committee on Ways and Means

APPENDIX A

Seed and Seedling Availability for Family Forestland Owners

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Committee for Family Forestlands has identified gaps in current seedling availability creating seedling shortages for Family Forest (FF) landowners' reforestation needs. This report outlines the issues and recommendations to help remedy the problem.

GOAL/OBJECTIVES

- FF landowners can procure sufficient seedlings/zones/species to meet timely reforestation needs, necessary to keep Oregon forests sustainable.
- FF landowner education expanded surrounding reforestation planning, planting and FPA 'free-to-grow' accomplishment—as a necessity in-conjunction with their harvest plans.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

In recent years, some FF landowners have difficulty procuring sufficient seedlings from proper zones in a timely manner for their reforestation needs.

Key Problems:

- Closing of the ODF Phipps Nursery in 2008
- Nurseries don't want to speculate for FF landowners; most have a 20,000 minimum order
- Difficult to forecast FF seedling needs the 2 years in advance needed to grow seedlings
- Many FF harvests are need or market driven making it hard to anticipate needs in advance
- Lack of statewide data on FF owners' harvest volumes that generate seedling needs
- Many FF landowners assume seedlings are always available
- Education about replanting and free-to-grow doesn't always get through to FF owners
- Fire is unpredictable, but when it occurs it starts the 2-year timeline for reforestation and growing seedlings if there is a salvage harvest.

CURRENT RESOURCES FOR FF LANDOWNERS SEEDLING NEEDS

- SEED: Schroeder Seed Orchard, operated under ODF's Private Forest Division: Mission is to ensure genetically superior seeds are available to FF owners: 6% seed reserved for FF owners
- OSWA Cooperative Seedling Programs: Available in Washington, Columbia and Clackamas counties. Requires upfront funding and volunteers. Has risk of growing too much or too little, but can benefit with revenue and service for county chapter. Serves a small percentage of seedling needs.
- IFA Seedling Program – Grows for big contract growers. Surplus available to FF owners, but no surplus for last few years
- Private Lands Forest Network (PLFN) – focused on NE OR; has 3 coolers in La Grande
- Forest Seedling Network (FSN) – website created by Bob McNitt to connect seedling growers and landowners

POTENTIAL SUGGESTED SOLUTION ALTERNATIVES

- ODF's Western Competitive Grant to increase seed and seedling supplies for FF owners and Oregon Seed Bank. If received, a committee could look at solutions including but not limited to:
 - Starting additional cooperative seedling programs
 - Addressing risk to nurseries to speculate

AGENDA ITEM 2

Attachment 1

Page 13 of 20

- Improving coordination of FF owners projected needs
- Increasing education of FF owners on what needs to be done for reforestation or afforestation
- IFA is currently working on developing a website to gather together small orders to meet 20,000 minimum. Mike Taylor is contact person.
- ODF expanded role in education and forecasting tied to landowner harvest notification

BACKGROUND

The January 19, 2016 CFF meeting, held at OR Dept. of Forestry's J.E. Schroeder Seed Orchard and Seed Bank, focused on understanding how family forestland (FF) owners procure sufficient tree seedlings for reforestation projects statewide and the challenges they face.

- A. **Many small forest tracts.** Oregon family forestlands = 40,000 different owners; <5,000 acres each; 4,324,000 acres; 42% of all private forests
- B. **Infrequent FF harvest.** FF owners with non-forestry careers; limited reforestation knowledge & experience
- C. **Timing of FF harvest & reforestation is very cyclic.** Wide range of statewide harvest from FF —10-year average 333 million bf/year (93 to 558 mmbf/yr); harvest sensitive to small changes in log price or salvage-driven; causing wide variation in year-to-year FF reforestation acreage
- D. **Harvest & reforestation planning limited.** FF reforestation and seedling needs often unplanned in advance; many FF factors contribute to less FF reforestation planning
- E. **FF forests in many seed zones statewide.** 13 species; 16 zones for Douglas fir; 26 zones for ponderosa; plus, elevation bands in many zones
- F. **Spec seedling growing for FF always been challenging.** Historically it has been difficult for any seedling nursery to predict and sow sufficient seedling lots (numbers and zones) to meet OR FF reforestation demands
- G. **Phipps Nursery used to grow seedlings for FF needs.** The now-closed ODF DL. Phipps Nursery in Elkton, OR, from 1957-2008 had forecasted and grown sufficient seedling lots for Oregon FF needs, which were unmet by other nurseries (called “speculative growing”).
- H. **Schroeder Orchard provides seed.** The JE. Schroeder Seed Orchard and Seed Bank's mission is to ensure genetically-superior seeds are produced for western Oregon FF availability.
- I. **New tree seedling paradigm.** During the 1990s and 2000s, four additional major changes altered Oregon's tree seedling growing and planting:
 - 1) 90% decline in federal harvest and federal nurseries—caused 50% loss in OR nursery capacity;
 - 2) Scope of seedling zone growing reduced in half by federal exodus;
 - 3) Expansion of private commercial nurseries to replace seedling growing formerly done by federal and Phipps nurseries
 - 4) Nursery investment/capacity compression during Great Recession (2008-2012), causing reduced FF reforestation acreage
- J. **Recent harvest increases have stressed limited seedling availability.** Since 2013, increased market-driven harvest, and unexpected extra salvaging (fires/storms/pests), has made it

problematic for FF reforestation seedling availability. Seedling shortages have occurred for FF, and other forest categories.

- K. **Recent FF seedling needs are too difficult for nurseries to predict.** The region's private sector commercial nursery industry in recent years has generally *not* succeeded in speculative growing sufficient seedling lots for the highly-cyclic variation in Oregon FF needs.
- L. **FF landowner reforestation success at times is lacking.** There is room for improvement in educating FF owners in reforestation timeliness, seedling acquisition, planting techniques and free-to-grow completion.

CURRENT FF SEEDLING AND REFORESTATION RESOURCES

Existing programs below are not consistently meeting FF seedling/seed demands.

Direct Purchase from Commercial Nurseries – FF landowners can order or purchase seedlings—as available—from approximately 24 commercial tree nurseries that at-times may have quantities to sell to FF landowners. For example, IFA Nursery grows for large purchasers, but sells surplus seedlings to FF owners (none available recent years). IFA's Mike Taylor is to develop a website that would gather small orders to combine into their minimum 20,000 seedling lot size.

Reforestation by Forestry Consultant/Timber Purchaser – Some FF landowners hire a consultant, or the timber purchaser, to complete their reforestation project. Experienced forestry consultants may combine multiple planting projects to create larger sowing and/or seedling buys from a commercial tree nursery, which may speculative grow quantities for the consultant.

OSWA Cooperative Seedling Programs – County chapters of Washington, Columbia and Clackamas annually buy seed from Schroeder Orchard, pay to speculative grow for two years at commercial nursery, and sell to FF on a 6-month lead-time. Linn chapter also has a plant/seedling sale. Chapters invest upfront funding, volunteer effort, and risk too many or too few seedlings; but may benefit from revenue and service to FF members. OSWA programs serve just a portion of FF needs within a county.

Private Lands Forest Network (PLFN) – ODF leads a local cooperative in La Grande, which is focused on NE Oregon seed and seedling & seed needs, tree coolers, forecasts, cost-sharing, and sowing orders for all landowners. Although a good model, it is under-funded and limited. As with the OSWA programs, the PLFN has current risks and limits.

ODF Publication: 'Sources of Native Forest Nursery Seedlings 2014-16' – ODF periodically publishes a booklet that provides information, although nursery-provided seedling availability is rapidly out-of-date.

ODF Publications: "Guide to Reforestation in Oregon," <http://www.oregon.gov/ODF/Documents/WorkingForests/ReforestationGuide.pdf> and "Successful Reforestation, an Overview," <https://catalog.extension.oregonstate.edu/ec1498>

Forest Seedling Network (FSN) – An informative website that serves as both a FF information source and a marketplace for nurseries to list their current seedling availability for sale to FF. Bob McNitt's site connects seedling growers to landowners.

GAPS in SEEDLING & SEED AVAILABILITY

1. Absence of data throughout the system about annual seedling demand by FF landowners
2. Annual seedling needs for FF not forecasted by anyone; and subject to market-swings
3. Advance allocation of demand into sowing orders to nurseries not available
4. Commercial nurseries unlikely to speculative without annual data thus worsening FF seedling shortages
5. Commercial nurseries favor large industrial customers
6. Seed bank inventories periodically become depleted
7. Fire unpredictable and can necessitate FF replanting
8. Some FF landowners uninformed about reforestation planning and FPA 'free-to-grow' requirements
9. ODF and OSU foresters need more reforestation communication tools for FF landowners
10. FF ownerships may demonstrate some diminished reforestation compliance
11. Absence of coordination necessary to assist FF at reforestation

SOLUTION ALTERNATIVES

ODF is working with the Committee for Family Forestland and a Seed/Seedling workgroup to identify potential solutions in the 2017-2018 workplan aligned with staffing resources and funding availability.

APPENDIX B

March 2, 2017

TO: Marganne Allen, ODF

FROM: Committee for Family Forestlands (CFF)

RE: Siskiyou/Eastern Oregon Streamside Protection Review

During the February 2017 meeting of the Committee for Family Forestlands, members agreed to put some ideas down on paper to share with Dr. Allen of ODF as to the approach, and types of questions, ODF should be using in their design of the Siskiyou/Eastern Oregon Streamside Protection Review.

Various members of CFF offered opinions and there was agreement that a small group would put some ideas down on paper to inform the Streamside Review process. This memo is the result of the discussion among the small group, which consists of Ed Weber, Scott Gray, Evan Smith, and Jim James.

In terms of a general approach to collecting appropriate data to inform the review, CFF members agree that the following ideas warrant consideration:

- Given the complexity and dynamism of riparian zones, ODF should “go big” with a holistic approach that seeks to model, as best as possible, the interconnected, interdependent dynamic found in such areas. While this approach courts at least some additional uncertainty in the eventual models, it avoids the weakness of a more tailored approach (e.g., temperature only) that necessarily forces decision-makers to extrapolate results from a narrow basis that does not represent the full complexity of the whole. There are recognized stark differences in conditions and vegetation types in each region. Each region needs to be evaluated independently to understand the unique riparian functions needed and determine if a problem actually exists with the existing riparian rules. A problem with existing riparian rules should not be assumed without good scientific evidence such problems exist.
- The discussion raised the likelihood that good science is lacking in many of the areas to be addressed by the Streamside Protections Review. CFF views this as an opportunity to make advances in scientific model-building that improves our overall understanding of riparian zone dynamics both in these regions and potentially in many other areas of Oregon. This would be of benefit to small forestland owners, ODF officials charged with making decisions in these areas, and the citizens of Oregon.
- Key areas of concern for CFF, in terms of specific items that should be studied, include, but are not necessarily limited to, the health and resilience of fish populations, effects of buffer size, effects of water temperature, and effects of large, woody debris. Focusing on the complete list of ecological values of a riparian area rather than a single attribute will allow for the better modeling of natural variability we know is found in nature. Since there is a tremendous amount of research on the impacts to fish from riparian activities, we suggest the Department start by clearly understanding what we already scientifically know about fish needs from riparian areas, then determine what information, if any, is missing. Once missing science is determined, then determine the most effective way to generate the science needed to assist in making public policy.
- We also believe that the Department of Forestry is taking the right approach in first identifying what the question is about riparian functions, before trying to answer any questions about such functions. Any research to assist decision making needs to be clear on its objectives so it will provide useful answers.

AGENDA ITEM 2

Attachment 1

Page 17 of 20

Thank you for your consideration. Please let us know if you have any questions or need clarification on these ideas.

Respectfully submitted,

Ed Weber

Chair, CFF

APPENDIX C

April 5, 2017

Testimony to the Oregon Ways and Means Committee, Oregon State Legislature

My name is Ed Weber, I am a professor in the School of Public Policy at OSU and am also the Chair of the Committee for Family Forestlands, a standing committee commissioned by the Oregon legislature to advise the State Forester and the Oregon Board of Forestry on issues relevant to some 70,000 family forestland owners in the state.

I come before you today in support of the Oregon Department of Forestry's budget request for the next biennium. Typically, our attention is directed to the Board of Forestry and the State Forester. Today, I am here to underscore the importance of the work of ODF to family forestlands and their owners.

CFF members represent all geographic areas in Oregon as well as a wide range of private and agency interests related to family forestlands. We are familiar with the careful and well-considered budget that the Department has developed, and we, as a Committee, stand united in our support of the Department's budget request. We would like to call your attention to several key elements of the budget request.

1) Investment in the Department's Private Forestry program. We would like to thank this body for the investment made in this program over the past few legislative sessions. It has allowed ODF to build capacity in field level staff and services, programs that directly affect private forestland owners. In particular, these investments provide the kind of technical assistance, information and support services that enable family forestland owners to manage their forestlands in ways that benefit all Oregonians. The legislature's investments in private forestry programs support small landowners in their efforts to do the right thing as well as provide the Department with the capacity to fairly implement the Forest Practices Act, which helps all landowners meet their obligations to Oregon's current and future generations. We urge you to maintain a level of funding that enables the Department to continue providing needed assistance to small forestland owners and other private forestland owners.

2) Wildfire. The CFF has long been actively engaged in Departmental discussions about the best ways to provide wildfire protection on our state's forestlands. We strongly support the complex funding stream that balances public and private benefits and public and private costs. In addition, CFF is sensitive to the particular vulnerabilities of, and the importance of fire protection to both Eastside and Southern Oregon forests. We also applaud the ongoing efforts by ODF to work more closely with local fire districts and federal agencies to collaboratively approach and manage wildfire issues, including forest restoration projects. We recognize that the best approach to fire management is to have private and public landowners and authorities working together for the common goal of protecting forest resources from undue harm. The base general fund support in the ODF budget request is essential in meeting needs related to fire management across Oregon.

3) Efficiency and effectiveness. Finally, CFF would like to go on record as supportive of ODF's efforts to improve efficiency and effectiveness in the delivery of private forestry programs and services. CFF has provided input to these efforts, reviewed progress periodically, and commented on such efforts formally and informally. We believe that changes like a web-based notification of operations system, the development of unified plan approaches, and enhanced monitoring allow the Department to provide more direct services to landowners while improving regulatory oversight and performance related to the Forest Practices Act. These efforts should continue to be encouraged.

While we have called out these several items for particular attention, we want to underscore our general support for the overall budget request by ODF. As one CFF member reminded us, the overall investment of general fund dollars by Oregon in natural resources is relatively small. In forestry, even smaller. Yet all of us in Oregon love and value our forests and the benefits they provide.

Family forestlands are the ones most proximate to urban areas, make up much of the urban/wildland interface, and are the forests most familiar to Oregonians in the areas where we live, work and play. Family forestland owners may have diverse goals for their lands, but many public values accrue from these lands. Family forestland owners are committed to keeping forestland in forests. The budget request made by the Oregon Department of Forestry is a careful budget that will allow ODF to do its work and continue to perform valuable services for Oregon and her forests.