

**DRAFT Board of Forestry Meeting Minutes**

**June 5, 2019**

INDEX

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Page #</u>
<b>A. APRIL 24, 2019 MEETING MINUTES .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>B. APPROVAL OF 2020 RANGELAND PROTECTION ASSOCIATION BUDGETS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>C. ANNUAL LETTERS TO THE STATE FORESTER.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>D. AUDIT COMMITTEE CHARTER .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. STATE FORESTER, BOARD MEMBER, AND PUBLIC COMMENTS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. 2019 FIRE SEASON READINESS.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. APPROVAL OF FOREST PROTECTION DIVISION 2020 FISCAL BUDGETS AND RATES.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4. FOREST TRUST LANDS ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>5. SISKIYOU STREAMSIDE PROTECTIONS REVISION AND DECISION .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>6. ECOSYSTEM SERVICES VALUING .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>7. EXECUTIVE SESSION .....</b>	<b>14</b>

*Items listed in order heard.*

Complete audio recordings from the meeting and attachments listed below are available on the web at [www.oregonforestry.gov](http://www.oregonforestry.gov).

- (1) Handout, [Written Testimony by Gray for Board Member, State Forester, and Public Comments](#), Agenda Item 1
- (2) Handout, [Written Testimony by Van Dyke and Stevens for Board Member, State Forester, and Public Comments](#), Agenda Item 1
- (3) Presentation, [2019 Fire Season Readiness and Fiscal Year 2020 District Budgets](#), Agenda Item 2 and 3
- (4) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Yamamoto for Forest Trust Lands Advisory Committee](#), Agenda Item 4
- (5) Presentation, [Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (6) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Erickson for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (7) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Detwiler for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (8) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Nawa for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (9) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Rowe for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (10) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Yarbrough for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (11) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Case for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (12) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Barnes for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5

- (13) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Messinger for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (14) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Shumaker for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (15) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Storm for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (16) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Brown for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (17) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Ferrari for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (18) Handout, [Written Testimony by Marsh for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (19) Handout, [Written Testimony by Golden for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (20) Handout, [Written Testimony by Klayman and Harper for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (21) Handout, [Written Testimony by Brown and Smitherman for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (22) Handout, [Written Testimony by Scurlock for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (23) Handout, [Written Testimony by Youren for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (24) Handout, [Written Testimony by Crawford for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (25) Handout, [Written Testimony by Laird for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (26) Handout, [Written Testimony by Dickman for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (27) Handout, [Written Testimony by David for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (28) Handout, [Written Testimony by Niemi for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (29) Handout, [Written Testimony by Stand Up for Southern Oregon Streams Campaign for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (30) Handout, [Written Testimony by We Need Stronger Siskiyou Stream Protections for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (31) Handout, [Written Testimony by Increase Riparian Protections for Southern Oregon Streams for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (32) Handout, [Written Testimony by Streams in the Siskiyou Region Deserve Equal Protection for Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision](#), Agenda Item 5
- (33) Presentation, [Ecosystem Services Valuing](#), Agenda Item 6
- (34) Handout, [Restoring Oregon Coast Coho Salmon Survey DRAFT](#), Agenda Item 6
- (35) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by James for Ecosystem Services Valuing](#), Agenda Item 6

In accordance with the provisions of ORS 526.016, a meeting of the Oregon Board of Forestry was held on June 5th, 2019 at the Oregon Department of Forestry Headquarters on 2600 State Street Salem, OR 97310.

Chair Imeson called the public meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Board Members Present:

Nils Christoffersen  
Cindy Deacon Williams  
Joe Justice  
Jim Kelly  
Brenda McComb  
Mike Rose  
Tom Imeson

Absent:

**CONSENT AGENDA:** Mike Rose motioned for approval of the consent agenda. Cindy Deacon Williams seconded the motion. Voting in favor of the motion: Nils Christoffersen, Cindy Deacon Williams, Tom Imeson, Joe Justice, Jim Kelly, Mike Rose and Brenda McComb. Against: none. With Board consensus for Items A through D, these items were approved.

A. APRIL 24, 2019 MEETING MINUTES

Approval of Board Meeting Minutes.

**Action: The Board approved minutes from the April 24, 2019 Board meeting.**

B. APPROVAL OF 2020 RANGELAND PROTECTION ASSOCIATION BUDGETS

To obtain Board approval of the annual budgets of the Rangeland Fire Protection Associations currently operating in eastern Oregon.

**Action: The Board approved the fiscal year 2020 budgets of the Ashwood-Antelope, Bakeoven-Shaniko, Blue Mountain, Brothers Hampton, Burnt River, Crane, Fields-Andrews, Frenchglen, Gateway, Greater Pine Valley, High Desert, Ironside, Jordan Valley, Juntura, Lone Pine, Lookout Glasgow, Post Paulina, Silver Creek, Twickenham, Vale, Wagontire, Warner Valley, WC Ranches, and Wheeler County Fire & Rescue Rangeland Fire Protection Associations.**

C. ANNUAL LETTERS TO THE STATE FORESTER

To report to the Board concerning the contents of the annual letters received from the nine non-operating forest protective associations and the written responses made to those letters.

**Information Only.**

D. AUDIT COMMITTEE CHARTER

Internal Auditing standards and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) require that internal audit functions and audit committees have a formal charter that describes the purpose, authority, responsibilities, and structure of the two activities. The charter is used to direct the activities and define the scope and expectations of the internal audit function and the Department's Audit Committee. Internal auditing standards require that the audit committee

charter be approved by a governing board. For the Department of Forestry, the Board of Forestry is the governing board of the audit committee.

**Action: The Board approved the Oregon Department of Forestry Audit Committee Charter provided in Attachment 1 to comply with internal auditing standards and OAR guidelines.**

## **ACTION AND INFORMATION:**

### 1. STATE FORESTER, BOARD MEMBER, AND PUBLIC COMMENTS

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 – (34 minutes and 47 seconds – 11.9 MB)

Chair Imeson commented on:

- Public Meeting will be live streamed.
- Executive Session is scheduled.
- Public comment open for each topic, and not to exceed 30 minutes.

State Forester Daugherty commented on:

- Acknowledged public state employees achievement and recognition at a recent Governor's proclamation signing for dedicated service, as well as hosting these ambassadors of public service for promoting positivity in the workplace.
- Provided a legislative update on the Department's budget, fire protection funding proposals, and the harvest tax bill.
- The initiation of the Board's two year planning cycle. Described the information that will be presented to the Board to inform the planning process, and involvement of the Divisions as they prepare strategic initiatives for the development of the Board's work plans.
- The November science and policy workshop framework in the context of the Forestry Program for Oregon. Explained that many natural resource issues are complex requiring transdisciplinary solutions, and outlined the intention behind the workshop to help the Board develop common understanding around policy formation.
- Followed up with Jason Miner, Governor's office representative for Natural Resources, confirmed that the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) is the Governor's priority and the importance of working with federal partners, as the Department continues to work on this project. Reviewed the continued work on Department improvements to business and operations. Discussed ideas for alternative sources of revenue and the Department's willingness to continue coordinating with the Governor's office, but have minimum resources to further develop the proposed ideas.
- Noted the progress of the Department's work on the Good Neighbor Authority (GNA) project under the Federal Forest Restoration Program. Listed the recent timber sales, acknowledged the good work and coordination of field offices, as well as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis funded for future sales. Explained the benefits from timber sales, described the pathways to shared stewardship through GNA work, and the Department's dedication to invest state dollars to achieve program work. Reviewed the shared stewardship agreement goals, operational principles, and identified themes by the Forest Service and the Department.
- Reviewed the efforts of the Governor's Wildfire Response Council and continued progress of the committees.

Board Members commented on Governor's Wildfire Response Council (GWRC):

- Federal Forest Subcommittee Chair Nils Christoffersen reviewed his involvement with the Council, listed the various work groups involved, and the work they plan to report out on.
- Impressive and diverse group of stakeholders participating, which required more foundational work at the beginning, and looked forward to seeing the work produced by these work groups.

Board Members comments:

- Joe Justice, attended many Forest Practice Advisory Committee meetings over the last month, and met folks who work with FPA implementation. He commended the ODF staff involvement in organizing these meetings, and explained how committees support the Board process.
- Cindy Deacon-Williams, attended an International Conference on Trout and Salmon, where common themes regarding climate change, species loss, aquatic systems temperatures and flow, as well as land management were discussed. She encouraged fellow Board members to continue to look at new information, as many aquatic systems function similarly worldwide, to help the Board make policy decisions in the future.

Public Testimony:

- Claire Klock provided oral testimony to follow-up on previous testimony made on the amount of clear cutting in coastal and cascade ranges. He stated Federal and State lands may have the majority of late seral stage and mature old growth forests. Endorsed balanced management of these forestlands from thinning to preserving habitats.
- Aisha Aiello from American Forest Resource Council, provided oral testimony on outdoor recreation and the importance of active management. She listed recreational activities that take place in Oregon and how they benefit the state's economy. Asked for responsible logging and reforestation efforts on State and Federal lands for wildlife, as well as for recreation.
- Glenna Gray submitted written testimony ([attachment 1](#)) on Oregon Forest Practices Act. Requested Board to reinstate timber industry tax, to change clearcutting practices, to fund training for timber industry employees, and to stop pesticide use.
- Bob Van Dyke from Wild Salmon Center submitted written testimony ([attachment 2](#)) regarding the Forest Practices Compliance Audit 2017, authored by Don Stevens. Stevens commented on the study's approach, design, and analysis. He offered his observations and cited references.

### **Information Only.**

#### 2. 2019 FIRE SEASON READINESS

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 – (38 minutes and 16 seconds – 13.5 MB)

Presentation ([attachment 3](#))

Doug Grafe, Fire Protection Division Chief, introduced the presenters and provided an overview on topics presented. Nick Yonker, Smoke Management Program Manager, referred to the [presentation](#) while reviewing the key indicators and weather aspects utilized for predicting fire season activity in the west and east of the Cascades. Ron Graham, Fire Protection Deputy Chief, stated the weather outlook is one of many tools to anticipate and prepare for each fire season, and reviewed wildland fire potential outlooks from June to September. Graham offered a snapshot on fire statistics year-to-date and the above normal significant wildland fire potential for 2019. He stated 2019 is trending similar to 2018 with an above average number of fires and acres burned over a 10-year span. Graham reviewed average acres burned by decade, and discussed how the Department prepares for this event, and reviewed each essential element for fire season readiness, from lessons learned to severity program. He emphasized how partnerships are

critical for the successfulness of season readiness towards a complete and coordinated system. Graham explained how strategic investments became available to the Department from landowner dollars from the Oregon Forest Land Protection Fund (OFLPF), then described how each resource acquired will enhance the protection system across the state. He reviewed aviation resources, the severity program, and call-when-needed resources.

Board commented on the 2019 Fire Season Readiness presentation.

- Discussed the meaning of keys indicators and how they speak to the baseline of normal wildland fire potential trend over the past 10 to 20 years.
- Discussed how fuel on the ground is considered with the key indicators. Fuel loading and fuel moisture is tracked throughout the year. As 2019 progresses, the dead fuel moisture would decrease, increasing the risk.
- Inquired about how the average acres burned by decade increases the amount of exposure hours, and injuries increase. This information is currently not tracked along the same graph. The State Forester reflected on the Secretary of State audit noting an increase in staff workloads are unsustainable in the long-term and may present more risk to the agency. He emphasized how safety is a core value and focus for the Department's work. Discussed including safety with the fire season close out report.
- Division explained agenda item C, Klamath forest protection association letter.
- Declared the Eastern Oregon communities are very excited in the Department's investments in 2019 for fire season readiness.
- Reviewed the option of appealing to non-profit organizations in Eastern Oregon, to pilot wildland red card training to help meet the call of the fire season surge.

Public Testimony: None

### **Information Only.**

3. APPROVAL OF FOREST PROTECTION DIVISION 2020 FISCAL BUDGETS AND RATES  
[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (5 minutes and 7 seconds – 1.76 MB)  
Presentation ([attachment 3](#))

Doug Grafe, Fire Protection Division Chief, commented that a decision is in front of the Board. Ron Graham, Fire Protection Deputy Chief outlined what the Board is to decide on, whether to approve the Division's fiscal year budgets and rates. He stated per ORS 477.265, the Board must review and provide final approval on all Forest Protection District budgets including the pro-rated assessment acreage rates. He explained the fund distribution thresholds and how the budgets provides funding to the base level of fire protection. He provided background on the complete and coordinated fire protection system, and identified key partners that maintain this century old system effectiveness. Graham described the budget development process and reviewed the statute that mandates this budget development process.

### **Action: Approve all Fiscal Year 2020 district and association protection budgets as presented in Attachment 1.**

Mike Rose motioned for approval of all Fiscal Year 2020 district and association protection budgets. Nils Christoffersen seconded the motion. Voting in favor of the motion: Nils Christoffersen, Cindy Deacon Williams, Tom Imeson, Joe Justice, Jim Kelly, Mike Rose and Brenda McComb. Against: none. Motioned

carried. With Board consensus for the Fiscal Year 2020 district and association protection budgets were approved.

Public Testimony: None

4. FOREST TRUST LANDS ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY  
[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (25 minutes and 32 seconds – 8.77 MB)

David Yamamoto, Chair for the Forest Trust Land Advisory Committee (FTLAC), provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 4](#)) to the Board on multiple topics. In his testimony, Yamamoto provided a letter from the County revenue office listing how the revenue received by the Department is distributed between the special districts and counties. As well as, included a graph for the average annual wages of 2017 employment, per industry in Oregon, and stated the data was secured from the Oregon Employment Department. Yamamoto stated more work to be done on the Forest Management Plan (FMP) revision. Commented on whether FTLAC can support a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) that may violate the agreement the Department has with Trust counties. He reviewed how modern sustainable forest practices can offer more carbon sequestration. Yamamoto discussed proper forest management and the influence it has on wildfire prevention. Closed with how encouraged he was with the increase in harvest levels.

Public Testimony:

- John Sweet, Vice Chair of FTLAC, provided oral testimony to the Board on comments that were offered at the April FTLAC meeting. He described how Bureau of Land Management (BLM) contributed to the decline of major timber harvests in Coos County. He commented on the other lands that reside in Coos County boundaries, and how very little harvest has taken place on these lands. He outlined the deteriorating state of the timber industry in Coos County, and described the community impacts from a lumber mill closure. Sweet recognized that Coos County is among the eight worst counties in the state dealing with poverty. He stated understanding, and recognition for the various pressures on the Board. Sweet closed by commenting on the value of rural communities in the Oregon landscape.

Board commented on Forest Trust Lands Advisory Committee Testimony.

- Discussed the revenue distribution from the Department to Tillamook County and all other special districts. Asked if the County considered showing the shared percentages of all total budgets and include timber harvest sales in the special district locations, this may provide greater context to the Board.

**Information Only.**

5. SISKIYOU STREAMSIDE PROTECTIONS REVISION AND DECISION  
[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (2 hours, 36 minutes and 26 seconds – 54 MB)  
Presentation ([attachment 5](#))

Lena Tucker, Private Forests Division Chief, introduced the presenters of the Siskiyou Streamside Protections revision and decision [presentation](#), and outlined the objectives.

Marganne Allen, Forest Health and Monitoring Manager, described the monitoring program's objectives, strategy, and cycle. She emphasized the purpose of the monitoring program, how the Board's guidance overlays with program work, and how the monitoring is reported.

Allen provided an overview of the Siskiyou region monitoring strategy and Board direction. She explained the purpose behind reviewing the Siskiyou region, described what was reviewed, and the method used for the review. Described the decisions in front of the Board and outlined their options. She commented that sufficiency rules for stream temperature and Desired Future Condition (DFC) have contrasting methods to determine sufficiency. Allen highlighted the criteria assessed for stream temperature, the challenges of sufficiency for DFC, and additional goals for the systematic review. She listed the contextual information provided by partner agencies that are pertinent to the Board's decision, from fish status and trend to water quality for the Siskiyou region.

Ariel Cowan, Monitoring Specialist, shared the systematic review results and definitions. She listed the results on stream temperatures against water quality standards. She listed the DFC results, and the limited metrics from the systematic review to answer whether streamside stands achieved DFC or on a trajectory to achieve DFC. She outlined the stakeholder and tribal input themes and ODF responses. Cowan reviewed the Board decisions and referenced the Division's decision support document as a reference tool for the Board.

Kyle Abraham, Private Forests Deputy Chief, offered information on the Division's staff capacity, current projects, and prioritization of staff workload. Asked the Board to consider tradeoffs of the monitoring team's work as they decide on next steps. He listed the Division's recommendations and opened up the presentation to Board questions.

Board commented on the Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision presentation.

- Asked if lidar data for that area was reviewed for pre and post harvests. The Division discussed the context of the suite of products, and how this request could be part of future products developed.
- Division staff provided a brief overview on Board's decisions around the premise of the Systematic Review (SR) to the Siskiyou region, when studies exist beyond geographic boundaries. Discussed how the Board came to this decision and how the scope was defined.
- Reviewed the contextual information from Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), and specifically the Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL) developed in this region. Discussed if DEQ would be able complete expanded analysis as an example of a potential next step in the Siskiyou review process.

#### Invited Testimony:

- Dave Erickson from Southwest Regional Forest Practices Committee (SW RFPC) provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 6](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic and recommended that the Board accept the Division staff recommendation. Suggested for the Department to formulate an approach to conducting studies in the Siskiyou region, when testing sufficiency of the Forest Practice Act (FPA) rules. Offered SW RFPC participation history, as context to the Board. Encouraged the Board to maintain the rule analysis process and complete monitoring studies to determine best management practices as it relates to the FPA. Mentioned areas of study if monitoring efforts take place, and reminded the Board to utilize their advisory committees.
- Stacey Detwiler from Rogue Riverkeeper provided oral and written testimony with a presentation ([attachment 7](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic. She provided background on the organization and their mission. Stated that the Siskiyou region must be protected under the same criteria already implemented throughout the remaining Western Oregon. She reviewed the historical decisions and ideal processes to follow in the area to determine the best criteria for the region. She provided

quotes and other analyses to reinforce the need for action to strengthen stream buffer requirements in the Siskiyou region, and urged the Board to act.

- Richard Nawa from Klamath-Siskiyou Wildlands Center provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 8](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic. He urged the Board to adopt rules for the Siskiyou region. Explained the history of the Siskiyou region plan development with BLM and USFS, one for Southern region and separate one for Coastal and valley region of Western Oregon. Offered an example of fish biology and how it relates to Federal land management. Asked the Board to consider using the same unified standards for stream protection.
- Blake Rowe provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 9](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic. Stated he was a former stakeholder who participated in the 1994 riparian rules process and working groups that conducted adequacy reviews of the forest practice rules. He provided a recap of his experiences, of the science presented, and reviewed the various elements that were considered in the rulemaking process. He highlighted the past goals and the positive outcomes from this work. Urged the Board to not guess, to not use model data from other regions, and to conduct work on the ground in the Siskiyou region before making a decision.
- Anna Yarbrough provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 10](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic. Asked the Board to conduct reliable, not-rushed research to inform their decision.
- Patti Case from Green Diamond Resource Company, provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 11](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic and aired support for the Division staff recommendation. Also supported the Department's desire to conduct additional research and monitoring to provide a scientific foundation for Siskiyou region riparian rules. Encouraged the Board to consider the most appropriate protection for working forestlands, and are ready to implement a monitoring plan that will provide necessary data to inform the rulemaking.
- Seth Barnes from Oregon Forest and Industries Council (OFIC), provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 12](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic and reviewed the relevant history of the Oregon Forest Practices Act, from 1987 to present. Urged the Board to accept the Division staff recommendation, and asked them to direct the Department to design a monitoring project that will inform rulemaking process.
- Bob Messinger from Eastern Oregon Regional Forest Practice Committee (EO RFPC), provided written testimony ([attachment 13](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic. Asked the Board to direct the Division to continue to use the designed decision support document to review the existing literature relative to the Siskiyou region. Urged the Board to continue focusing on goals that protect stream temperatures, and desired future conditions of streamside stands. Supported the Division staff recommendation.
- Bonnie Shumaker from Committee for Family Forestlands (CFF), provided written testimony ([attachment 14](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic. Supported the Division staff recommendation, and asked the Board to utilize the current body of peer reviewed studies, collect more data, and secure funds to assess FPA rules effectiveness in the Siskiyou region.

#### Public Testimony:

- Clair Klock provided oral testimony to the Board on the Siskiyou topic. Asked the Board to set a goal to maintain tree shade and urged them to apply western Oregon rules to the Siskiyou region.
- Bob Van Dyke from Wild Salmon Center, provided oral testimony to the Board on the Siskiyou topic. Asked the Board to do what they can to meet Protecting Coldwater Criterion. Commented on the degradation of this region and to assess how effective stream buffers are. Stated rules must be implemented as a patch until realistic science can be researched.
- Rex Storm from Associated Oregon Loggers, provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 15](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic. Supported the Division staff recommendation, and

recommended to formulate a study to test rule sufficiency for desired future conditions. Recognized that cooperative stewardship is key to make the FPA rules effective in practice.

- Dan Brown, from the Environmental Protection Agency Region 10, provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 16](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic. Shared concern that the current forest practices in the Siskiyou are not protective of water quality standards. Stated that privately managed forestlands within the Siskiyou are listed as impaired for temperature and sedimentation. Offered many analyses and statistics to support these findings. Informed the Board that existing forestry practices do not ensure streams will meet water quality standards, and urged them to accept greater riparian buffers and take action.
- Megan Tuttle from Weyerhaeuser, provided oral testimony to the Board on the Siskiyou topic. Supported Division staff recommendation, to research additional information in the Siskiyou region and aired choice for Option C as a secondary to the initial recommendation.
- Chandra Ferrari from Trout Unlimited provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 17](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic. Encouraged the Board to find that current streamside rules for Siskiyou streams do not meet the Protecting Cold Water criterion (PCW) and are degrading water resources. Urged the Board to take action and to accept staff recommendation as presented.
- Representative Pam Marsh submitted written testimony ([attachment 18](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic. Urged the Board to review the information submitted by Scurlock, Detwiler, and other stakeholders regarding the Siskiyou Streamside Protections. Asked for the Board to consider aligning the rules to the water quality standards under the Clean Water Act.
- Senator Jeff Golden submitted written testimony ([attachment 19](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic. Asked the Board to amend the current rules to ensure adequate environmental protection for the Siskiyou region's water quality, and that complies with Protecting Cold Water Criterion.
- Ben Klayman and Craig Harper from the Medford Water Commission submitted written testimony ([attachment 20](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic. Urged the Board to strengthen stream buffer rules in the Siskiyou region to meet the same standard of western Oregon.
- Paula Brown and Julie Smitherman from the City of Ashland submitted written testimony ([attachment 21](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic. Urged the Board to strengthen stream buffer rules in the Siskiyou region to meet the same standard of western Oregon.
- Mary Scurlock from the Oregon Stream Protection Coalition submitted written testimony ([attachment 22](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic. Urged the Board to find that the Protecting Coldwater Criterion (PCW) has not been met under the current forest practices rule in the region, and offered an analysis to support that the Board has a duty to act in protecting streams.
- Joseph Youren from the Audubon Society of Lincoln City submitted written testimony ([attachment 23](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic. Asked the Board to direct the Department to develop rules for meaningful logging practices, and to work on Siskiyou streamside protections.
- Jake Crawford from the Native Fish Society submitted written testimony ([attachment 24](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou Topic, and advocated for the native fish in Southern Oregon. He stated there is evidence to support that current stream buffer protections are inadequate for protecting water temperatures for native fish, and requested the Board to review available scientific data available when moving forward with a rulemaking process to improve stream buffers.
- Geoff Laird submitted written testimony ([attachment 25](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic, and asked the Board to move forward with protecting southern Oregon stream buffers.
- Alan Dickman submitted written testimony ([attachment 26](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic, and urged the Board to strengthen the Forest Practices Act to include protective stream buffers.
- Carla David submitted written testimony ([attachment 27](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic, and urged the Board to move forward with rulemaking process to improve stream buffer protections.

- Ernie Niemi submitted written testimony ([attachment 28](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic. Recommended the Board to review their past decisions, and develop a more comprehensive analytical framework to evaluate forest values, social and economic benefits from forests. He urged the Board to review economic consequences of resource management and incorporate these alternatives as a new rule for stream side buffers in southern Oregon is developed.
- *Stand up for Southern Oregon Streams* campaign submitted written testimony ([attachment 29](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic, and urged the Board to move forward on a rulemaking process to improve stream buffer protections for southern Oregon Streams under the Forest Practices Act.
- *We Need Stronger Siskiyou Stream Protections* campaign submitted written testimony ([attachment 30](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic, and urged the Board to move forward on a rulemaking process to improve stream buffer protections for the Siskiyou Region.
- *Increase Riparian Protections for Southern Oregon Streams* campaign submitted written testimony ([attachment 31](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic, and urged the Board to move forward on a rulemaking process to strengthen stream buffer standards for Oregon waterways.
- *Streams in the Siskiyou Region Deserve Equal Protection* campaign submitted written testimony ([attachment 32](#)) to the Board on the Siskiyou topic, and urged the Board to begin rule development to meet the Coldwater criterion in the Siskiyou Region of Southwest Oregon.

Division and Board discussion on the Siskiyou Streamside Protections Revision and Decision.

- Chair Imeson asked the Division staff to review the recommendation again, and offer further information on the potential agency coordination between DEQ and ODF, as they explore the relationship around the Forest Practices Act (FPA) and TMDLs. The Division asked the Board to allow them more time to meet with DEQ to identify a work plan that they could bring back to the Board in September and offered the Board a revised staff recommendation. The Board brainstormed and offered suggestions on how the recommendation could be framed.
- Jennifer Wigal, DEQ Deputy Water Quality Administrator, commented that determining Water Quality Standard (WQS) is complex. She explained how ODF and DEQ could work together on the work plan to review the TMDL's framework, integrate the water quality information from the basin with the understanding that the data collected is potentially representative of multiple aspects on the landscape; to create a framework that the Board could use in evaluating options. She remarked how DEQ has worked with many other agencies or data products have contributed to local and Federal entities on land management and water quality issues. Stated to the Board that each agency has different authorities, with different lens and objectives. DEQ planned to work with the Board, shares concerns on water quality in this region, and willing to work with the Department on TMDL implementation. State Forester Daugherty reviewed past actions, statutory ties, and collaborations between agencies when each other engages in rulemaking.
- Discussed with the Division on broadening the net of existing data and available studies, versus introducing new field studies. The Board further discussed the potential analyses to consider, as the Division widened the net of information.
- The Board shared positions around water quality degradation from existing riparian buffers in the Siskiyou, and dialogued with one another on how additional information could benefit the decision-making and rule analysis process. Further discussion about the decision's complexity, and how a balance must be made between short-term issues and long-term resilient goals.

Chair Imeson asked if there was a motion to accept the revised staff recommendation.

Mike Rose motioned to accept the revised staff recommendation. To formulate a range of approaches to study sufficiency of the rules. The Department will work with DEQ to develop a work plan to address

fundamental questions related to approaches for water quality protections and bring this to the Board as a September monitoring update. The objective would be to better understand agency approaches, alignment or gaps, evaluate existing TMDL data, and analysis and identify where additional data or analysis may be needed. Joe Justice seconded the motion. Board discussion followed.

Cindy Deacon-Williams offered a modification to the motion. Board discussion continued.

The Board reviewed past rulemaking analysis and discussions where Board direction has been unclear or motions were too intricate to complete with the available staff workload and capacity. Division staff explained that a level of analysis would be required to review each additional research study or data set in relation to the FPA and WQS, and synthesized into a work plan for the Board by September.

Cindy Deacon-Williams motioned to modify the motion to define the range of approaches listed in the revised staff recommendation, to include information from Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI), relevant studies from other geographic areas, climate projections, and habitat relationship. She asked to modify the Systematic Review's objectives and remove Desired Future Conditions, and principally focus on temperature. Brenda McComb seconded the motion. Voting in favor of the motion: Cindy Deacon Williams and Brenda McComb. Against: Nils Christoffersen, Tom Imeson, Joe Justice, Jim Kelly, and Mike Rose. With a minority, the modified motion did not pass.

Chair Imeson returned the Board to vote on the original motion to accept the revised staff recommendation. Prior to the vote, the Division sought clarification from the Board on the interpretation of the second part of the revised staff recommendation and confirmed with the Board that the range of approaches to study sufficiency of rules may include existing information from EPA, DOGAMI, GIS, climate projections and relevant studies from other geographic studies similar to the Siskiyou region. The Division stated this wider net of information gathering and analysis will be limited, as the Division's capacity to conduct an extensive analysis is limited, and will strive to prepare options for the Board to review by the September Board meeting.

**Action: The Board determined that for FPA rules on small and medium fish streams for clearcut and thinning harvest types<sup>1</sup> in the Siskiyou region using vegetation prescriptions, there is inadequate evidence to decide on sufficiency of these rules in meeting water quality temperature standards and DFC as it relates to stand structure and shade. The Board directed the department to formulate a range of approaches to study sufficiency of rules, including additional work with DEQ and further evaluation of Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL).**

Voting in favor of the original motion: Nils Christoffersen, Tom Imeson, Joe Justice, Jim Kelly, Mike Rose, and Brenda McComb. Against: Cindy Deacon Williams. With a majority vote, the motion carried.

6. ECOSYSTEM SERVICES VALUING

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (43 minutes and 8 seconds – 14.8 MB)

Presentation ([attachment 33](#))

Brandon Kaetzel, Department economist, introduced the Oregon State University (OSU) presenter, recapped the information that was provided to the Board, and reviewed the [presentation](#) goals.

---

<sup>1</sup> Clearcut (Harvest Type 2, 3) and thin (Harvest Type 1) as per OAR 629-600-0100(31), (32), (33).

David Lewis, Professor of Applied Economics from OSU, provided an overview of ecosystem services, and reviewed examples of these services in Oregon timberland context. He discussed how the framework for ecosystem services is utilized in academia through ecological production function evaluation and economic valuation methodology to determine values of ecosystem services. He described how this framework can be included in policy making, the values create a set of benefits and costs for rules and decisions.

Lewis focused on the economic valuation methods portion of the framework, and offered a case study example to illustrate the various methods used to determine value of an ecosystem service. He explained how research in determining the public benefits of a service can be difficult, since many benefits are non-market and values are considered non-use. He distributed a handout ([attachment 34](#)) to the Board on a recent study that utilized a stated preference method, to estimate the public perceived value of Oregon coast Coho. Lewis outlined how an experimental study is designed, conducted, evaluated, and recorded to determine the change of an ecosystem service value. Discussed the intent behind the experiment is to measure people's values and different methodological approaches can be used depending upon the field of ecosystem services you are attempting to value. Explained the scope of work, length of time, and costs associated in crafting a new experimental study.

Lewis offered a recommendation to the Board and how to integrate the framework into the Board's decision making process. To consider investing in original knowledge specific to Oregon's forests, for a small subset of ecosystem services that may be affected by Board rules and decisions. He commented that by limiting focus to a small subset this would allow studies to be more manageable, to allow for coordination of ecological production functions with economic valuation functions. Lewis closed by commenting how the Board could utilize and track the subset of information for future decisions.

Board commented on the Ecosystems Services Valuing presentation.

- Discussed methodology behind the general population survey, the average response rate to surveys, and how sample selection bias may impact study results.
- Reviewed the function of the survey results, and discussed the importance on generating an evaluation method that allows the evaluator some flexibility in determining value by establishing a lower and upper boundary.
- Expanded on the experimental study concept intent, which was to develop information for the researcher, who can aggregate the data in many different ways, depending upon what benefits are of interest.
- Discussed how the experimental survey was designed to provide the population awareness on the threatened and endangered species in the region, and how the valuation is for one species. Expanded on how the studies are designed for general population, not built to respond as they were on a board. Revisited the study's intent, to value an ecosystem service and the costs associated with different scenarios. Explained any questions on tradeoffs are limited to the attributes included in the survey. A multi-ecosystem services survey can be developed and survey methods could be flexible enough to extrapolate extinction trends.

#### Public Testimony:

- Jim James from Oregon Small Woodlands Associations provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 35](#)) to the Board on Ecosystem Services Valuing. He aired support of the ecological values concept. He stated the greatest contribution to protecting ecological values is to maintain forests. He discussed conversion of agriculture land versus forestland. James recognized the contributions made by landowner communities, and commented on what this community may or

may not support to ensure these ecological values are sustained. He remarked on how the public could contribute to sustaining and protecting ecological values. Urged the Board to utilize credible science when evaluating regulation changes and the impact to private forestlands.

State Forester Daugherty asked James to provide a status update of the Legislative concept HB 2469 to the Board. James indicated that the second dwelling bill passed the house and senate, and anticipated that the bill will be signed by the Governor. He provided credit to the Family Forest for Oregon and Department staff for the work done to help find solutions that fit for everyone.

**Information Only.**

7. **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

*Chair Imeson* proceeded with the formal Executive Session announcement.

The Board of Forestry entered into Executive Session for the purpose of consulting with legal counsel regarding the Board's legal rights and duties in regards to current litigation or litigation likely to be filed [ORS 192.6600(2)(h)].

No decisions were made during Executive Session. The Board exited the Executive Session and reconvened meeting.

**Information Only.**

With no further business before the Board, Chair Imeson adjourned the public meeting at 3:56 pm.

---

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Peter Daugherty



---

Peter Daugherty, State Forester and  
Secretary to the Board