

Board of Forestry Meeting Minutes

November 6, 2019

INDEX

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Page #</u>
A. SEPTEMBER 4, 2019 MEETING MINUTES.....	2
B. OCTOBER 9, 2019 RETREAT MINUTES	2
C. EAST OREGON FOREST PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION AGREEMENT REVISION	2
D. NEHALEM RIVER SCENIC WATERWAY RULEMAKING.....	2
1. STATE FORESTER, BOARD MEMBER, AND PUBLIC COMMENTS	3
2. WICKED PROBLEMS IN POLICY MAKING	5
3. SOCIAL CONSTRUCT FOR SCIENCE AND POLICY.....	6
4. GOVERNOR’S COUNCIL ON WILDFIRE RESPONSE REVIEW.....	7
5. FOREST TRUST LANDS ADVISORY COMMITTEE	8
6. SPECIFIED RESOURCE SITES RULEMAKING FOR MARBLED MURRELETS	9
7. WESTERN OREGON STATE FORESTS HCP AND FMP UPDATE	10

Items listed in order heard.

Complete audio recordings from the meeting and attachments listed below are available on the web at www.oregonforestry.gov.

- (1) Handout, [Fire Finance Information for State Forester, Board Member, and Public Comments](#), Agenda Item 1
- (2) Handout, [Memorandum of Understanding Pacific Coast Temperate Forests for State Forester, Board Member, and Public Comments](#), Agenda Item 1
- (3) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Niemi for State Forester, Board Member, and Public Comments](#), Agenda Item 1
- (4) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Cafferata for State Forester, Board Member, and Public Comments](#), Agenda Item 1
- (5) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Peralta for State Forester, Board Member, and Public Comments](#), Agenda Item 1
- (6) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Bell for State Forester, Board Member, and Public Comments](#), Agenda Item 1
- (7) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Aster for State Forester, Board Member, and Public Comments](#), Agenda Item 1
- (8) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Thompson for State Forester, Board Member, and Public Comments](#), Agenda Item 1
- (9) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Van Dyk for State Forester, Board Member, and Public Comments](#), Agenda Item 1
- (10) Presentation, [Wicked Problems in Policy Making](#), Agenda Item 2
- (11) Presentation, [Social Construct for Science and Policy](#), Agenda Item 3
- (12) Presentation, [Governor's Council on Wildfire Response Review](#), Agenda Item 4

- (13) Handout, [Written Testimony by Sullivan for Forest Trust Lands Advisory Council Testimony](#), Agenda Item 5
- (14) Presentation, [Specified Resource Sites Rulemaking for Marbled Murrelets](#), Agenda Item 6
- (15) Presentation, [Western Oregon State Forests HCP and FMP Update](#), Agenda Item 5
- (16) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Jones for Western Oregon State Forests HCP and FMP Update](#), Agenda Item 5

In accordance with the provisions of ORS 526.016, a meeting of the Oregon Board of Forestry was held on November 6, 2019 at the Oregon Department of Forestry Headquarters on 2600 State Street, Salem, OR 97310.

Chair Imeson called the public meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

Board Members Present:

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

CONSENT AGENDA:

- A. SEPTEMBER 4, 2019 MEETING MINUTES
 Approval of Board Meeting Minutes.

ACTION: The Board approved minutes from the September 4, 2019 Board meeting.

- B. OCTOBER 9, 2019 RETREAT MINUTES
 Approval of Board Retreat Minutes

ACTION: The Board approved minutes from the October 9, 2019 Board retreat.

- C. EAST OREGON FOREST PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION AGREEMENT REVISION

Approval of a revision to the forestland protection agreement in accordance with the Board’s statute ORS 477.406, and rule OAR 629-041-0100. Oregon Department of Forestry and East Oregon Fire Protective Association met legal sufficiency in this revised joint agreement.

ACTION: The Board confirmed the revision to the East Oregon Forest Protective Association Agreement in adherence to the requirements of statute and rule as required by OAR 629-041-0100.

- D. NEHALEM RIVER SCENIC WATERWAY RULEMAKING

Oregon Department of Parks and Recreation (OPRD) administers the State Scenic Waterways Program and required to adopt specific rules under Oregon Revised Statutes chapter 183. ORS 390.845 requires consultation with the Board of Forestry on rules governing the management of state scenic waterways and related adjacent lands. Approximately 75 percent of the designated

scenic waterway is on Board of Forestry lands, with the remainder being industrial forestland and scattered private parcels.

Information Only.

Mike Rose motioned for approval of the consent agenda items. Joe Justice seconded the motion. Voting in favor of the motion: Nils Christoffersen, Cindy Deacon Williams, Tom Imeson, Joe Justice, Jim Kelly, Brenda McComb, and Mike Rose. Against: none. With Board consensus Items A through C were approved, and the motion carried. Noted item D was an informational item.

ACTION AND INFORMATION:

1. STATE FORESTER, BOARD MEMBER, AND PUBLIC COMMENTS

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 – (1 hour, 1 minute and 32 seconds – 28.1 MB)

Chair Imeson commented on:

- Public Meeting will be live streamed, and is experiencing technical difficulties.
- Public comment open for each topic and not to exceed 30 minutes, with exception agenda items two and three.

State Forester Daugherty commented on:

- The overarching themes from the Board of Forestry October 9, 2019 Retreat. Highlighted the Board's structural and operational processes, working relationships and decision making, strategic planning and work plans.
- The Fire Finance background, summary of Department actions to address financial issues, and formation of the Forestry Financial Oversight team. Provided the Board a handout ([attachment 1](#)) highlighting the Department, Board, Department of Administrative Services, and the Governor's office collaborative efforts to respond to the financial situation.
- The Department's actions in addressing climate change, by mentioning the release of the Forest Carbon report and the inter-state collaborative efforts in developing a Memorandum of Understanding on Pacific Coast Temperate Forests ([attachment 2](#)).

Board Members Comments:

- Joe Justice attended a meeting with Environmental Quality Commission (EQC) and Board of Agriculture (BOA), to discuss water quality roles and responsibilities. Highlighted themes from the meeting, like reasonable assurance and accountability on the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) plans, agency rules and regulations, and Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) pursuit to further identify how shade and temperature impacts land use. Complimented the EQC members on their commitment to the commission. Listed some research areas related to the Siskiyou region, he is working on learning with the help of the Private Forests Division. Stated how complimentary the work by DEQ and the Department are, and optimistic about the outcome of this interagency effort.
- Brenda McComb reviewed the latest Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) meeting she attended and highlighted OWEB actions, like fund distribution for streamside restoration projects across the state. Commented on committee structuring areas that may overlap with the Board's strategic plan. Listed themes of climate change and diversity, equity and inclusion, and

commented on OWEB consideration to integrate into all work or address through a subcommittee function.

- State Forester Daugherty reviewed the Department's current efforts in collaborating with other natural resource agencies to address these issues, and described how disparities can limit an agency's commitment to work on these areas. Stated he will continue working with OWEB to see where the two Boards can coordinate efforts.
- Jim Kelly reviewed his latest tour at Green Diamond Resource, and explained how this company participates in the California cap and trade program. He highlighted some program themes like tree species diversity, fire response preparation and accountability, management planning for a working forest, and application costs for private land owners. Commented on latest press that the Department has received, and shared his perspective on the multi-faceted issues in front of the agency, and the political players involved that intervene or negate the agency from resolving funding issues.

Public Testimony:

- Ernie Niemi from Economics Resource provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 3](#)) to the Board about three climate-related events. Urged the Board to assess any carbon-related and liability damages that may result from a timber sale. Recommended the Department to suspend all timber sales until risk assessments are complete and management plans are made.
- Fran Cafferata from Cafferata Consulting provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 4](#)) to the Board on the positive outcomes from working forests and wildlife. Offered her perspective on sustainable forest management and timber harvest practices that are implemented to promote wildlife and biodiversity across the Pacific Northwest.
- Sal Peralta provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 5](#)) to the Board on the Oregon Forest Resources Trust origin and statutory authority. Explained how the program can be used to develop a protocol for carbon sequestration offsets. Commented on how the trust program is underfunded and underutilized. Asked the Board and Department to review the statutes and rules related to the trust, to determine if the program scope can be broadened to better meet climate policy needs, and described an approach for them to take for optimal engagement.
- Jill Bell provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 6](#)) to the Board on the Oregon Women in Timber (OWIT) organization background and objectives. Highlighted OWIT's successful student program and community educational campaign in Lane County. Expressed loggers and foresters commitment to ensure working forests are around for future generations.
- Anna Yarborough from OWIT provided oral testimony to the Board about advocating for active forest management and recreation in forests. Shared her perspective on balancing water quality and protecting wildlife habitat with working forests and rural community economies.
- Amanda Astor from OWIT provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 7](#)) to the Board on the benefits of a working forest for families, communities and local businesses. Asked the Board to recognize climate benefits from wood construction and products, higher yields of carbon sequestration from young stands, and mitigate loss of high density, old growth stands.
- Melissa Thompson from OWIT provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 8](#)) to the Board on the value of the timber industry. Shared her perspective on OWIT and the importance of sustainable forestry and active forest management.
- Kyle Williamson from Oregon Forests and Industry Council (OFIC) provided oral testimony to the Board on fire on the landscape and the increase of acres burned. Commented on fire

management on Department protected lands and private land owners versus Federal lands. Reviewed the benefits of active management and suppression.

- Bob Van Dyk from the Wild Salmon Center provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 9](#)) to the Board on the Forest Practices Act 2017 compliance report. Questioned the report's validity of the study design and data analysis. Noted how this reporting issue was brought to the Board and Department's attention in the past, and sought clarification on next steps.

Board member commented on public testimony:

- Stated understanding on compliance audit review next steps as an analysis to be completed on study design and statistical analysis. State Forester outlined actions taken in response to this issue, and explained how he asked the Division staff to re-evaluate options for a past review. Stressed the importance to communicate with the Board and the Legislature if report contains margin of error. Board summarized request to the State Forester for an external statistical review of the compliance audit sampling design and analyses.

Information Only.

2. WICKED PROBLEMS IN POLICY MAKING

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 – (48 minutes and 8 seconds – 22 MB)

Presentation ([attachment 10](#))

Craig Shinn, Professor from Portland State University, provided background on his professional and academic pursuits. He explained resource sociology as the study of how society produces and creates meaning about the things in nature and arbitrates the differences among those meanings, which can result in tension. Described the constructed set of assumptions within which society operates. He commented on the system of governance in place, how leadership is challenged in making determinations for the greater populous when only hearing from a few, and coalescing differences in similar political arenas, but scale of agreement is not universal.

Shinn reviewed the enhanced model of public service leadership, noted how value propositions underlies decision making, and reviewed specific themes present in public officials decision-making space. Commented on leadership and followership roles, the work associated with those roles and their implications. Reviewed network governance and the multi-faceted nature of wicked problems. Described elements of these problems as polycentric, interrelated, and borderless. He defined wicked problems and noted how these problems are normally present in natural resources. Provided an illustration of emerging wicked problems and further explained each component of a wicked problem.

Shinn transitioned to decision making, and explained how making a decision is not objective, but subjective in nature. Explained how criteria and set of alternatives are created to make a decision, noted how criteria are essentially values reified, and posited that a beholder values interprets the criteria's meaning differently, so reaching an agreement as a group can be problematic. Explored how social scientists can assist policymakers. Noted how most systems have routinized mechanics, and how important it is to sort out these mechanisms to determine appropriate techniques that can address the problem. Listed science based aspects considered by policymakers. Suggested for the Board to determine how science assessments are used and credibility of that science, to define science architecture they can support and cautioned not to rely on design alone for their decision making. Offered tricks of the trade

in decision-making to transform the decision-making space. Closed by thanking the Board for their service.

Board commented on the presentation:

- Shared that sometimes the Board defines a solution using an ‘and’ approach, but it can create a challenge to implement. Shinn noted how he can introduce how new public governance operates across a political economy in a power shared world.

Public testimony was not available on this topic, part of November 7, 2019 Board values, science and policy workshop.

Information Only.

3. **SOCIAL CONSTRUCT FOR SCIENCE AND POLICY**
[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (43 minutes and 35 seconds – 19.9 MB)
Presentation ([attachment 11](#))

Denise Lach, professor from Oregon State University, provided her background as a sociologist and shared her area of expertise. She described climate change as a wicked problem with various implications with potential outcomes. Reviewed the definition of value, the overlaps of principle with worth, and how values are brought into decision making. She clarified how values link with normative science, and defined normative science as it relates to wicked problems. Noted the different types of values, from deep core beliefs to policy core beliefs and explained how secondary beliefs can lead to common ground. Stated how complex problems are dynamic and ever-changing, in turn, suggested evaluating problems based on level of uncertainty and importance of the stakes. Explained how high decision stakes and systems uncertainties within applied science can lead to post-normal science implications and wicked problems. Described the characteristics of post-normal science, provided examples of each component, and explored post-normal science approaches. Highlighted the benefits and caveats of a transdisciplinary approach in using science to address a wicked problem.

Lach defined clumsy solutions and described how this cultural theory is used in planning or policymaking. She reviewed the importance of an individual position versus a group position, outlined four aspects within this spectrum and connected these aspects to how people work with choice restrictions. Commented on the relational understanding and attitudes that exist in each spectrum, listed the four quadrants and implications these quadrants had on group dynamics in decision making. Offered an example to help illustrate utilization of clumsy solutions for a California multi-water district decision process, and explained the outcomes had fulfilled a need for each quadrant type. Elaborated on how these quadrant types may perceive climate change as a wicked problem.

Lach commented on the co-production of knowledge approach, outlined the parameters of this approach, defined knowledge within this construct, and how this approach is utilized by decision-making groups. Provided a step-by-step example of a co-design and co-production approach used for an Idaho action network in Big Wood Basin and explained how the various stakeholders involved worked through the approach. Reviewed the lessons learned and key takeaways in using this approach in planning and policy making. Noted that the issues identified change overtime as a planning project continues and to build in that flexibility. She reminded the Board that there are many tools and techniques available to help provide clumsy and collaborative solutions to wicked problems.

Board commented on presentation:

- Stated the two presentations will lend to the foundation for the Board conversations at the November 7 workshop. Thanked the presenters for their time and presentations to the Board.
- Appreciated the emphasis and value of local knowledge, for science is abstract and moves away from the work done on the ground. Recognized in any planning endeavor, practices and systems need to be in place to integrate local knowledge into the decision-making process.

Public testimony was not available on this topic, part of November 7, 2019 Board values, science and policy workshop.

Information Only.

4. GOVERNOR'S COUNCIL ON WILDFIRE RESPONSE REVIEW
[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (52 minutes and 24 seconds – 23.09 MB)
Presentation ([attachment 12](#))

Matt Donegan, Chair for the Governor's Council on Wildfire Response, provided an overview of his ([presentation](#)) for the interagency and stakeholders effort in 2019. He expressed gratitude to the Department for their dedicated work on the council, and to the Board and State Forester for their support. He provided background on the council's origin, mission, and objectives under Governor Brown's Executive Order 19-01. Described the wide breadth of knowledge on the council, which provided a strong representation of those impacted by wildfire. Outlined how the council developed a committee structure for planning, collaborating, and reporting back to the council over the year. Commented on the integral efforts of multiple committees ensuring the key elements from the national cohesive wildland fire management strategy are thoughtfully discussed over the year. He reviewed how each committee worked under the key elements of fire-adapted communities, resilient landscapes, and wildfire response to produce sufficient and sustainable recommendations for the Governor. He reviewed the timeline of work, report cycles, and end goals.

Donegan reviewed the preliminary findings and recommendations as a product of the subcommittee and council work under mitigation, protection, and recovery lenses. Discussed how the systems in place were built for another era, outlined how opportunities, needs, and risks have evolved. Explained how each key finding has social, environmental and economic implication. Commented on the rigor in finding the right strategy to implement that can withstand midcourse corrections, be applied appropriately, and incorporates systems that are working for Oregonians.

Donegan highlighted what aspects of the overall public system are working sufficiently and how it will need to be maintained into the future. Reviewed the 11 areas for moderate course corrections, described the degree of the recommended course correction for each area, and prospective next steps for each area. He commented on the six significant course corrections, explaining the magnitude of scope and complexity of issue would require some political ownership and perhaps alternative funding models.

Donegan commented on the importance of framing the debate around wildfire, by focusing on primary issues under each subject identified as areas to address. Reviewed the potential implications for the Department, from suppression cash management, GNA staffing, public engagement, to budgeting for a cohesive strategy. Closed by discussing next steps with the Board and how legislative guidance will be needed.

Board commented on Governor’s Wildfire Response Council presentation:

- Asked if anything was surprising to the Chair. Council Chair noted the level of engagement across the council, knowledge sharing, and critical thinking exceeded expectations, which produced a diverse and comprehensive body of work.
- Discussed how the militia model may need to be added under the moderate course correction category. Observed this model as not sustainable with the current funding structure and to consider modifications to insulate Department staff and to help maintain operational core duties. Donegan clarified this is not necessarily an endorsement of maintaining status quo, but that it will need to be adaptive to the fluctuating fire seasons, and provide adequate resources to the Divisions. Board member Christoffersen highlighted that this recommendation is based on the policy option package (POP) created by the Department and approved by the Board. Reviewed how resources may increase overtime to match the longer durations of fire seasons.
- Noted the implications beyond fuel treatments that contribute to landscape and ecological resiliency, pre and post fire. Donegan stated these items are part of a greater set of objectives approved by the Council. Expressed the focus of resilient landscapes for ecosystems and communities was a charge to the mitigation committee, and were considered in a much broader context as they developed recommendations.
- Recommended to consider the public policy perspective to include rural economic health, jobs, cost savings, and safety. Mentioned how Department staff levels have not recovered since the recession, and to include this piece into the overall strategy for increasing resources and capacity.
- Commented on what themes are emerging politically and are prudent to maintain momentum and support. Listed the main themes that emerged: strengthening utilities, suppression expansion, land use, and improving resilient landscapes. Listed the wider ranged themes that emerged: health systems for low income communities, disaster recovery, and wildfire preparation.
- Discussed the different schools of thoughts around gathering, maintaining, and communicating out information on resources and management of structured buildings on the landscape. Reviewed various scenarios, but ultimately proactively planning for these fire events and prioritize firefighting response.
- Explored fire risk interface modeled by current climate conditions, and what is considered as an investment moving forward to proactive planning. Established the modeling efforts strategy is a priority but may require improvement to address the evolving environment and technological advancements. Noted how one ask may be to support the council’s overall funding ask, but this does not include maintenance of the systems that may be put into place.

Public Testimony: None

Information Only.

5. FOREST TRUST LANDS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (49 seconds – 383 KB)

Board Chair Imeson asked if any county commissioner or Forest Trust Land Advisory Committee (FTLAC) member would like to provide in-person testimony. No one stepped forward, but noted Clatsop County Commissioner submitted written testimony for the agenda item.

Public Testimony:

- Kathleen Sullivan, Clatsop County Commissioner provided written testimony ([attachment 13](#)) to the Board on FTLAC and State Forests Division topic number seven. Supported a balanced forest management plan and the HCP efforts. Stated minimal to no support for the FTLAC Chair’s testimony. Expressed that the HCP is a priority, and how it may be the best balance between conserving resources, protection from lawsuits, and as a next step in updating the Forest Management Plan (FMP).

Information Only.

6. SPECIFIED RESOURCE SITES RULEMAKING FOR MARBLED MURRELETS
[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (19 minutes and 2 seconds – 8.71 MB)
 Presentation ([attachment 14](#))

Josh Barnard, Private Forests Deputy Division Chief, provided a [presentation](#) overview, and introduced fellow presenter Jennifer Weikel, Private Forests Division Biologist. She reviewed the rulemaking timeline and anticipated next steps. Barnard described three components for the next phase of plan development. He reviewed the Division 680 rules, outlined when Board input will be needed to define resource sites for marbled murrelets with a corresponding protection strategy.

Barnard noted that the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 629-665 creates sideboards for the rulemaking purpose and protection goals. He mentioned the utility of a matrix to populate a range of approaches identified in the technical report, both regulatory and voluntary, and as a method to seek input from focus groups on resource sites and protection strategies. He commented on how a facilitator will be enlisted to work with the Division staff and groups, then summarize outcomes and report to the Board. Closed by reviewing the rulemaking next steps projected over the next two years.

Board commented on the specified resource sites rulemaking for marbled murrelet presentation.

- Inquired about OAR 629-665-0010 (1), whether a period of time is implied with site protection and whether productivity is maintained. Discussed how these factors are determined on a species by species level, and stated the definitions for abandoned or active sites will need to be flushed out in the focus group process.
- Revisited the Division 680 Rules and provided further clarification on the purpose to move forward on the highlighted items, A and C.
- Discussed how the Board will have time in January to review Division work plans with a corresponding schedule. Stated the Board may also want to explore work priorities and workforce capacity in addressing new requests.
- Shared observation on the times allotted for Division work and inquired about the timeline’s flexibility. Discussed how these are an estimated range. Reviewed how there are next steps after the final phase, and described those steps to the Board.
- Inquired whether staff recommendations will be brought to the Board. Division commented that this will be assessed, dependent upon stakeholder and focus group feedback, additional research may be needed to bring the Board a suite of alternative options.

Public Comment:

- Sristi Kamal from Defenders of Wildlife, provided oral testimony to the Board on the marbled murrelet rulemaking process. Appreciated the engagement with the Division staff, and asked that future engagement continue to be as inclusive, with opportunity to assess the matrix and provide

additional inputs. Shared her hope that this work will produce a precautionary approach and provide protection beyond voluntary tools, and result in a functionally and scientifically acceptable definition of habitat use for the species.

Information Only.

7. WESTERN OREGON STATE FORESTS HCP AND FMP UPDATE
[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (2 hours, 2 minutes and 59 seconds – 56.2 MB)
Presentation ([attachment 15](#))

Brian Pew, State Forests Deputy Chief, introduced the presenters and provided an overview of the [presentation](#) order. He outlined the scope of the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), stakeholder engagement and FTLAC disengagement. Summarized the adjustments made on the Forest Management Plan (FMP) and HCP work schedule.

Cindy Kolomechuk, State Forests Division HCP Project Manager, outlined the HCP three-phased approach, explained which phase has been completed and listed the work objectives for each phase. She reviewed the stakeholder, advisory committee, and public feedback process for the work products developed. Noted the work planned for completion in the current phase. Recognized the indigenous people were the original stewards of the lands that are managed by the State, explained the outreach efforts and how the division plans to continue cultivating relationships with the tribes in the forest management process.

Brett Brownscombe from Oregon Consensus, explained his role in the HCP process, reviewed a timeline graphic that illustrated the HCP process with stakeholder engagement and relationships, as well as meeting facilitation. He explained the cyclical, iterative public process for HCP work products with staged gates in place to ensure a full review. Noted if the Board decides to enter the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, then there will be a separate public process. Reviewed the current status on work development for the biological goal and objectives (BGO), as well as conservation strategies. He offered a summary of the current stakeholders perspective on the HCP process thus far, highlighted themes, and general understandings. Explained how the work products drives the timeline. Emphasized the high-level nature of the mission, vision, and goals (MVG), the purposed behind MVG, and how it is connected to the HCP outcomes.

Troy Rahmig from ICF, explained his role in the HCP project, provided an update on the HCP covered species listed in HCP, and the current status of the project overall. Reviewed the planned efforts for the conservation strategy, explained the concept and outlined the associated objectives. He explained how the biological goals and biological objectives are a requirement for the HCP, then described how each operates and tracked through a planned monitoring program. Expanded on biological goals and objectives purpose as the HCP is being drafted, adopted, and maintained. Reviewed the conceptual draft being developed by ICF and ODF technical teams, the modification and review process including public engagement. Described how in the reviewer process key terminology was defined and agreed upon before the HCP draft is assembled. Provided two terminology examples created on covered fish and wildlife, and explained why each example includes individual goals and goals. Noted how this terminology may become tenants for the conservation strategy and can apply towards the timber management strategy. Described how the comparative analysis is an extension of the business case analysis, and explained the design stage of the analysis that will lend to the development of

methodology and variables used across all planning efforts. He closed by reviewing his team's next steps and outlined when the project team plans to present next to the Board, scheduled in 2020.

Board commented on Western Oregon State Forests HCP and FMP presentation update.

- Sought clarification on the terrestrial species and whether species are bundled or individually identified with biological goals and objectives. Confirmed species are individually defined, but can be bundled in the biological goals and objectives, when appropriate
- Discussed whether economic aspects will be assessed in the social aspect of the comparative analysis. Rahmig explained how revenue generated will be a part of the HCP, and a more thorough impacts analysis will be conducted through NEPA.
- Reviewed the importance of applying the terminology framework of conserve, maintain and enhance with the defined terms included with the HCP. Expressed value behind clarity of each definition and the words included with each term, as it relates to the plan. Provided feedback on the biological goals and objectives listed in the presentation, and listed various areas to consider revising. Rahmig appreciated the feedback and stated the teams are working on further clarifying the definitions and terminology used in the HCP. He also explained that monitoring implementation, compliance and effectiveness will be included as part of the technical portion of the analysis. Board member mentioned integrating thresholds into the monitoring plan.
- Encouraged the project team to keep the Board informed as the products are developed.
- Discussed how resilient the HCP planning and stakeholder engagement timeline is in adapting to the changing priorities of the agency. Division stated a level of confidence that the schedule will be maintained as they adapt with the Department's critical needs. Noted the importance in maintaining the schedule outlined as Board member transition is forthcoming.

Pew explained how the HCP is a tool to help comply with the Endangered Species Act (ESA), but is not the whole plan to manage State Forests or to implement Greatest Permanent Value (GPV). He outlined how a companion FMP plan would need to be developed using the best elements of the revised draft FMP, the current FMP and also integrating elements of the HCP. Pew reviewed the origin and purpose for the FMP revision. He noted the value of the original goals set for the revision process, and listed additional goals that would improve the plan's outcome. Highlighted the utility of the revised plan and how it can be implemented across a greater geographic area in a way that is effective and efficient in managing Oregon forests. Reminded the Board that the plan revision was one piece of a greater whole, emphasizing the work completed on internal business improvements and organization restructuring, as well the next steps to diversify revenue streams.

Justin Butteris, State Forests Policy Analyst and Manager for the FMP project, reviewed the progress made on the revised draft FMP and listed the suite of information that will be presented to the Board. He outlined the draft FMP improvements and described how each aspect lends to meeting the revision goals. Explained the role and value of public engagement as the draft FMP revision is considered, outlined the series of events planned, and stakeholders set to be involved. Noted the comparative analysis will also be comparing the outcomes of the current FMP with the proposed FMP. Commented on the scope of the science review process, contractor to be hired to coordinate science panels, and outlined the contractor's objectives. Closed by reviewing the proposed timeline for the proposed FMP revised plan.

Board commented on Western Oregon State Forests HCP and FMP presentation update.

- Reviewed the projected work product timeline for the HCP and FMP. Expressed the value of evaluating all versions of the FMP concurrently versus working through one plan at a time. Aired desire to hear from the public regarding this topic.
- Recognized a lot of changes occurred over the last two years that may alter the pathway of the decision on the FMP. Reviewed the schedule possibilities for the HCP and FMP decision, how any changes would shift work product timelines, and when Board action is the most appropriate. Discussed the implications of accepting or rejecting the HCP has on the FMP and staff work efficiency. Commented on how the comparative analysis can be adjusted as needed. Board could see benefit from a science review and comparative analysis, but sought feedback from Division about preferred timing to complete work products that would best support the Board in making a decision. Pew stated preference to bring FMP topic in April as an informational item, to think through what the Board decision would look like in September, and discuss what the Board needs to make this decision in January.

Public Testimony:

- Seth Barnes from Oregon Forests Industry Council provided oral testimony to the Board on State Forests HCP and FMP update. Commented on the need for a viable and durable FMP. Explained how the current plan is not a take avoidance plan, and how the current plan allows for a corresponding programmatic plan to be established. Mentioned the comment periods planned for the FMP and outlined some stakeholder concerns in providing response.
- W. Ray Jones from Stimson Lumber provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 16](#)) to the Board on State Forests HCP and FMP update. Concurred with Barnes concerns on providing baseline information, accountability, and measurability. Highlighted a lack of transparency over the years as the FMP revision work progressed. Stated the revised plan needs a robust annual inventory, a maintenance program, yield more revenue, and measurable outcomes.
- Bob Van Dyke from Wild Salmon Center provided oral testimony to the Board on State Forests HCP and FMP update. Concurred with Barnes and Jones concerns on lack of revised plan details, definitions, and baseline information available. Agreed with Jones on the need for a monitoring strategy. Urged the HCP to include language on restoring aquatic ecosystems.

Board provided additional comments:

- Inquired with Division if any issue in extending public comment period for FMP. State no issue, and the comment period can be extended for another month to the end of January, beyond that board material deadlines limit incorporation of feedback.
- Discussed how presenting revised draft FMP information in April 2020 to the Board may provide a longer duration for public comment and additional time for Division staff to create more substantive information for the stakeholders to review. Further discussed what information would be provided to the Board if the decision is set for fall 2020. State Forester explained the balance between receiving, responding to and incorporating public comment.

Board member McComb stated she would like to propose a motion, but would like to outline what was discussed. Inquired if feasible, to bring back a draft of the revised FMP with some stakeholder feedback in April 2020, but would exclude the comparative analysis and scientific review with the expectation that these items will be available before the Board makes a decision in fall 2020. Pew acknowledged Board member McComb's outline, and mentioned it is unclear what information would be necessary

for the decision in front of the Board in October 2020, but further discussion can be explored in January 2020 with the Board to flush out these scheduling details.

Board member McComb motioned that staff bring a draft revised FMP to the Board in April as an informational item. Board member Deacon Williams seconded.

Board discussion followed motion:

- Inquired that if time was available for the Division team to review timelines, would an alternative course of action be brought to the Board in January. Pew explained the need around meeting with his team on what the decision space will be in October, and stated it would be unlikely their team would present an alternative option in January.
- Sought clarity from Division team on how long the public comment period will be extended to. Pew responded with the expected extension of time and reminded the Board that in April the comparative analysis and scientific review will not be complete. Board asked to further discuss these items in January to better understand anticipated timelines and staff workloads.
- Discussed whether the revised draft FMP will consider Swiss Needle Cast and alder species monitoring, as well as address inventory type. Pew responded and stated these are included with the draft, as well as public meetings are scheduled in December to receive feedback.

ACTION: Directed the Department staff to bring a draft revised FMP back to the Board in April as an informational item.

Voting in favor of the motion: Nils Christoffersen, Cindy Deacon Williams, Brenda McComb, Mike Rose, Joe Justice, Jim Kelly, and Tom Imeson. Against: none. Motion carried.

Board provided meeting closing comments:

- Announced location and time for Subcommittee of Federal Forests to take place following the Board meeting.
- Inquired whether the Department can do a shallow dive review of the Oregon Forests Resource Trust and report to the Board if any value to revitalize this program. State Forester noted a review can be done, explained that this program has not yielded a carbon credit to date and has been shelved since Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) have responded to this market. He commented that a response to this inquiry may best addressed in the Department's work plan development discussion on climate change. Board members agreed.
- Anticipated the Department to respond to the compliance audit discussion and potential board involvement in future audit design with the Divisional work plans.

With no further business before the Board, Chair Imeson adjourned the public meeting at 4:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Peter Daugherty



Peter Daugherty, State Forester and
Secretary to the Board

HR

Meeting Minutes Approved at the January 8, 2020 Board Meeting