



# Committee for Family Forestlands Meeting January 9, 2020



Pursuant to public notice made by news release with statewide distribution, a conference call meeting of the Committee for Family Forestlands [an advisory body to the Oregon Board of Forestry with authority established in Oregon Revised Statute 527.650] was convened on January 9, 2020 hosted in the Santiam Room of the ODF Operations Building, 2600 State Street, Salem, Oregon

---

## ***CFF Committee members participating:***

Evan Barnes, Committee Chair & SW Landowner Rep. (Voting)  
Josh Barnard, Deputy Chief Private Forests (Secretary)  
Kaola Swanson, Conservation Rep. (Voting/Vice Chair) (Sustainable NW)  
Rex Storm, AOL/OTFS Ex-Officio  
Barrett Brown, NW Landowner Rep. (Voting)  
John Peel, EO Landowner Rep. (Voting)  
Glenn Ahrens, OSU College of Forestry Ext. Ex-Officio  
Janelle Geddes, USFS State & Private Forestry  
S. Mark Vroman, Industry rep (Voting) Hampton Family Forests  
Julie Woodward, OFRI Ex-Officio

---

## ***ODF Staff:***

Josh Barnard, Deputy Chief Private Forests  
Kyle Abraham, Private Forests Division Chief  
Marganne Allen, Forest Health & Monitoring Manager  
Susan Dominique, Committee Administrative Support  
Scott Swearingen, Dev. Field Support Coord.  
Kristin Whitney, Office Specialist  
Nate Agalzoff, Incentives Coordinator  
Greg Wagenblast, Policy Analyst

---

## ***Members not attending:***

Jim James, OSWA Executive Director Ex-Officio

---

## ***Guests:***

### **1. Welcome and Review of the Agenda**

Barnes called the meeting to order and asked for any changes to the agenda, questions or comments. (None offered.)

### **2. Roll Call**

(See attendance list above.)

### **3. Approval of the November 2019 Minutes**

Brown made a Motion to Accept the Minutes as final. Swanson seconded. Barnes called for a vote and all were in approval of accepting the November 2019 Minutes as provided.

### **4. Public Comment**

No comment was offered.

### **5. Private Forests Division Update – Josh Barnard**

Barnard began with the personnel transitions for the Division. Bodie Dowding who was serving as the Field Support Unit Manager in a developmental appointment is transitioning back to State Forests in his normal role. Scott Swearingen, who normally functions as the Department's Southern Oregon Area Assistant to the Area Director is coming in for the second 3 months of that developmental while they prepare a recruitment to permanently fill the position. In addition, more transition as Marganne Allen, Forest Health and Monitoring Manager has accepted a position at another agency and will be moving on at the end of the month to a water quality position at the Department of Agriculture. He noted staff will be transitioning in and out of the Division, as well as backfilling roles for a while. Ryan Gordon, Family Forestland Coordinator is on leave until February.

The Division has a couple of projects moving forward. One large effort is the **East Moraine Project** that was awarded funding by the USFS State & Private Forestry Program having successfully competed against other States for the Forest Legacy Grant. Then he described the purpose of that Program is to provide conservation easements or fee title acquisitions for properties that are at risk of being sub-divided and providing an opportunity to keep those perpetually as working forests. This project goal is to save the East Moraine of Wallowa Lake from subdivision. The State is looking to close that transaction by the end of the month but definitely this year. That parcel has been held in

trust between some different family members and they were at a decision point on what to do with that property. Through a host of collaborating partnerships and fund-raising Wallowa has the funding lined up and to lands will be transferred from the family to the County. There will be a conservation easement on that property once the transfer is complete. 1700 acres in total. He added that there is a little bit of non-forested with that as well but he shared that it's the largest piece ever to be placed in a conservation easement and the most undisturbed piece of glacial moraine in the U.S. Swanson shared that from the land trust community, it's considered a very historic project as well.

Another piece of work he reported on was a **Stewardship Agreement** with Port Blakely. Staff are working on the Public Hearing piece this week. Port Blakely is wanting to move a 30,000 acre parcel in total into a Stewardship Agreement. The main incentive of the Stewardship Agreement is that by choosing to go above and beyond the Forest Practices Act, the Department will provide them regulatory certainty around future rule changes. Port Blakely is pursuing a **Habitat Conservation Plan** (a multi-species HCP) so this Agreement is the first step in their process to do that. The parcel involved is outside of Molalla. The Public Comment period is closed. Those comments received at the Public Hearing will be assessed and used to do a final check on the Agreement. Members shared their positive interactions with Port Blakely. Ahrens added that even the neighbors on adjoining lands had positive things to say and Port Blakely participates in education, opening their lands for tours for legislators, conservation groups, and environmental groups by providing demonstration sites. Woodward said that there is a SAF tour on April 15<sup>th</sup> on Port Blakely ownership if members are interested in attending. Vroman added that they are a fairly active group in Washington as well. Their major business is exporting logs.

Barnard changed topics to provide an update on preparations for the **Short Legislative Session** coming up and those timelines. The deadline to file bills was January 17<sup>th</sup>. The Session opens Monday, February 3<sup>rd</sup>. He recalled that there will be bills coming out of the Wildfire Council's work on multiple fronts. He was aware of 4 to 5 bills so far. Lacking more detail he asked Storm and Swanson (members of the Mitigation sub-committee of the Wildfire Council) if they had anything to add. Swanson didn't have an add to that but asked about the **100-Year Water Vision** that ODF had participated in as part of that core team and whether ODF had budget related links to that Vision. Barnard answered that Abraham will be joining the meeting later and would have details on our current Policy Options Packages they may be working on that could be related.

So Barnard and Gordon worked on the **Seed & Seedling** issue before Gordon left on leave. They had discussed the grant funds still available from Forest Service State & Private Forestry for this issue. Gordon did modify the grant, tailoring it closer to some of the work discussed. And they are dedicated to doing a test run with J. Herbert Stone Nursery (USFS). Working through an option to partner up to acquire seedlings relative to reforestation after salvage operations due fire losses. Gordon had done the grant modification with the thought of using the FERNs notification system to funnel landowners to the seedling ordering options. That idea has some potential moving forward.

Ahrens offered a similar effort was done by OSU with their annual Seedling Availability look and did outreach through their newsletter. The article noted that there was a private group called MySaplins that Mike Taylor (that used to work for IFA Nurseries) created to respond to this need for a brokered system to aggregate small orders and ordering from multiple nurseries so that small landowners could take advantage of the opportunities available for those doing larger orders. That is a positive effort, an independent entity to aggregate up smaller orders to take advantage of bulk ordering. It's called <http://www.mysaplins.com/> and its Saplings, LLC. The website is up and they are still in business. Ahrens offered to get back in touch with Taylor and try to learn more.

Swanson provided that members did go over the Executive Summary of the **Wildfire Response Council Report** at the last meeting. With those reports available online through the Governor's office. All the different sub-committee reports were integrated. The Report is meant to provide high level recommendations for funding as recommended by the Council. Swanson shared that there is also money to continue some consultant work and sounds like Matt Donegan's role advising the ongoing implementation of those recommendations will continue. Senator Jeff Golden is working on a committee and is likely to promote some legislation related specifically to mitigation work. Although he is working with others who may be more interested in Suppression funding. So two potential pathways for moving

that forward. (Barnes requested the Executive Summary.) Storm added that the Summary is useful as it is only 14 pages long but contains an accounting of all 27 recommendations and a preamble. He thought there may already be legislative concepts arising from the Council's work such as expanding the effectiveness of local utilities to prevent powerline fire starts and procedure for public power safety shutoffs as they did in California. Not a favored strategy as there were fatalities in California because of the shutoffs and medical needs such as oxygen machines or kidney dialysis. Barnes offered that they have some areas they have identified in the south counties for Pacific Power to begin planning. Brown agreed they should take to heart those cautionary lessons and look at the incentives and regulatory framework as maintenance has been an issue for decades. Barnes said some technical issues are increasingly difficult because parts of that infrastructure are 100 years old. The insulators may go out of compliance and raising rates for a public utility to pay for that replacement is very difficult.

## 6. Work Plan Review and Schedule for the Year

Barnard began this discussion recalling that a couple of times last fall they had expressed interest in some offsite meetings. He has it in mind to continue to plan that. He felt it would be beneficial to review the work plan to prioritize issues and see what off-site meeting locations may serve that work. And in light of that, set the meeting schedule for the rest of the year. He thought there would potentially be interested Board members that would consider joining a meeting especially if given plenty of notice on dates and locations. The current work plan was submitted in July 2019 as part of the Committee's Annual Report to the Board. Swanson asked the ex-officio members who work with the small landowners if there are issues of interest or need in that community that might inform the priority of topics. Ahrens offered that he sees it all wrapped up under Family Forestland Viability, with sub-headings such as forest health, climate change, fire mitigation, etc. Storm agreed that it may be more defining the bullets to prioritize under the main categories, and noted Viability is a very strong concern in eastern Oregon. He recognizes that the Board of Forestry key topics will most likely demand more focus from the Committee as there are five rulemaking, rule assessments or reviews current for the Board. So five major efforts, as well as Board work planning for the biennium with a set of three overarching issues so basically nine issues, a huge bundle of work in itself. Storm added that this calendar year will also see four out of the seven Board members tenure ending.

Brown suggested that on the Forestry Program for Oregon (FPFO) would be a good opportunity for the Committee to be proactive and start conversations around that work so the Committee can be prepared to give recommendation. He saw no reason that the Committee shouldn't start their own conversations informed by what they can glean from the Forestry Program for Oregon. Those are massive value judgements that will affect all Oregonians and he thought there was a lot of fear regarding climate change. He suggested that topic should be elevated in light of forestland viability and family forest values. Barnard shared that the Program review won't be finalized until March but recognized the interest to follow that process.

Barnard and others identified the Board's project list as including the Coho petition, Western Oregon Large Wood, Food Plots, Marbled Murrelet Rules and Siskiyou sufficiency. Changing back to Work Plan subjects, Woodward added that Forest Management Planning is under Forestland Viability and OWSA/OTFS are revitalizing a new landscape level planning project with a lot of nexus to the Department. The Tree Farm got some funds to start a landscape-scale project to facilitate more engagement in active management plans. She thought this group could provide good input. And suggested that is relevant to our thought process. Swanson asked about the priority of tracking the Wildfire Council recommendations and outcomes from the Short Session which may either result in accessibility to funds or higher taxes which may change the priority of the issues.

A discussion then took place about what data was available to adequately define family forestlands. What numbers could be provided to the Board who the Committee is representing. Barnes offered that those numbers would be useful to have when discussing issues like viability. Ahrens also thought it would be an important distinction to place before the Board. What is a family forestland owner? How many are they? What kind of significance do they have on the landscape? The Forestry Program for Oregon does a good job of that, but that's all being re-done and with the Board turnover, it would be really good to provide a concise but clear characterization of family forest owners in Oregon. And periodically update presentation to the Board, as membership of the Board changes. Barnes suggested that it needs to be a living document to speak for those landowners accurately on how policies add or detract from

their ability to manage their lands. Members agreed there is a gap in underserved, or unprotected lands. Landowners who might self-identify as farmers and ranchers that have forest parcels but aren't necessarily informed of forest policy and incentive programs and generally don't have forest management plans.

Barnard summed up the ideas and asked how members wanted to prioritize and intersect with these issues. He saw two themes out of the conversation. One providing input to the Board of Forestry issues and then Family Forestland Viability, which can be scheduled in around the other testimony. So, one set of issues will be driven by the Board's timeline. And the other where the Committee is driving the process. So he suggested formatting the agenda under those two needs and merge the rest of the detailed topics below those. He offered to keep members in the loop when there are decision points coming up for the Board.

In response to a question on Recreational Immunity, Brown answered that there are Recreational Immunity Statutes that protect landowners in Oregon which seem to be always challenged in court cases. He didn't see it coming to the Board's attention at this point. Storm agreed that it was part of the viability quotient, the costs and risks of forest land ownership where you could be liable just by virtue of owning the land. Swanson said that the Land Trust community is very concerned about that also and offered the Committee would find many allies on the subject. Barnard conceded with HB 2469 the Committee interacted with other stakeholders and just kept the Board informed. But as the Board and Department cannot lobby the legislature, those issues aren't in their purview. Then Brown suggested that it would be good to establish not just a list of prioritized items but an intentional plan of work. So Barnard reiterated that the Committee's work would be led by the issues in front of the Board but CFF can identify and prioritize specific Viability issues. So one is to identify the nexus between the BOF work plan issues and CFF meeting schedules still remaining flexible based upon those needs. To begin in that direction Barnard asked members to schedule 2020 meetings and then he could match up agenda items supporting the Board's priority issues and those of the Committee.

Peel (who was not at the last meeting) asked for more detail on the potential mix of the Stewardship Coordinating Committee and CFF. Barnard explained the mix of representation and updates that wind up being repetitive items on the both group's agendas and that they were trying to be efficient with staff time and have more ability to maintain a quorum by filling in vacancies on CFF with the SSC Committee's representatives. He explained the thing that SSCC takes action on is prioritizing and submitting project applications to the (USFS State & Private Forestry) Forest Legacy Program. Storm was asked as a member of both committees to provide his thoughts on the scope of the work to be integrated. Storm replied that in his view it's a different kind of work. He conceded that it made sense to have one committee doing the two things but it's a whole different bundle of work that involves a separate set of partners, other state and federal agencies. SSCC's work currently involves a somewhat political process to prioritize and rank projects one over the other to be competitive nationally. He was concerned that this Committee's role is too different. The players have different objectives and the outcomes are different so it may be hard for one committee to do both things very effectively. Barnard noted that there was a suggestion that perhaps the Legacy role would be maintained as a subgroup performing that function independently. April would be the first chance to pull something together. Still a conversation to be explored. Dominique offered to send out the minutes of the last Stewardship Coordinating Committee meeting to give CFF members a heads up to State Stewardship Coordinating Council (SCC) discussions.

[Kyle Abraham and Scott Swearingen came in and were introduced. Barnard introduced Scott as the new interim Field Support Unit Manager, taking over for Bodi Dowding who was in the first part of the interim for the position. Scott's regular role is as the Assistant to the Southern Oregon Area Director.]

Storm then concluded his comments on the work plan and agreed that it would be valuable for this Committee to define who the family forestland owners are to the Board as it could influence ongoing conversations about the viability of forestlands and our involvement as a Committee. Woodward believed that between OFRI and OSU they both have a lot of that data and presentations that could be a starting point. Ahrens agreed and maintained that it is important timing as the new Forest Program for Oregon is coming out. Brown asked if Woodward and Ahrens would have a 'sketch' of what their data could provide for the next meeting. Barnard reminded them that February will be tight as the legislature will be meeting.

Swanson announced that she has accepted a position at Sustainable Northwest. She expressed concern for finding a replacement but the Committee members assured her she was welcome to continue on as Environmental representative. She expressed that the Pacific Forest Trust was very supportive and interested in the work of the Committee and they may want to maintain membership if possible. She suggested the Senior Conservation Projects Manager at the Trust as a possible member. Abraham assured her that if she remains interested she doesn't have to leave the group. The Charter just says, one environmental community representative and it's not about specific organization representation.

Regarding the CFF Report to the BOF in the past the members from different regions testified during the Committee's Annual update in July representing their regional perspectives. Woodward agreed that it would be good to have the individual stories connect them and give them a picture of who the Committee is representing and have that face time with the Board.

**Schedule for the Year?** They began with calendar suggestions and set out meeting dates as follows:

- Wednesday, February 19<sup>th</sup>, Clatsop Room
- Wednesday, March 18<sup>th</sup>, Santiam Room
- Tuesday, April 14<sup>th</sup>, Clatsop Room
- Wednesday, May 20<sup>th</sup> & 21<sup>st</sup> (offsite meeting?) Santiam Room held tentatively
- No meeting scheduled in June
- Wednesday, July 22<sup>nd</sup> Board of Forestry Meeting/CFF Annual Report
- No meetings scheduled in August
- Thursday, September 17<sup>th</sup> Conference Call
- Wednesday, October 14<sup>th</sup> Santiam Room
- Thursday, November 19<sup>th</sup> Santiam Room
- Thursday, December 10<sup>th</sup> Santiam Room

## 7. Promotional Outreach for HB 2469

Barnes picked this up again to solicit more effort and ideas for promotional outreach of HB 2469 Second Forest Dwelling. He explained he has tried to get a signing ceremony with the Governor that would provide some interest and possibly a mention in the Capitol Press. Publicity that could include a solicitation for new members. He recalled that CFF is down a Citizen-at-Large and Landowner-at-Large. But then asked whether when the Legislature passed 2469 was it voluntary or a mandate that each of the counties pick it up? He offered that Douglas County was holding a public hearing on it and he thought that they were planning on adopting it. So it's possibly voluntary. Brown offered that it reads "a county *may* approve a new single family dwelling..." not shall. Barnes had another call out to members who could post a notice in their publications of the new legislation.

## LUNCH

## 8. January Board of Forestry Update

Nate Agalzoff, Incentives Field Coordinator provided an update on the **Wildlife Food Plots Rulemaking**. As had been mentioned previously staff presented the draft rules to the Board of Forestry yesterday as a consent agenda item. There wasn't too much discussion as most of the content is very, very similar to the last version brought to CFF as they are Advisory to this effort. Members had recommended establishing a minimum size, but that was left out of the final draft as written as after some DOJ consulting it was unclear if the State had the authority to establish a minimum. But the plan components are still in there and that is something they will put in the guidance for field staff to review, or as part of their plan review. One other add was just to formalize the definition of 'target wildlife'. Agalzoff hopes to bring the fiscal impact piece to the next CFF meeting. They are on track for adoption of the rules by the summer. Agalzoff added that the new rules will touch three Divisions within the Forest Practices Act. 600, 605 and the very end of 610, Reforestation Rules. They will continue into the Public Comment Period and Hearings and if they get any new information they might need to re-draft the language or if there aren't any other concerns with the language they will continue to finalize the draft. He clarified that this Statute was previously signed into law and the Department was instructed to make rules and set up processes. Considering the implementation, Ahrens asked about the existence of

some kind of biodiversity guide. Some guidance for landowners that like that idea but I don't know how to get started. He asked about a menu of wildlife forage types or species list? Agalzoff replied that much of that will be provided in the Guidance with links to publications or sites that can help answer those questions, like finding the list of Noxious Weeds. And there are publications matching up species and forage types. Ahrens was curious about what may be needed in terms of education and resources to help landowners do the right thing and manage those plots. He agreed that there are a lot of online resources if you bring up Oregon's Flora and Fauna. Agalzoff included that Jennifer Weikel, Wildlife Biologist is included in the review of those plans.

Barnard asked Allen to provide a recap of what happened at the Board meeting on the **Siskiyou Project**. Allen began by reminding members this project is all about having the Board make a sufficiency call on whether streamside protections in the Siskiyou area for Small and Medium Fish-bearing streams are effective and performing for meeting water quality goals and the riparian stands condition. The Board was provided with the first suite of information that was looking at the science available specifically to the Siskiyou Geographic region. The Board didn't find that science provided enough information to make a decision on. So, they asked the Department to expand the geographical focus to a broader range of existing literature by expanding up into the western Pacific U.S., and into Canada, and Alaska. Staff were also directed to work more closely with DEQ to ensure that we are integrating our processes with theirs to ensure outcomes for State stream temperature/water quality and Total Maximum Daily Load goals.

So the Board did have decision to make on the approvals of objectives for the Stakeholder Advisory Committee for the Project. The establishment of a stakeholder advisory committee followed the Board's request to ensure stakeholder engagement in the process. The Board approved those objectives, so the Division is moving ahead with contracting a third party to facilitate those meetings, hoping to get the first meeting convened in February. Allen shared that CFF will be represented in that endeavor. Meeting dates and locations will be determined and the use of teleconferencing and webinars will be used to maximize everyone's access to that process. The expanded literature review has not been completed yet and is on a two-staged timeline. We are separating things out now. We are taking stream temperature and shade together and expediting that information and then separate out the sufficiency decision on the Desired Future Condition Review. That DFC review is a longer effort Adam Coble is working on to finalize the data analysis from the RipStream data and doing all the modeling work. Allen reported that the Board is aiming to make a decision on stream temperature and shade in July. And another six months for Desired Future Condition.

She went on to note that in an earlier Western Oregon rulemaking the Board made the decision that the Siskiyou georegion should *not* be considered but be left out of pending SSBT rules because the regions differed so much in habitat and climate. So the Siskiyou georegion was left out of those Western Oregon SSBT riparian rules. But effectively they are not expressing that value and belief anymore, and have asked to include Western Oregon data and the majority of the PNW coast, Alaska and Northern California to expand the literature search for the Siskiyou decision. That change is creating a very odd situation. If conditions are the same everywhere staff would have a hard time justifying the use of science to inform specific decisions if they are factoring in data from dissimilar ecosystems. On top of that it gets more challenging as rulemaking is driven by the 714 statute which requires the Department to have very, very specific evidentiary criteria for making decisions. In this we are targeting sufficiency of the rules *only* for Small and Medium Fish-bearing streams in the Siskiyou in achieving standard water quality targets. And that is what the statute directs us to do. But looking at collaborating with DEQ's TMDL processes is complicated because they don't operate on the same scale. Barnard added collaboration also must include deciding what authorities are involved on the landscape. Potentially they could be looking at an MOU to navigate that data. The BOF approval of the advisory committee objectives moves forward the DEQ/ODF collaboration as part of the work plan. The most significant part of the agreed upon objectives was to include climate change as a key factor. At the recent BOF meeting staff brought back two decision-points for the Board on the inclusion of climate change data. Option 1 was integrating climate considerations into current work and/or Option 2, looking at the entirety of the Forest Practices Act in light of climate change. If they did that project by project without reconsidering the Board's goals and objectives, and our relative authorities we run the risk of potential unintended consequences and duplicative work. Ultimately, the Board chose both Options. It will take time for the Agency to synthesize climate change projections as a whole in the Board's work plan and be able to bring it down to the project by project basis. So they elected both options and requested the Division to stay on time with the July Siskiyou decision by using external resources. Staff

plans is to utilize speakers with expertise on climate change to speak directly to the Board to provide them contextual information to inform their sufficiency decision. Another part will be bringing the Department of Justice on to help the Board understand the legality of either their degradation or sufficiency decision with the additionality of other questions, or seeking to address issues other than temperature. So that will mean that the Board will include Climate Change as a work plan topic and as one of the Options have a Forest Practices Act Review for Climate Change, which would be work across the entire Department. There will need to be some goals and vision work that needs to be done by the Board so that is pretty high level stuff to start that process. It will probably impact the Protection Division, us or even State Forests. Swanson asked about external organizational support possibly from OFRI or the Oregon Climate Change Institute.

Allen continued summarize that there were three decisions before the Board at that meeting. One for the Siskiyou, one for the Advisory Committee objectives, and the choice of Option for adding Climate Change to the Siskiyou work. Staff re-emphasized having DOJ training on making decisions. And additionally the ODF/DEQ collaboration. So more work added to the timeline so creating the potential of not meeting the July deadline. The Division is going to be running ahead and setting an example that would roll into the BOF work plan, an Agency Work Plan of which the FPA Review would be one component. Barnard reminded members that the Division doesn't have any new staff so more will be put on the staff that is already working on other projects. So, that piece hasn't been balanced out yet. It might take them a few months to start talking about their goals and where they are headed. We can't do any other analysis until they know what that looks like. So the next step is in March where they should have this work plan reorganized in the way they consider final for the next two years. So, that's coming up pretty fast. Allen thought it was fair to say the Board had consensus on including climate change considerations, such as anticipating increased air temperatures and the timing and quality of precipitation, as well as indicate some changes to species composition. To tell that story, ODF will have to sort out who the external resources may be. Staff proposes to take the high level synthesis of information and using that as the contextual information to aid their decision.

Allen thanked the Committee for their time and involvement.

#### **9. Incentives Update – Nate Agalzoff**

Agalzoff hit on some highlights of the ongoing work they are doing for the **State & Private Forestry Review** beginning with written responses to Review questions. The funds that come through that federal program have been traditionally used for some staff time and also for writing management plans. A Review is done, every 5 years. In those past 5 years there have been less and less dollars available. **The Stewardship Program** nationally is undergoing a Modernization effort in reaction to those cuts in funding and will see changes effective next year. We also have ongoing work around the **Forest Action Plan**, as well as providing responses to the Reviewers on the work we've done to prioritize lands for Stewardship dollars. Once the Modernization is effective we will be able to get performance points or credits for other types of plans not just the ones that we cost-shared. That will mean taking a more strategic view of placing funds. As far as our work with NRCS its largely business as usual but with a new NRCS State Forester, Andrew Owen, in place in Portland that appointment has increased the interaction and tempo of things. New ways to support the work through the statewide agreement and provide good government without duplicating efforts.

Swanson offered that inviting Owen to speak with CFF about what he does in leveraging partnerships and sought after projects. Agalzoff agreed using EQIP as an example. Funds that comes to landowners through the Statewide Agreement with NRCS. Then Agalzoff explained the suite of practices eligible for funds. NRCS has a list of different eligible practices and codes. But that Program is more or less active depending on the portion of the State. Originally developed as an agricultural program some areas are just starting to accept applications for forestry work. Barnard added that there are different levels of working relationships in different areas in the State based on how long they have been doing this. So varying levels of participation. We have quite an important role in making those connections. Agalzoff shared the essence of the discussions he has had with the NRCS State Forester about trying to use local expertise to provide some teachable moments through tours of private lands and onsite outreach opportunities in areas still not adequately served. One big effort is trying to figure out how to fit pile burning into the mix. It is currently an eligible practice for disposal but *when* you can actually burn might not align perfectly with other eligible activities.

An example he provided would be a fuels treatment, taking out a lot of understory and suppressed stands, largely not salvageable that is piled for burning and needing to wait for appropriate conditions and approval to burn.

**Barnard** clarified that the Stewardship Modernization will provide some re-vamp to the Program nationally. The funds go to two places: one for cost-sharing plans and the other for technical field assistance. So it's really Oregon's gateway to provide technical assistance to small non-industrial landowners. Part of the thought has been that Federal funding has probably been declining in part because the current mode of reporting doesn't tell a good enough story. So they have been working on a way to change how we report to them, changing how our performance is judged to do that. Better stories equate with more funding. They are working with several different partners some of the Associations of State Foresters and different things like that in the Stewardship Modernization project. It is probably a year before that is fully implemented but they are definitely on a pathway to re-vamp what that looks like. Ahrens added that these landowner incentive programs having the NRCS EQIP funding for pre-commercial thinning and fuels reduction has been very beneficial to achieving on the ground accomplishments. Locally folks are saying that anyone that signs up is pretty likely to get a contract if they want it. But the contractual stuff is between the landowner and NRCS. Planning administration, certifications that's all done by ODF. Barnard addressed the Program size, the way it is currently structured, the Statewide Agreement (\$1 million dollars) is available for this type of work. And there has never been a stoppage in that cycle since we moved to that size of agreement. Barnard shared that the other challenge moving to that scale is just sheer capacity. With the intent to get more plans on the ground they are piloting in two states, Colorado and Oregon. And are coupling those efforts with WoodsCamp online social media processes. They are finding out that they need to be careful because too much interest could actually overwhelm our present capacity, and the capacity of local contracting specialists in the area.

## **BREAK**

### **10. Operator of the Year – Greg Wagenblast**

Wagenblast presented information on the Operator of the Year Recognition Program and the 3 operators selected by the Regional Forest Practices Committees for that recognition. With a change in the Program timeline, he will be sending out the email inviting folks to start nominating for this coming year. From this year on they will begin accepting nominations in November and closing nominations mid-June to facilitate the nomination process for Stewardship Foresters that are pulled away in the summer by fire season call ups. An earlier timeline for the nominations will also help Public Affairs staff do the video interviews at the operation locations. He plans to keep everything the same for the RFPC tours and meetings in the fall. The intent of the changes is also to be able to make those awards at the January Board of Forestry instead of waiting until March to recognize winners. (For 2019 we are recognizing the winners at the March BOF meeting.) But for the 2020 winners the plan is to do that presentation at the January 2021 Board meeting. The goals of this program are to find those operators that are doing a great job exceeding the FPA rules and they are doing it consistently. The authority comes as a part of the Forest Program for Oregon. The award program recognizes one Operator of the Year for each of the three Areas. Then Merit can be awarded to those nominated but not the chosen Operator. (One per District.) The other point of recognition is a Letter of Commendation which comes directly from the Districts themselves on their own timeline. Nominations can be submitted by anyone but mostly come from the Stewardship Foresters or landowners themselves. He wanted to encourage members to consider putting in a nomination. The nominations will be reviewed in the District and Salem headquarters for eligibility. The nomination forms are on the ODF website and should be submitted to the Area. They will be evaluated for consistency, difficulty, results, innovation and extra effort, and some financial risk. Once nominations are vetted and accepted Wagenblast sets up tour dates and selection meetings with each RFPC usually in October. Selections are made and the new timeline will see the operators awarded at the January 2021 meeting. Other award venues are the Associated Oregon Loggers January meeting and then the Oregon Logging Conference. Wagenblast began showing the video interviews with the winning operators.

The winner for Northwest was **Gahlsdorf Logging**. A very challenging operation out in the middle of the Coast Range. Kind of halfway between the valley and the coast. They were using lift trees and had 8 moving blocks going at one point. Brought in several different yarders. They had a lot of challenges, using some iPads and Avenza mapping

and things like that so, a very worthy candidate and they've got a long track record of doing very positive, consistent work out there. [NWRFPFC 2019 Operator of the Year Video]

Southwest Operator of the Year is **Pacific Forest Contractors**. Based out of NW Oregon, they were asked to come down to southern Oregon for a unit that had a bunch of snow damage down in Douglas County and so they moved in and at one point they had three different operations going within the unit. They protected RMAs on some fish and domestic streams. And had some challenges with neighbors having to go up a road system by a vineyard and keep the dust down. And had a lot of challenges with fire season and things like that they were embracing as well. [SWRFPC 2019 Operator of the Year Video]

Operator of the Year for Eastern Oregon is **Steve Jackson Logging**. Mr. Jackson was not available when we did the videotaping and but the unit toured was outside of Hood River. It had a high use public access recreation road going through the middle of that. So challenges of dealing with the public coming and going. They had several streams that they left solid buffers on. And actually bucked the logs shorter than they needed so they could fly them over the top of the RMA instead of dragging them through the RMA on yarding corridors. They protected some of the residual trees in patches that didn't need to be disturbed by the yarding and that sort of thing. Some of the comments that really resonated with him was hearing that Steve Jackson, is one of the guys down in the brush. He's not driving around in a pickup. He's right there in the brush setting chokers, if it's raining he will shut things down ahead of when someone else would make the call. And you'll find him out driving roads, checking ditch lines and cleaning things up. Same thing on the fire side of it. He will shut his operations down ahead of time to prevent any fire risk. [Eastern Oregon 2019 Operator of the Year video]

There was one Merit Award winner this year. **C & C Logging** in NW Oregon Area. They will be awarded a Merit Award Certificate given out at the District's Industrial Fire Breakfast/Dinner so they may be recognized by the peers.

Members had some questions about the number of operations annually and the percentage and severity of violations. He answered that there always are habitual violators that like to push the line. But there are some mistakes that aren't even considered violations because the unsatisfactory condition was fixed before damage occurred. Barnard noted that there are approximately 15,000 notifications entered annually from harvest activities to reforestation, fuel treatments, restoration activities...

Wagenblast also announced that he was able to get the Landowner Recognition Program re-instated with ODF&W. The program is predominantly administered through ODF&W, but it is a joint program between Forestry and Fish and Wildlife. There were nominations this year in NW Oregon and SW Oregon. Fish & Wildlife and their committees did make some selections. He recalled there being two or three landowners that are going to be recognized for their great work this last year. And that program's nominations will routinely be solicited soon as we are trying to run the two programs side-by-side. The ODF&W program has different categories. One for Small Woodland Owners. One for Industrial Forestland Owners and another for Public Entities.

## **11. Next Meeting, Agenda Topics**

Barnard led by suggesting they take another look at the work plan and also complete the Recommendation process that is in the Charter. He also noted member's interest in defining who the family forestland owners are to the Board during the CFF Report to the Board. Kyle may be presenting more information on the DEQ alignment. The climate change as relative to Siskiyou decision will be coming up in April so, in terms of the Board of Forestry policy topics but he didn't see formal input necessary at this time.

Swanson noted that it seemed like we should be categorizing things, topics that we are following with the BOF and responding to. And then working on viability and landowner challenges to stewardship. Additionally she suggested developing an opinion on climate change so we are aligning our relationship and topics with the needs or decisions of the Board. Barnes added that the Board Work Plan will be finalized in March.

There was also interest in investigating further what Saplings.com was doing to help small woodland owners to get reforestation seedlings. Perhaps just reporting back on that. Are they still in business? How does that fit into those processes and to what degree that will help the seedling supply long term?

Once again, possibly inviting NRCS State Forester, Andrew Owen to do a presentation on NRCS? Also the usual updates and a Legislative Update as the Short Session will begin.

Barnes asked for comments for the Good of the Order. Ahrens reported that Amy Grotta, Extension Forester had recently passed away. Many members were familiar with her and appreciated her work.

Barnes adjourned the meeting.