



Committee for Family Forestlands Meeting April 14, 2020



Pursuant to public notice made by news release with statewide distribution, a 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 April 14, 2020 as a virtual online meeting hosted off-site.

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)
Barrett Brown, NW Landowner Rep. (Voting)
Glenn Ahrens, OSU College of Forestry Ext. Ex-Officio
Jim James, OSWA Executive Director Ex-Officio
S. Mark Vroman, Industry rep (Voting) Hampton Family Forests
Julie Woodward, OFRI Ex-Officio
Rex Storm, AOL/OTFS Ex-Officio

ODF Staff:

Josh Barnard, Deputy Chief Private Forests Division
Susan Dominique, Committee Administrative Support
Scott Swearingen, Interim Field Support Manager
Ryan Gordon, Family Forestland Coordinator
Al Devos, Federal Initiatives Unit
Wyatt Williams, Invasive Species Coordinator
Nate Agalzoff, Incentives Coordinator
Kristen Whitney, Office Support

Members not attending:

Janelle Geddes, USFS State & Private Forestry Ex-Officio
John Peel, EO Landowner Rep. (Voting)

Guests:

Clair Klock, CCSWD
Wendy Gerlach, Pacific Forest Trust
Jeremy Felty, OSWA
Andrew Owen, NRCS

1. Welcome

Chair Barnes called the meeting to order and called roll of persons joining the meeting remotely. [See attendance above.]

2. Approval of the Minutes

Barnes asked members if they had a chance to review the meeting minutes from the February meeting and asked for a Motion to Approve. Mark Vroman motioned to approve. Kaola Swanson seconded. All approved, none opposed. The Motion carried to Approve the CFF minutes from February.

3. Public Comment

The guests attending declined to provide comment at the time.

4. Private Forests Division Update – Josh Barnard

Barnard began with staffing updates, and the recruitment and selection ongoing for Private Forests managerial positions. Scott Swearingen has been selected as the Field Support Unit Manager. The Monitoring Manager recruitment is on hold due to the current COVID-19 restrictions. He followed that thought by walking through other impacts to normal business in the Division. The work of Forest Practices Act administration and field work by the Stewardship Foresters is continuing with some social distancing protocols. But offices are only open by appointment. For external partners and federally funded programs, some of our partners have adopted some practices to accommodate social distancing for the most part our work continues on federally-funded grant projects. Urban & Community Forestry has had a few changes with their interactions with partners and communities but are trying to accomplish what they can through other formats. The Urban & Community Forestry Conference has been rescheduled to next year. The J.E. Schroder Seed Orchard has not had many impacts to their work and may actually be increasing operations and orchard work as they are potentially looking at one of biggest harvests that they have recorded. He reported that the annual Aerial Forest Health Survey normally occurring in the spring has been put on hold. One member voiced a question on the outlook for continued harvest notifications. Barnard reported that they are still coming in but not increasing at this time. Related to that of course is the Harvest Tax, where they are speculating there to be a 20 to 30% decline in the market effecting both the workloads and funding. Storm agreed and pointed out that could and will change week by week, but right now he was seeing reductions in production,



Committee for Family Forestlands Meeting April 14, 2020



harvests and log deliveries. Barnes added he is seeing huge layoffs in the forest product industry in Douglas County, not only reflecting the lack of construction but the interruption to normal daily living and the normal levels of consumption and business activity. As our economy is marketplace driven that is all affected by domestic American consumer behavior which has drastically changed due to this health emergency.

As far as other ODF position recruitments, Gordon added that the Federal Forest Restoration Program lead position was open and closed at this point awaiting interviews which are currently on hold because of COVID. There is also an open recruitment for Chad Davis' Partnership and Planning Director position as a two-year developmental rotation open to ODF employees, also other State Agencies. Other questions came up regarding the status of ODF's Financial Review. Barnard answered that the review is being conducted by the consulting firm, NGO looking at the operational portions of the funding. He shared that they expect fire season funding, but the timing and amounts are uncertain but they are hopeful that solutions can be found to keep moving forward. There was strong recognition of the fire funding structure to pay for fires in the long term. And a huge workload of additional planning for fire response given the COVID-19 restrictions on social distancing especially in regards to crew travel. Another caveat is the concern that the State won't be able to get personnel from other states to respond based upon the status of the pandemic. Storm emphasized that the transportation distancing is the hardest challenge but ultimately there are some functions that still need to occur, if there is fire the Department will be there to put it out.

Continuing the update, Barnard noted that there was a Memorandum of Agreement signed during the Short Legislative Session in a collaborative effort between representatives of the timber industry and conservation groups pertaining to gaining increased environmental protections but negotiating with industry to provide assurances that they will be able to plan out their forest management without the constant uncertainty when litigation is underway. Those MOA Initiatives were written for the Short Session but never got to hearings. Barnard noted that support remains for that process to work and it will probably gain traction in the next Session. Regarding rulemaking, he shared that the Marbled Murrelet Rule Analysis was moving forward and currently holding focus group meetings with stakeholders reminding members they have an equal opportunity to comment if there is interest. Wildlife Food Plots final draft process is underway. He reported that the Siskiyou Project is still being prepared and moving forward. At the April Board Meeting a person presented some contextual information on climate change regarding the Siskiyou. We are waiting for the Board's direction. We can't just arbitrarily stop the process without direction from them and they are aware that the MOU exists. So until we receive official direction to change course we really don't have the power to do that. Swanson was curious to get some clarity and others thoughts about how the MOU gets incorporated into rules. Will the forest landowners get to opt in or out? What is the legal context? Does that become an HCP somehow? How would it be funded? James re-capitulated that reading between the lines of the MOU it's about collectively working together, following science to jointly come up with some viable solutions outside of litigation. James shared that the parties involved in the Agreement developed mutual trust that was surprising after the many years of separation on the issues. And it has given him some faith that this process will work as intended. Swanson pointed out the inefficiency of continuing to put staff hours into monitoring not essential to the Board's decision and that tying up valuable capacity.

The Chair floated the idea of composing a letter from the Committee to the Board supporting this collaboration. Members in general did not disagree but needed more clarity on the issue. Members offered their views in turn.

- Barnes began that he agreed with the desire for some efficiency but with "the unchartered territory we are in", he would give pause, rather than having to re-do work later. Barnes responded that it would be good to provide efficiency for rulemaking and monitoring. Pausing until the initiative process brings clarity to the process.
- Brown was pleased that the MOA had survived the Short Session and was receiving post-session support. He offered that it may be time for the Board to pick this up and assess how the elements of the MOA will integrate with their work. Currently, the Board directed the Divisions to respond to the petitions in discussion in the Agreement and suggested that with the concession given to industry drop all litigation. The Board needs to update



Committee for Family Forestlands Meeting April 14, 2020



that direction for monitoring. Brown saw it as the most promising thing to happen in forestry in this State in 15 years and well worth consideration by the Board.

- Ahrens (speaking as an ex-officio member) submitted that it certainly sounded like a good thing to do, but the complexity of the legal standing requires some clarification. He felt he had a good enough understanding to recommend that the Siskiyou process should be suspended until the direction is clear and the Board knows the impact to their work plans and philosophy.
- James suggested that staff invite the State Forester and BOF Chair to a CFF meeting to help their discussion and provide some advice on what is legally possible for the State to authorize and provide guidance to the Committee on how members can best support the Agreement and whether or not a recommendation would have any value.

Barnard pointed out that one of the challenges is where the desired outcome of the MOA described a certain set of specifications for buffers in the Siskiyou. If that was legislatively changed, the Department wouldn't have any further processes imposed by the litigation. But the Board still has a larger process to go through than the legislature does for that same desired outcome. So if the suggestion is to pause the process till the legislative process comes to fruition that route is different than saying that either process will have the same outcome.

Barnard ended that the work by saying the Coho petition is continuing. Staff are continuing the Agency's work aligning with the Department of Environmental Quality on their continuing work on a Fish Passage MOA with ODF&W. Wildlife Food Plots rulemaking is still on track with public comment and hearings. They will have the Fiscal Impact Statement (FIS) prepared soon which should approximate and forecast any financial implications for timber owners.

5. CFF Fact Sheet for Woodland Owners – Julie Woodward, OFRI

Woodward reported that OFRI and ODF Public Relations are working on a draft Fact Sheet and preparing a presentation for the July BOF meeting. But with COVID restrictions the Board meeting format hasn't been determined at this time for July. Barnard added that ODF is planning as appropriate to public meeting restrictions. Ahrens offered support to doing a virtual presentation if preferred.

Along the lines of outreach, members were disappointed that Tree School was cancelled/postponed. It was announced that there is going to be a virtual Tree School webinar series, spearheaded by the Partnership for Forestry Education with Mike Cloughesy and OFRI. This will be a weekly webinar occurring on Tuesdays. Extension has been taking a lot of programs to a virtual format. On the eastside, the series will be led by John Punches, Extension Agent in NE Oregon. He will be doing the Basic Forestry Short Course for Woodland Owners which will be available online, a format they are getting more comfortable with their providing convenience to landowners who would have to travel a long way to attend. The Tree School Series, is going to be slightly different a lot more classes but a similar type of thing. Woodward mentioned that in addition to the weekly Tree School topics they are planning to highlight the forest industries response so far to COVID-19 restrictions, what is going on in the communities, mills and markets. That discussion will be held on the afternoon May 5th. James shared that they are planning an email blast to all of OSWA's members to encourage them to participate. Woodward's intention is that they will get the Fact Sheet for Woodland Owners out before the May meeting, she will send it to members ahead of the meeting for their review to finalize for the July BOF meeting.

Committee Vacancies Discussion continued...

Barnard opened a continuing discussion regarding Committee vacancies and impacts of the national emergency on outreach. Open member positions are for the Citizen-At-Large and Landowner-At-Large. Vroman and James offered to try and speak with a landowner they both are acquainted with to discern his interest. Gerlach, (attending as an interested party) wanted to offer that the Pacific Forest Trust would be interested in being considered for the At-Large member vacancy. Swanson echoed that would be a good match for the group. Barnes brought up the issue of getting some press for



Committee for Family Forestlands Meeting April 14, 2020



the efforts of the Committee focusing on the HB2469 signing, through Capitol Press reporting, or articles in OSWAs newsletters. James would ask Roger Beyer again about making a request to the Governor's Office to do the signing. There was also the mention of the Committee merger and how that might satisfy the member vacancies. Barnard offered continuing discussion on that but didn't see it as a barrier to inviting in new folks.

The update on membership kicked off another continuing discussion. That of merging CFF and the State Stewardship Coordinating Committee. Looking at each group's roles, chartered functions and membership, he thought CFF has a broader scope in terms of their involvement in policy and as an Advisory Committee to the Board of Forestry and the State Forester. And the SSCC, which has similar representation in terms of small landowners and representatives, and ex-officio members who are already serving on both committees. Where CFF identifies landowner concerns and opportunities, the federal programs whose members serve on SSCC are a part of the solution. Especially where landowner issues affect a larger landscape, solutions often come found through Federal programs represented on the SSCC. So staff are looking to create some synergy in their reporting efforts by aligning those efforts but still maintain and treat the groups as separately. But providing opportunity to tackle important issues together. The SSCC would become a Work Group under the CFF maintaining their role in the Forest Legacy Program process independently.

Ryan Gordon contributed more detail describing the concept and federal requirement to convene these authorities in a coordinating committee. The concept and requirement for the SSCC came through the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act and the intent was to provide oversight and feedback to State Forestry Agency and their application of USFS State & Private Forestry programs. So membership as outlined in the Act was primarily State and Federal Agencies, industry representation, landowners, the conservation community and consulting foresters. A constituency similar to CFF membership and their ex-officios representation. A few CFF members serve on both committees already. Gordon added that the SSCC is also party to a review of the State Forest Action Plan which occurs every 5 years and the Oregon Forest Management Planning System (Uniform Plan) under our Forest Stewardship Program. So the idea would be to create a Forest Legacy/Forest Stewardship working group under CFF endowed with those responsibilities. But recognizing that there is a fair amount of overlap between these two groups and that over time there may be opportunities to invite some of those folks to be official members of CFF if they fit the bill for a voting position, but as agency representatives they would be welcome to attend CFF meetings as non-voting members to engage in the conversation. Chair Barnes wanted member's feedback, especially the outlook from the members already serving on both committees. James offered he understood the obvious efficiencies but had some concern about maintaining CFF's advisory role and compromising the ability of the CFF to be a valued asset to the Board's decision-making. But he also offered that it would add value to CFF discussions having an ODF&W representative on board.

Gordon clarified the goal of keeping the two roles separate but connected enough to provide some efficiency in staff capacity. Separate with different authority, but a little bit more connected for that efficiency. The State & Private Forestry side in the Forest Service is on the other side of the National Forest System. State & Private Forestry provide a lot of the funding and support for State Forest agencies to work with industrial landowners and communities on a variety of forestry related topics. And the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act requires that we identify a body that serves as a Stewardship Coordinating Committee. He proposed that the State identify CFF as that body but then have this working group that remains focused on Forest Legacy and Forest Stewardship and keep that separate from the regular business of CFF.

Swanson agreed and thought this would make CFF a better advocate for State match on Federal programs. Brown agreed it would be a net gain for both groups. The efficiencies also apply to the volunteer members as well as agency resources and as a potential source to fill committee vacancies. Gordon agreed noting the challenge of achieving quorum with both committees. Storm offered, as a representative on both committees, that both these groups have a different charter, different mission, and different role. And while we might want to achieve some efficiencies, the term merger is probably not a good way to go because of those very different authorities.



Committee for Family Forestlands Meeting April 14, 2020



Gordon answered that on paper for the purposes of satisfying the requirement of the Cooperative Forestry Act, CFF would be identified as the body that fills that State Stewardship Coordinating Committee role. But practically speaking, the work that SSCC Committee does would remain focused in this working group keeping those two work lines separate.

Woodward speaking for OFRI offered that they would welcome any direction the members agree upon.

Gordon went on to describe the meeting schedule for the Work Group would be dictated by the timing of the Forest Legacy application cycle, usually in August and September. He couldn't predict how many work group members would attend the CFF meetings except perhaps when the dates synched up or they choose to attend based upon their interest in topics coming up on the agenda. If they chose to attend one of your meetings they would attend as a non-voting member. Barnes observed that the preponderance of opinion seemed positive and asked if there was a Motion on the concept.

Brown Motioned that this concept move forward with the creation of the CFF Chartered Work Group that would continue the functions of the State Stewardship Coordinating Committee under the umbrella of the Committee for Family Forestlands. Swanson Seconded the Motion. All voting members were in favor, none opposed. The Motion carried. Gordon announced that SSCC will be meeting April 29th and this discussion is scheduled on that agenda. He will bring the results back to CFF at the next meeting. The idea would be to formalize this from both sides and aim for the end of June as a start date so they can formally recognize the transition in the revised Forest Action Plan. If CFF chose to invite one of those members to fill a voting member role that would go through whatever the standard process is for the Board to approve that appointment.

7. Forest Health Overview – Wyatt Williams, Invasive Species Coordinator

Barnard introduced Wyatt Williams, who was invited to provide an update on the State of the State in terms of forest health.

Williams provided his presentation online focusing on all types of invasive species destructive to the forests. White Pine Blister Rust, first showed up in Oregon in 1910. Also Balsam Wooley Algid causing mortality of True Fir at high elevations. Port Orford Cedar Root Disease has really affected export market beginning in the 50's and 60's. And most recently Sudden Oak Death. He showed a chart illustrating that forest invaders are still arriving in the U.S. at the rate of about 2.5 exotic, invasive species per year and described the worst of the worst forest insects, weeds and disease. The Department's invasive species strategy is kind of like the wildfire model. Where when we have an area infested as time goes on the control costs get higher and the infested area larger. So just like wildfire where we want to control fire with out initial attack, they want to prevent the spread of new invasive species by detecting them early when we can keep our control costs down low. Our whole strategy with invasive species is to prevent transport or detect them early. Starting off with weeds, Oregon Department of Agriculture is the lead in these efforts by regulation through the State's Noxious Weed List. He explained there are regulated weeds, like Scotch Broom and Himalayan Blackberry, Geraniums. But there are a lot of exotic plants that are not regulated and not particularly noxious like Woodland Groundsel, Fox-eye Daisy, and Prickly Lettuce. These are all plants that we deal with in western Oregon forests. And Woodland Groundsel has occurred in our State since the 1900's. But with a sharp uptick in the 90's and 2000's, it has become probably our number one forestry weed but it's not regulated on our State's Noxious Weed list! Another one is Foxglove with growing populations which definitely out-compete those early tree seedlings for light and water. He emphasized that Noxious Weed Listing matters! If it is not regulated it is totally legal to purchase adding to the populations. Even though this has been in this country for a long time these are not native plants and are adding to the problem in our forests. He brought up that issue because ODA administers the State Weed Board which fall under the guidelines for public meetings. As such the public has the ability to propose additions to the Noxious Weed List. Stakeholder groups as well as individuals can propose changes and additions as well. ODF supports the work of ODA who do a great job of receiving that input, doing risk assessments and making changes to the list every year. As a result of a February State Weed Board meeting, he reported that they have added English Hawthorne to List B. List B weeds are illegal to buy, sell and transport. List A are our top



Committee for Family Forestlands Meeting April 14, 2020



priority, requiring mandatory eradication regardless of the ownership. List B they don't have that stringent requirement but at least it makes it illegal to buy, sell or transport. Forest landowners need to play more of a participatory role in that process. We can facilitate changes. And it's important! If a weed is regulated landowner applications for eradication can receive priority ranking for their projects when applying for incentives. One of these highly invasive regulated noxious weeds, is Orange Hawkweed (a List A weed), at the highest priority for mandatory eradication. It can invade a clear-cut or open pastures and it is "pollen-allelopathic" which means it produces chemicals that will kill and prevent germination of other competing vegetation to it. It is on Oregon's List A. It is currently found in Washington. So if we see it, we eradicate it and did so when a small population was discovered in Astoria and treated. That's was a big success story.

Sudden Oak Death is our number one invasive species right now. Sarah Navarro our Forest Pathologist is the lead on this. Sudden Oak Death was detected in 2001 by aerial survey and since then it has been quarantined and our eradication program has now shifted to Slow the Spread. In Oregon it kills the tanoak native to SW Oregon and it is just in a portion of Curry County. But it is very, very extensive, in 14 counties in California. But they have been able so far to limit it to 1 county in Oregon but that has taken a lot of hard work and a lot of money. This fungus spreads in wind-driven rain and prevailing winds in the winter are from the southwest. The suspected pathway into Oregon has been determined to be the nursery trade. This organism can live in 150 different host plants and some of them are some of our biggest plant nursery trade species, like rhododendron, azaleas. He reported that the State has a pretty aggressive Slow the Spread Campaign where we go in and knock down all the hosts in a certain area whether they are infested or not. That brings down the inoculum level. This has been where the majority of our funding goes is paying these contract crews in Curry County to control that. He has been real proud of our team's effort and collaboration with the Forest Service and other agencies to keep the infestation as small as possible.

Gypsy Moth is detected almost annually in Oregon. But fortunately the pheromone traps ODA hangs are really good at detecting GM populations at extremely low levels, so provide good early detection and eradication with an organic labelled pesticide. The State has saved hundreds of millions of dollars in control costs and pesticide use in this rapid response strategy since 1979.

Williams reported that another invasive coming is the Emerald Ash Borer (EAB). It has killed over 100 million Ash trees in the eastern U.S. really quickly, in some areas killing over 95% of native Ash in Michigan and Ohio and has cost the U.S. over \$2 billion by now. Eradication attempts in affected states hasn't stopped it. The closest infestation is in Colorado only a days drive away. When it comes to the west coast we could see 100% mortality of native Ash within 10 years. He shared that Ash is really common in western Oregon in elevations below 1000 feet, normally around riparian areas. ODF and ODA have developed a Risk Map and [EAB Response Plan](#) on how Oregon can prepare a big interagency effort including the Forest Service and other agencies as well as local communities. That Plan is available on the web. The strategies are being looked at proactively learning from efforts in other States. One lesson learned is other States neglected to collect seed. We applied for Forest Service funding and got it to use for Ash seed collection into long term storage, seed vaults. The goal here is to collect 1 million seeds from 300 mother trees. We are at about 40% of the way to that goal to conserve the species genetics.

Williams then reported on a 3 year exotic insect survey. Traps were set from Astoria up to The Dalles with 8 different traps at 12 sites. They sampled at 8 different times April through September. They focused this survey on the high trafficked corridor for new invasive wood borers, bark beetles and ambrosia beetles. They detected 4 new exotic wood borers. The total species list found had about 200 species, but most were native. They got 24 exotics and out of that 4 new state records. One has the potential to be a problem for Oregon, an exotic Ambrosia beetle which is the first record of one in North America. Its hosts are oaks at this point. We do know it's from Europe and was caught at Chinook Landing by Troutdale right on the Columbia River which is good as we don't want to catch invasive species in our forests! The good news is we didn't detect any more here in 2019, but it is killing oaks in the Bay area, so there is current research going on in that region to identify the fungal associates involved killing the White Oak species. They are calling it the California



Committee for Family Forestlands Meeting April 14, 2020



Oak Wilt right now. Ambrosia beetles go into the wood and actually farm fungus, they feed fungus to their young. And sometimes those fungus species are pathogenic and that is the case for this one in White Oak. So that was one that we are on high alert for in Oregon and Williams has a research proposal underway right now to do education outreach in southern Oregon in Medford and Grants Pass for the possibility of that one moving up from California.

On a positive note he wanted to mention some successes. One is the Oregon Forest Pest Detectors, a professional program through OSU. Not citizen science, but to train professionals to identify key invasive forests pests. We are going to run out of funding at the end of June but by bringing together a lot of partners a training curriculum was developed and had over 500 arborists and foresters, landscape contractors, park workers participate in 35 workshops and 13 field courses. Students have logged 27 reports of suspected new invasive species to the Oregon Invasive Species Council Hotline as a citizen reporting tool. Two new exotic species reported resulted from that program! So we detected a brand new invasive species using the Oregon Forest Pest Detector so, that program does work and we hope to keep using it in the future.

To close, he shared that last year the Spruce Aphid populations blew up on the coast. This invasive species was introduced to Oregon in the early 1900s. In the 50's it caused over 20,000 acres of damage for a few years in a row on the Coast Range and in 2019 it was detected again by aerial survey. Recall that ODF and Forest Service fly every single acre in the forest every year. They were first getting reports in 2018 of the Spruce Aphid in Sitka Spruce on the coast. And ODF, OSU and Parks are collaborating on a project to do monitoring on this in 2020 and in communication with Washington and Alaska as well. We were hoping to do aerial survey this year, but because of COVID that might be on hold. Spruce Aphid doesn't kill Sitka Spruce but it reduces radial growth and cone production. They do expect it to taper off this year or next year. Williams then invited comments and questions.

Barnes asked about what resources they use to see the history of detections, infestations. Williams responded there was a site called The Oregon Flora Project where they have digitized all the State records and 30 to 40 of the records kept by small colleges and universities and private collections for digital records of all the herbaria. You can see the map of the first occurrence of any plant, native or exotic in the State.

Addressing the governance of the effort, Williams clarified that there is a State Weed Board at ODA similar to the BOF, but not as formal and only meeting twice a year. Another group is the Oregon Invasive Species Council formed by statute. Made up of a collection of 17 agencies and some At-Large members as well. ODF is a member agency. They meet 3 times per year. The purpose of the Oregon Invasive Species Council is coordinating and communicating across those agencies. The idea for Oregon Forest Pest Detectors, evolved out of those conversations realizing how Emerald Ash Borer is going to affect forestry, it's going to affect Ag, it's going to affect soil and water conservation districts, so prompted some brainstorming. The existence of the Council forces all the agencies into the room to talk about invasive species and common strategies to work on them.

Brown asked about image analysis of satellite canopy images that are collected. ODF wrote up an alternative strategy for aerial surveys due to COVID restrictions with social distancing. But putting people up in planes to do the surveys are the cheapest and most effective way for reporting of forest health conditions. A human observer can discern and detect host tree species and the insect and disease way better than any camera or computer. But with the current restrictions we are proposing to utilize satellite-based imaging tools to do a small survey that way. Along with that they were able to purchase 3 drones. Staff are in a drone pilot training program to be licensed to fly. Danny Norlander, Survey Specialist is a drone pilot. The survey will be extremely small scale. Currently one survey has already been cancelled. The Swiss Needle Cast survey that usually starts in May. And the General Survey that starts in June, is looking like it's going to be cancelled too this year. Staff will know more in their Thursday meeting with the Forest Service. Ahrens offered to send a link for the Forest Health Oregon 2020 State of the State conference which has a lot of excellent presentations.



Committee for Family Forestlands Meeting April 14, 2020



James thought it might be of interest to the Committee to petition to have Foxglove and groundsel added to the Noxious Weed list. He added that would interest OSWA as well to actually request the Department of Agriculture to add those to the list. Vroman offered that foxglove and groundsel are extreme water/moisture users in the spring, choking out young Douglas-fir. Williams continued that when a weed is listed it opens the door to funding for projects trying new control techniques. He suggested that if there were letters signed by landowner groups that request would garner greater weight with the Weed Board to list them. James suggested the Department help prepare the message providing the necessary details pertinent to the species. SAF, OFIC, OSWA/Tree Farm and others might want to sign off on that. Barnard agreed to investigate the correct way to engage with ODA and other stakeholders and through whatever the appropriate mechanism is to consider providing a letter. Listing would provide two distinct benefits. One it makes it illegal to sell. The second it makes any eradication efforts more competitive in research grant proposals. ODF administers incentive programs like the NRCS grants. ODA has a Weed Grant Program. The State Weed Board administers something like \$1.5 million dollars in weed control projects every biennium. And so they fund approximately 50 projects every biennium on noxious weed control.

5. Roundtable

Ahrens spoke about OSU Extension Fire Program and the ramp up to that. They have done interviews for the Manager on campus and the State Fire Specialists and expect to be hiring soon. The Regional Specialists positions for 6 different regions around the state will be recruited this summer. They are also trying to address fire preparedness webinars working with the counties and Extension and partners like ODF and SWCD to do those things virtually. Because a webinar is available to a much broader geography, they are not sure exactly how to connect to the local fire districts and ODF Fire Protection folks. Just a heads up about that and that they will be knocking on your door as kind of a statewide effort. Gordon suggested he get in touch with Jenna Trentadue in Salem to be directed to the Community Wildfire Planners in the Districts.

Swanson mentioned that Sustainable NW has worked to develop a Community Forest Guide, focused for communities interested in purchasing forestland for recreation, view sheds, source water protections helping them move through that process. Unfortunately they have had to cancel their in-person conference this year. We're going to do a series of webinars instead and I think the first one will be on the day the conference was supposed to happen. I think on May 7th, so it will be a Community Forests 101 and if folks are interested you can let me know. Barnard shared that ODF's role has been on the Community Forest Program side of the Forest Service funding. ODF reviews project but doesn't take ownership of that process as we do Forest Legacy. The process is similar but the applications get submitted directly to the Forest Service. Amy Singh follows up and provides input on those projects representing the State Forester for review but applications are solicited through the Forest Service. Janelle Geddes is the USFS representative on the SSCC and this Committee and is their preferred representative to direct those questions to.

Brown shared that his ongoing project personally is to be publically involved and engaged with lots of different recreation communities with public and private lands to defend the Recreational Immunity statute (ORS 105.682) in Oregon. To immunize all landowners from claims of negligence unless charging a fee to use the land. A permit, like a hunting permit, or even a Driver's License would have negated that Recreational Immunity Statute. Just to clarify landowners are immune from gross or willful negligence claims under that statute. But there are other threats to that statute in the courts today but that's the latest he could share on that. [In two cases, the Court of Appeals interpreted the word "permit" in the statute to mean that landowners with recreational immunity have the authority to exclude the public from using the property for recreational purposes but if they choose to allow such use suggests that if a landowner can't prohibit people from using their property for recreational use, then the landowner can't permit people to use the property and therefore can't claim recreational immunity.] James thought this would be a good effort for the Committee to consider and extremely important to woodland owners. He offered that OSWA would be interested in pursuing that. Brown offered to keep the members informed.



Committee for Family Forestlands Meeting April 14, 2020



Barnard summarized what he heard as subjects to include as agenda items for future meetings.

- The Woodland Fact Sheet for Landowners
- The petition letter for Weed Board listings.
- Reporting back on the State Stewardship Coordinating Committee and the workgroup piece of the Charter, as a placeholder if we are ready to go at that point with Amy Singh, our Legacy Program Coordinator, provide an introduction.
- Bringing Andrew Owen from NRCS to that meeting to provide a high level overview of their programs.
- Board-related items: Reviewing the Annual Report Draft; BOF Siskiyou decision.
- Any update on the ceremonial signing of HB 2469 and publicity for the Committee.
- Updates on ODF's budget, Wildfire Council work and budgeting fire.

Barnard reminded members that the meeting format for May is still to be determined after assessing the current COVID restrictions situation.

Barnes adjourned the meeting.