

Meeting notes for Forest Management Plan and Habitat Conservation Plan Informational Meeting October 26, 2018 – Salem, OR

In attendance

ODF Staff: Interim Deputy State Forester Travis Medema, State Forests Division Chief Liz Dent, State Forests Division Deputy Chief Brian Pew, FMP Project Manager Justin Butteris, HCP Project Manager Cindy Kolomechuk, Geotechnical Specialist Mike Buren, Asset Unit Manager Kevin Boyd, Forest Inventory Coordinator Jeff Firman, Wildlife Biologist Nick Palazzotto, Business Team Leader Joshua Clark, Seedling and Young Stand Management Coordinator Robbie Lefebvre, Forest Resource Analyst Tod Haren, Interim Resource Unit Lead Shannon Loffelmacher, Public Affairs Specialist Jason Cox

Others participating: Clatsop County Commissioner Kathleen Sullivan, Oregon Fish and Wildlife Forest Practices Coordinator Rod Krahmer, ODFW Oregon Plan Analyst Julie Firman, Seth Barnes of Oregon Forest Industries Council, Ralph Saperstein, Debra Nudelman and Sylvia Ciborowski of Kearns and West, Peter Harkema of Oregon Consensus, Mark Buckley of ECONorthwest, David Zippin of ICF, Tara Brown of Wild Salmon Center, Dan Edge of Oregon State University

Habitat Conservation Plan: State Forests Division Chief Liz Dent introduced topic of Habitat Conservation Plan scoping process by describing phased approach, and recommendations on scope of HCP. Staff recommending that HCP cover all BoF-owned west of the Cascade Mountains, but does not include Common School Fund lands due to uncertainty over future management of those lands.

Cindy Kolomechuk described the stakeholder outreach process to date on the HCP. Phase II will be critical for stakeholder engagement. She also outlined the multi-agency group that is working on the process. She noted that we have engaged consultants who specialize in stakeholder engagement to ensure a broad and productive public process.

She noted that draft species list includes 16 species (11 listed and 5 non-listed), anticipating that some of the non-listed species may become listed in the future over the 50-year span of an HCP.

Dent underscored that the November Board of Forestry meeting is not to approve an HCP, but whether the Board feels that further pursuit of an HCP is in the best interest of the state.

Mark Buckley described the relationship between an HCP and the federal Endangered Species Act as well as an incidental take permit. He outlined how current ODF practices avoid and minimize impacts to listed species, which results in costly annual surveys and somewhat unpredictable impact to harvests. An HCP, which is required for an incidental take permit from USFWS and NMFS, provides “no surprises” assurances, which can lock in mitigation and expected costs – “a deal is a deal.” An HCP also provides durable and high-quality conservation for covered species. An HCP would be more proactive in anticipating where harvests should not take place due to high-quality habitat for threatened and endangered species.

Buckley then went on to provide detailed comparison on the HCP vs. No HCP scenarios. He noted that most harvest restrictions would be the same in both scenarios, i.e. inoperable and policy-constrained areas. Initially, with an HCP unavailable acres would increase. However, it is anticipated more acres would become unavailable for harvest over next 50 years without an HCP:

Acres available for harvest in 2070 (anticipated)

- With HCP: 370,000
- Without HCP: 268,000

Accordingly, annual harvest volume is projected to steadily decrease without an HCP, but would remain relatively stable with an HCP.

With an HCP, Buckley said an HCP would provide financial benefits by 2021, with annual savings of almost \$2.2 million. These savings rise to over \$5 million annually by 2070.

Non-timber effects include reduced planning costs for ODF staff, reliable habitat provision for ecological and species benefit, negligible impacts on recreation and ecosystem benefits, and reduced long-term litigation risk and liability.

Dent explained that the HCP Business Case was built on informed assumptions that allowed for agency to analyze impacts prior to investing more resources in HCP pursuit.

Saperstein questioned staff on past HCP pursuits, noting that agency was unable to reach agreement with the U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). Dent noted past talks with NMFS regarding Elliott State Forest included discussion of riparian zones, and that those past negotiations provided ICF with a basis to make informed assumptions.

Seth Barnes of OFIC said analysis was simple, and that any number of conditions may occur in forests. He said “status quo” is not good assumption since department is also pursuing FMP that would not be status quo. Dent said current FMP was best anchor, as opposed to assumptions rooted in possible revised FMP. Buckley said Business Case Analysis focused on delta between HCP vs. no-HCP as opposed to exact conditions. Palazzotto added that the business case analysis was built on ranges that are unlikely to be extremely different in any new FMP. Barnes further questioned staff on stakeholder engagement moving forward. Kolomechuk said first phase was largely process-oriented and that public process would be much more robust in next phases.

Tara Brown asked if agency would be reaching out beyond faces in room to get communities that may not come to the table as regularly. Nudelman said a goal is to engage in samples of wide-ranging groups with stake in the process.

Forest Management Plan: Staff provided an overview of the draft Goals, Strategies and Measurable Outcomes document that will be presented at the upcoming Board of Forestry meeting. Dent said staff is proposing that FMP development continue under an adaptive management framework, and that the scope be a single FMP for lands west of the Cascades; currently there are four FMPs for state forests in Oregon.

Barnes said the goals seem agreeable but there’s very little detail. Dent said plan was to provide flexibility so long as there are clear measurable outcomes. She said goals are generally broad, but welcomed input on more specificity.

Tara Brown asked about climate change and said that, while appreciative it was part of aquatic goals, should also be included in other areas such as timber and wildlife, connecting forests to carbon

retention. Dent said that carbon was extensively detailed in the goals, strategies and measurable outcomes as its own goal.

Meeting concluded at 3:16 p.m.