

MEETING SUMMARY

WESTERN OREGON HCP SCOPING TEAM

Tuesday, May 7, 2019, 10:00 am – 1:00 pm

Oregon Department of Forestry, 2600 State St, Salem, OR

ATTENDEES

Participants: Julie Firman (ODFW), Jim Muck (NOAA Fisheries), Ken Phippen (NOAA Fisheries), Nick Palazzotto (ODF), Mark Meleason (ODF), Rich Szlemp (USFWS), Brian Pew (ODF), Rod Kraemer (ODF), Ryan Singleton (DSL), Josh Seeds (DEQ) – *on phone*

Technical Consultant: Troy Rahmig (ICF), Melissa Klungle, Greg Blair and Aaron Gabbe (ICF) – *on phone*

Facilitation Team: Cindy Kolomechuk (ODF), Debra Nudelman and Sylvia Ciborowski (Kearns & West)

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Deb Nudelman (Kearns & West) welcomed members. Meeting participants introduced themselves.

Deb reviewed the agenda, which includes: 1) agency updates from Scoping Team (ST) members, 2) update on stakeholder engagement, 3) report out on April 30, 2019 Steering Committee (SC) meeting and outcomes, 4) review Western Oregon HCP Mission, Vision and Goals, 5) review HCP Plan Area and Permit Area, and 6) discuss covered species distribution maps and data. Deb reviewed the meeting materials, which include the Western Oregon HCP Operating Principles, Western Oregon HCP Mission, Vision and Goals, Permit Area and Plan Area Map, and various meeting summaries.

Deb reminded members of the meeting ground rules.

Deb noted that there is an interest in making SC and ST meeting summaries available to the public for transparency and to keep stakeholders informed of the process. SC members agreed with this approach. ST members will receive meeting summaries after all meetings for review and will be asked to adopt them at the following meeting. ST members are asked to provide edits on the April 2, 2019 ST Meeting Summary, as well as past meeting summaries, by May 14, 2019.

Cindy Kolomechuk (ODF) clarified OSU's role as a technical reviewer to support the ST. SC member Dan Edge (OSU) suggested having an OSU reviewer at the ST level. The intent is that

OSU reviewers will be kept up to speed and will be brought along in the process to avoid delayed review. ST members had questions about the role of OSU in science review and expressed an interest in avoiding debate over science late in the process. ODF clarified that OSU is not being asked to do a science review. Instead, the university is being asked to read documents and be engaged at a high level.

AGENCY UPDATES

Members provided updates relevant to the Western Oregon HCP process:

- **Updates from NOAA Fisheries:** NOAA Fisheries won the second appeal with BLM Resource Management. There is still the possibility of appeal to the 9th Circuit.
- **Updates from ODFW:** None.
- **Updates from USFWS:** None
- **Updates from ODF:** 1) ODF is working with ODFW to finish the stream resource assessment. A paper related to the study is available, and Mark Meleason will share it with the ST. 2) ODF held Board of Forestry, Forest Trustlands Advisory Committee (FTLAC), and stakeholder roundtable meetings in April regarding the HCP and FMP. Jason Miner attended the Board of Forestry meeting and expressed the Governor's support to the HCP. There were questions from the public about stakeholder engagement in Phase 2, and questions about how far along ODF and the agencies are in HCP development. Sharing the ST and SC meeting summaries will be helpful for transparency and to keep stakeholders apprised of the process.
- **Updates from DEQ:** None.
- **Updates from DSL:** None.

WESTERN OREGON HCP STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT UPDATE

The next public meeting is scheduled for June 12 from 1:00 to 4:00 pm. at Broadway Commons. ST members are invited to RSVP to Sylvia Ciborowski and attend if possible. The format will likely include a round of presentations and updates, and opportunity for Q&A and discussion, followed by an informal meet-and-greet from 3:00 to 4:00 p.m. A livestream option will also be available.

The project team is working on an overall stakeholder engagement plan that will be available soon.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT OUT

Deb provided an overview of the April 30, 2019 SC meeting. The SC adopted the Operating Principles and an approach for decision-making. They adopted the Western Oregon HCP Mission, Vision and Goals, HCP Plan Area and Permit Area, and Covered Species List.

Deb explained the process for how the ST will be asked to make recommendations or show their alignment on topics using a tent cards approach. If a member is not present, the project team will circle back with that member to seek their concurrence. If ST members cannot get to consensus, then the topic may be taken to the SC with an explanation of the various viewpoints, for SC discussion. ST members noted that there may some topics for which greater public process is needed before the agency can express full alignment.

Deb directed members to the adopted Operating Principles document in the meeting packet, noting that the Operating Principles apply to the SC and ST.

WESTERN OREGON HCP MISSION, VISION AND GOALS

Deb noted that SC members spent several meetings reviewing and revising the Western Oregon HCP Mission, Vision and Goals document. The language is important guidance for the HCP. The federal services may incorporate the language into the NEPA Purpose and Need if appropriate.

Cindy reviewed the Mission, Vision and Goals, and noted that the intent is to incorporate the language into Chapter 1 of the HCP. The goals may be used when developing and analyzing alternatives in the NEPA process. The goals are also helpful in conversations with stakeholders, to highlight the many values of the forest that the HCP is considering.

The SC approved the Mission, Vision and Goals at their last meeting, and today is an opportunity for ST members to provide their comments from a technical point of view.

Discussion

Deb asked members for their reflections on the Mission, Vision and Goals and whether there are any omissions or concerns. Members discussed and made the following comments:

- Question about when forest modelers and economists will be brought into the conversation. It will be important for economic experts to determine whether ST recommendations are economically viable. ST members expressed an interest in understanding the interaction between achieving the biological goals and objectives within the economic framework. Troy Rahmig (ICF) responded that the project team is just beginning to meet with economists to discuss harvest modeling and economic elements, and they can be engaged at ST meetings at the appropriate times. The biological goals & objectives workshops also provide an opportunity to have discussions related to timber harvest modeling, to help ST members understand how timber harvest decisions affect conservation decisions.

- Suggest reviewing the HCP mission to ensure that it is appropriately comprehensive. The HCP mission's relevance to the goals seems lacking. Also suggest adding hunting and commercial fisheries to Goal 5.

Members were asked to provide any remaining comments on the Mission, Vision and Goals by May 14, 2019.

Deb noted that the project team will also share the Mission, Vision, and Goals at the June 12 public meeting.

PLAN AREA AND PERMIT AREA

Troy explained that the SC was in favor of the HCP Plan Area and Permit Area at their last meeting. The Board and FTLAC also reviewed this version.

Troy explained changes made to the HCP Plan Area and Permit Area since it was last presented to the ST:

- Common School Fund (CSF) Lands and Board of Forestry lands are collapsed into one category: ODF-managed lands.
- The project team worked with the Districts to review District land acquisition and transfer plans, to include lands that might come under ODF management into the HCP area. These are shown as the HCP Plan Area. The ODF managed lands (i.e., Permit Area) include approximately 635,000 acres. The Plan Area adds approximately another potential 200,000 acres.

The Districts are now reviewing the map as a final check. The boundary might change very slightly based on that review.

The SC came to consensus on the HCP Plan Area and Permit Area. They had questions on the pros and cons of having the larger Plan Area and suggested that there be clear messaging around ODF's intent in acquiring and exchanging lands for the future. The public may assume that ODF is interested in acquiring all the lands in the Plan Area, and that is not be the case.

Discussion

Deb asked members for their comments on the Plan Area and Permit Area. Members discussed and made the following comments:

- The HCP will need to address what conservation will occur on the Plan Area lands if and when they are brought under ODF management. Suggest that the HCP include language to encourage land purchases that would specifically further conservation, when possible. Troy noted that the HCP language currently says that land exchanges could only occur if the conservation strategy could still be implemented, as described in the HCP. This would likely incentivize identifying and acquiring lands that have a high conservation value. Troy can review this language with the ST at a future meeting.

- Members had questions about why the Plan Area is more expanded in some areas than others. ODF staff explained that some parcels are more limited due to closely adjoining private and federal lands.

COVERED SPECIES DISTRIBUTION

Troy noted that the project team is developing life history accounts for each of the covered species, as well as associated covered species distribution maps. The aim is to characterize the covered species in enough detail to be able to develop meaningful conservation strategies. The life history accounts are succinct statements of our current understandings of the species; each will include a map of current species distribution.

Fish Species Distribution Maps

Troy and Greg Blair, ICF, presented sample covered species distribution maps for select fish species. The presentation noted:

- The maps show the HCP Plan Area and Permit Area boundaries and are intended to provide context on how much of the species is within the Plan and Permit Area.
- The maps were developed using StreamNet data. Major independent populations will be mapped separately. Information will be shown at the hydrologic unit code (HUC) level.
- Zoomed-in versions of the maps are also being developed. These help to show the scattered parcels in relation to stream layers. We may ask the ST whether it makes sense to do some strategies on certain parcels (i.e., site-specific strategies). The detailed map information helps us understand where we can get the best benefit for the species, and the best place to apply some of the strategies.

Discussion on Fish Species Distribution Maps

Key comments, questions, and discussion topics included:

- Comments on development of objectives:
 - When thinking about conservation strategies and goals and objectives, suggest creating a higher-level set of goals and objectives under a relevant organizing principle, and then having a discussion on the benefits that the strategies provide to the given species.
 - We will likely want objectives at the population level for some fish species. If we set up objectives by population, that will drive the level of detail that we want (i.e., HUC level or other).
- Comments on data and map layers:
 - Suggest bringing in additional stream network to understand what the range would look like on individual parcels.
 - Question about how foresters would use the maps on the ground, when assessing future timber sales.

- Suggest turning on topography layer to provide more detail in the zoomed in maps.
- Spring Chinook: It is important to include both the upper section and the areas that are traditionally part of the ESU.
- Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast (SONCC) coho: Questions about how SONCC coho is mapped, since there is not a lot of data on the species. ICF noted that the most up to date StreamNet data is used. Members suggested including not just distribution of current coho populations, but also including potential habitat and recovery area and historical coho area (see NOAA Fisheries' critical habitat data). NOAA Fisheries is developing a mapped representation of how NOAA Fisheries is interpreting the federal register definition of critical habitat for coho. Since there are very few data points, suggest that for now the HCP think about just ODF lands, rather than the entire ESU. Members agreed that StreamNet steelhead distribution, which is updated by ODFW, is the appropriate data for the HCP mapping.
- Question about how the HCP will consider the Klamath and Smith River portions in Oregon that drain into California. ODFW does not manage those populations of fish because the rivers drain into California. ICF noted that Klamath River is not part of the HCP Plan Area.

Wildlife Species Distribution Maps and Discussion

Troy noted that the wildlife species distribution maps are developed using published ranges and information. Data on terrestrial wildlife is not as robust as data available for fish species.

Troy and the ICF team presented sample covered species distribution maps for select terrestrial species.

Key comments, questions, and discussion topics included:

- Red Tree Vole: ICF noted that this map shows published distribution data, using all available data from a reputable source.
 - Members commented that the Distinct Population Segment (DPS) line does not define the actual and known distribution of red tree vole. It is possible that tree vole exists east of the DPS line. USFWS will announce a decision on that boundary in the next few months. Troy noted that if the DPS line changes, the team will change that line on the HCP covered species distribution map as well.
- Slender Salamander: ICF noted that this map uses published data, including occurrence data and a published distribution boundary. In order to map this species, the project team will likely use the general distribution maps and a combination of stand age and LIDAR data to come up with a better understanding of where the species may be. Future monitoring will be important to provide a check on whether the assumed habitat features are accurate.

- Members noted that a Weyerhaeuser study of stands found salamander on every plot in the study.
- Marbled Murrelet: ICF and ODF noted that the map shows marbled murrelet management areas. The map includes two layers: adjacent federal occupied lands that we know of, and observations (presence and occupied detections). Occupancy data will be used to help make conservation strategy decisions. The project team will likely use stand age and LIDAR data to make assumptions on how habitat might develop in the future for the species.
- Coastal Marten: ICF presented the coastal marten species distribution map, noting that it is digitized from the USFWS species status assessment. Members had no concerns or comments.
- Norther Spotted Owl: Members asked whether the maps for all species consider the location of the activity center and asked how the HCP will handle situations where the activity center is not on ODF land. Members expressed interest in considering species occurrences outside of the Plan Area, when activities could impact the species. Troy responded that the HCP will use data outside of the Plan Area to help inform what conservation strategies to take within the Plan Area.
- Members had questions about public distribution of maps that use ORBIC data. ICF agreed to check licensing agreements to make sure ORBIC data can be used in the HCP.

Members were asked to provide a high-level review of the maps by May 21 to identify major concerns or gaps, and to review the data sources and whether the most appropriate data was used.

WORK FLOW AND PROGRESS UPDATE

Troy provided an update on the HCP work plan and progress:

- Timing for conservation strategy development has been pushed back to allow more time, but this will not change the overall HCP development timeline. This will allow the ST to review the conservation strategy alongside the effects analysis.
- It is anticipated that biological goals and objectives workshops will be held in July.
- ODF is nearly done with review of draft Chapter 1. Introduction
- ICF is delivering draft Chapter 2. Environmental Settings, draft Chapter 3. Covered activities, and a set of draft life species accounts to ODF for review in May.
- When it is time for ST members to review chapters, ICF will send emails to the ST to provide edits on SharePoint by a specified deadline.

- Stakeholders will be provided with an overview of the work products associated with these chapters at the June 12th Public Meeting.
- Overall HCP development is on schedule. The HCP is scheduled to be complete in April 2020, with a Board of Forestry meeting scheduled for July 2020.
- The related FMP development should be complete in March 2020.

BIOLOGICAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES WORKSHOP

Troy provided an overview of the purpose and format of the biological goals and objectives workshops. Goals are intended to be high level statements that apply to all species. Objectives are the measurable outcomes expected from the HCP and indicate what we think we can accomplish for each species.

The workshops are generally working style meetings. The project team will develop draft goals and objectives and then work with ST members to refine and edit the language. ICF proposes a full-day workshop, followed by follow-up workshops with an updated version of the goals and objectives for ST review.

Discussion

- Members agreed that face-to-face meetings are preferable to trading edits via email.
- Members asked for sample goal language to understand what the goals and objectives look like. Troy said the team will bring some examples to the June ST meeting, to help inform the structure of the July workshops.
- Members made suggestions for how to structure the workshops to be effective and efficient. ICF noted that the project team would send out drafts in advance so the ST could be ready to discuss at the workshop.
- Members suggested that the objectives for fish and aquatic salamanders should include consideration of water quality, temperature indicator, and sediment.

CONFIRM TOPICS FOR SC UPDATE

The project team will relay discussion from today's ST meeting to the SC.

The next SC meeting is scheduled for May 29 from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. in Portland and will include attendance by the attorneys representing the agencies. There is interest in making this a joint meeting with ST members. Members made suggestions for topics to discuss at the meeting, including permit term and ESA action area.

NEXT STEPS AND SUMMARY

Cindy thanked members for their time and participation.

The next ST meeting is scheduled for June 4, 2019 from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. in Salem.

Biological goals and objectives workshops will be scheduled for July. If themes emerge from those workshops on things we want to see in the field, we can set up a field trip for August. The field trip would be in addition to regularly scheduled ST meetings.

ACTION ITEMS

The following action items were identified throughout the meeting:

- ST members – Provide edits on the April 2, 2019 ST Meeting Summary, as well as past meeting summaries, by May 14, 2019.
- KW/Mark Meleason – Share paper with ST related to the stream resource assessment: Miller et al., “A Large-Scale, Multiagency Approach to Defining a Reference Network for Pacific Northwest Streams” (2016).
- ST members – Provide edits on the Western Oregon HCP Mission, Vision and Goals by May 14, 2019.
- ST members – Provide a high-level review of species distribution maps to identify major concerns or gaps and review the data sources and whether the most appropriate data was used. Send comments to Troy by May 21, 2019.
- ICF – Seek clarity on public distribution of maps that use ORBIC data.
- ICF – Bring example goals and objectives to the next ST meeting, to help inform the structure of the July biological goals and objectives workshops.
- ICF/KW – Confirm biological goals and objectives workshops dates.
- Project Team – Hold a date for an August Field Trip
- ST members – Let the project team know if you cannot make the July or August meetings due to vacations.

RECORD OF AGREEMENTS AND GUIDANCE

Updated 5/14/2019

This record tracks agreements, guidance, advice, and levels of support of key milestones and elements of the Western Oregon HCP. It includes major outcomes and guidance provided by the HCP Steering Committee, HCP Scoping Team, and Board of Forestry.

Date	Group/ Body	Action	Relevant Milestone/ HCP Chapter
November 8, 2018	Board of Forestry	Unanimously voted to move forward with Western Oregon HCP Phase 2: Strategy Development and Stakeholder Engagement	Phase 1 Completion
February 7, 2019	Steering Committee	Expressed support for the Western Oregon HCP Phase 2 Scope of Work and Work Plan	Phase 2 Beginning
February 13, 2019	Scoping Team	Provided support for the proposed covered species list	Covered Species List (Chapter 1)
February 13, 2019	Scoping Team	Agreed that the current data on the covered species is sufficient to move forward with developing an HCP, and there is not a need to collect additional data at this time. Expressed support for ICF's approach to identifying best available data for each species.	Approach to Gathering Best Available Data
April 2, 2019	Scoping Team	Provided support for the covered species list presented by ICF, including an agreement to drop Lower Columbia steelhead. They also recommend not including Southern DPS red tree vole but revisiting that species when more information is available in fall 2019.	Covered Species List (Chapter 1)
April 22, 2019	ODF and DSL	Decided to include Common School Forest (CSF) lands in the Western Oregon HCP Permit Area.	Plan Area and Permit Area (Chapter 1)
May 2, 2019	Steering Committee	Adopted Western Oregon HCP Operating Principles by consensus.	Process
May 2, 2019	Steering Committee	Adopted the Western Oregon HCP Mission, Vision, and Goals by consensus	Mission, Vision and Goals (Chapter 1)
May 2, 2019	Steering Committee	Expressed alignment with Plan Area and Permit Area (with direction to ST to review inclusion of Santiam Forest area)	Plan Area and Permit Area (Chapter 1)
May 2, 2019	Steering Committee	Provided consensus support for the proposed covered species list	Covered Species List (Chapter 1)