MEETING SUMMARY

WESTERN OREGON STATE FORESTS HCP SCOPING TEAM

Tuesday, September 7, 2021, 9:00 am – 11:00 am

By Webinar/Video Conference

ATTENDEES

Participants: Tere O’Rourke (NOAA Fisheries), Julie Firman (ODFW), Josh Seeds (DEQ), Ryan Singleton (DSL), Mike Wilson (ODF), Nick Palazzotto (ODF), Sarah Dyrdahl (ODF), Rich Szlemp (USFWS), Rod Krahmer (ODFW)

Technical Consultants and Guests: Troy Rahmig (ICF), Melissa Klungle (ICF)

Facilitation Team: Sylvia Ciborowski (Kearns & West), Ellen Palmquist (Kearns & West), Cindy Kolomechuk (ODF)

WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

Sylvia Ciborowski, Kearns & West, welcomed Scoping Team (ST) members and reviewed the agenda, which included: 1) Welcome and Agenda Review, 2) Agency and Stakeholder Engagement Updates, 3) Report out on 8/24 HCP Steering Committee Meeting and 8/3 FMP/IP State Partners Meeting, 4) Review and Discuss Proposed Changes to the Draft HCP, 5) Update on NEPA Process, 6) Update on FMP, 7) Approach Going Forward, Next Steps, and Summary.

AGENCY AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT UPDATES

Members provided the following updates relevant to the Western Oregon State Forests HCP and FMP processes:

- **ODFW**: No updates.
- **USFWS**: No updates.
- **DSL**: No updates.
- **DEQ**: Kyle Abraham and Jennifer Wigal, from the Private Forests Division, have been working on a draft MOU between DEQ and ODF that was finalized in early September. The MOU clarifies Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) responsibilities between the agencies and outlines ODF’s role as an implementation agency. ODF’s Private Forests Division has been a primary partner in crafting the MOU. This agreement applies to ODF’s State Forests Division and to all non-federal forest lands. Practices on state forest
lands generally exceed standards set by the Forest Practices Act and meet TMDL requirements.

- **NOAA Fisheries**: The agency is experiencing staffing shortages in addition to an intensive timeline for the Private Forest Accord. Despite shifting priorities and timelines, the agency is working to keep projects moving forward.

- **ODF**: 1) The Board of Forestry will discuss the Climate Change and Conservation Plan at their September 8 meeting. Direction the Board provides during the meeting may have implications for FMP strategies. 2) ODF will also hold a discussion on September 8 with all of the division heads to discuss the roles of various divisions.

Sylvia Ciborowski, Kearns & West, provided an update on recent and upcoming public and stakeholder engagement:

- ODF held an August Meeting Open to the Public to provide updates on FMP goals and the planning process.
- ODF held an August Joint Stakeholder Meeting to collect public input on the FMP goals. The meeting included dialogue between different interests and alignment between stakeholders around climate change.
- ODF is using a survey to collect feedback on the FMP goals from the public and stakeholders.
- Upcoming engagement for the FMP will be focused on strategies. A Meeting Open to the Public is scheduled for October 12 and a Joint Stakeholder Meeting is scheduled for October 22.

**REPORT OUT ON 8/24 HCP STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING AND 8/3 FMP/IP STATE PARTNERS MEETING**

**Steering Committee Meeting Topics:**

- ODF shared their approach to herbicides for the HCP with the Steering Committee.
- Members of the Steering Committee recognized the importance of ODF’s operational feasibility review of the HCP for future implementation.

**State Partners Meeting:**

- ODF reviewed draft FMP goals with the State Partners.

**REVIEW AND DISCUSS PROPOSED CHANGES TO DRAFT HCP**

**Chapter 3 Covered Activities**

Troy Rahmig, ICF, reviewed changes made to Chapter 3: Covered Activities. Over the past several months, ODF conducted an internal operational feasibility review to ensure HCP actions could be implemented. ODF hosted three workshops and used a survey to collect feedback from staff. Most of the feedback received was for Chapter 3 and Chapter 4. The Project Team
also met with Rich Szlemp, Tere O'Rourke, and Rod Krahmer and further refined the draft based on their feedback. Troy noted that there were no fundamental changes to HCP strategies as they've been discussed over the past several years. Changes are primarily clarifications for how the strategies are implemented.

The Project Team anticipates sending a complete revised draft HCP in October or November, with time for discussion, to the Scoping Team for review. Final updates from discussions with the Scoping Team will be completed in December and January.

Discussion

Comment: Is ODF planning to release an HCP separate from the NEPA process?
- Troy Rahmig: No, the Public Draft HCP will be released alongside the Public Draft EIS, after the permit application is submitted.

Water Drafting and Storage

Comment: Suggest clarifying how volume is being measured in a stream and defining how a baseline will be determined.
- Mike Wilson: In many situations, ODF would estimate stream volume because stream gauges are not available. Further analysis may be needed to determine which locations are used for routine water drafting. Gauges could be installed where water is routinely drafted.

Comment: Consider what the changing fire season and drought years mean for fish throughout the area and how to deal with potential impacts from a biological perspective. Federal land managers are concerned about potential impacts.

Comment: If there is spatial data available for where water is drafted, this could be overlayed with models for stream flow temperature and fish occupancy during different seasons. If ODF has any data available about the volume of water historically removed, this could provide insight on future trends. Restrictions could be used in areas where the stream is likely to be near critical temperatures if water is removed or if it is a temperature refuge.
- Mike Wilson: ODF has a list of drafting sites and is open to avoiding streams that may have temperature impacts. These sites are used when a need arises and data availability may vary by activity. For example, there may be data available for dust abatement and suppression activities, but for other landowner uses and the county there will be limited data available.

Herbicides Approach

Mike Wilson, ODF, reviewed ODF’s approach to herbicides and noted that ODF will follow up with a document that outlines the rationale for not including herbicides as a covered activity.
Chapter 4 Conservation Actions 8 and 10

Troy Rahmig reviewed changes to Chapter 4: Conservation Actions 8 and 10.

Discussion

Conservation Action 10

**Question:** Is there a survey component to coastal marten conservation?

- **ODF:** There is a survey effort that would begin early in implementation, because ODF does not have a lot of data on marten distribution. Surveying may be tied to a tagging effort or, if individuals are found, a tracking effort. If den sites are known, ODF will take actions to avoid and minimize impacts where possible. Survey and protection guidelines have been adapted from fisher CCAA strategies.

**Question:** Why was “in consultation with the services” removed from the marten section?

- **ODF:** ODF was concerned about the time requirements for providing the services with data and time for review. ODF would prefer to call someone at the services to inform them of marten activities. This can be adapted during implementation if needed.

**Question:** Is ODF going to create a summarized HCP guide to assist staff with implementation or will this be worked on through the FMP?

- **Mike Wilson:** Yes, ODF would like to create a checklist for staff. This will be done in conjunction with the FMP to ensure the list is comprehensive.

BMPs for Recreation

ODF does not have a specific best management practices trail guide; recreation staff use a variety of resources. ODF is currently working on characterizing management for maintenance and construction, and collecting data on how much of the trail system is currently within various resource areas. While recreation staff expressed initial concern that HCAs would not allow recreation activities, this is not the intent. ODF is working on identifying which events will be permitted in HCAs.

Next Steps

Troy Rahmig provided next steps:

- The HCP Project Team will send an updated tracked changes draft of the HCP to the Scoping Team for further feedback and will be available for small group discussions as needed.
• ODF is conducting a fourth workshop with district staff to collect final feedback.

**UPDATE ON THE NEPA PROCESS**

Tere O’Rourke, NOAA Fisheries, provided an update on the NEPA process. The agency is waiting for counties to provide data to inform a socio-economic analysis, to inform the alternatives development. Modeling has also taken longer than anticipated. The NEPA Team anticipates that a draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be available for internal review between November or December, and a draft will be released for public review in February, 2022.

**Discussion**

**Comment:** When will the draft HCP be ready for the NEPA Team?

• **Troy Rahmig:** The Project Team is working on a few substantial updates, including updates to the herbicides and recreation sections of the HCP. Remaining edits are clarifications. The Team anticipates that a full version of the draft HCP will be ready for Scoping Team review in October. Additional comments will be addressed in November and December. The current version of the draft HCP can be shared with the NEPA Team now as an example of the changes that are expected.

**Comment:** Will the HCP be released the same day as the Public Draft EIS?

• **Troy Rahmig:** Yes. ODF will also provide a key changes document to speed up review. The Project Team has not received any formal public comment since the Administrative Draft HCP was posted on the website in March 2021.

• **Tere O’Rourke:** The NEPA Team will most likely hold a 60-day comment period with public meeting if both drafts are released at the same time. This will include pre-meetings with the tribes. One anticipated topic of concern is herbicides.

**UPDATE ON FMP**

Mike Wilson shared key updates for the FMP:

• ODF has received stakeholder and public input on the draft FMP goals and has a meeting scheduled with FTLAC on September 17 to discuss draft goals.

• The FMP Project Team is currently drafting strategies and will conduct public engagement on strategies in October.

• Modeling scenarios is anticipated to take place in January and February.

• The Board of Forestry will discuss the FMP schedule during their October retreat.
Discussion

Question: Are FMP modeling outcomes reflective of HCP modeling outcomes?

- **Mike Wilson**: While FMP outcomes will be more refined, the policy overlay from the HCP remains the same. Modeling will be based on the Administrative Draft HCP. The Board of Forestry will be considering the draft EIS and may still indicate they want to see changes to the HCP. There are a lot of moving pieces and it will be a challenge to focus both internal and external conversations.

Question: Is there still a decision point between take avoidance and the HCP?

- **Mike Wilson**: A Board decision is anticipated at the end of the process in February 2023 for the HCP and FMP. The FMP is built around the HCP.

**APPROACH GOING FORWARD, NEXT STEPS, AND SUMMARY**

Sylvia reviewed next steps:

- The next Scoping Team meeting is November 2 from 9-11am
- The next State Partners meeting is December 7 from 9-11am
- A Meeting Open to the Public is scheduled for Oct 12 – *HCP ST and SC members are invited to attend*
- Kearns & West is working on scheduling 2022 meeting dates.