

Eastern Oregon Regional Forest Practices Committee Meeting

Minutes – October 15, 2020

Pursuant to public notice made by news release with statewide distribution, a combined committee meeting of the Eastern Oregon Regional Forest Practice Committees [an advisory body to the Oregon Board of Forestry with authority established in Oregon Revised Statute 527.650] was held virtually on October 15, 2020 hosted by the ODF Private Forests Division

<p>EO members present:</p> <p><i>Bob Messinger, Chair</i> <i>Elwayne Henderson, Henderson Logging</i> <i>Patrick Marolla, Hancock Forest Management</i> <i>Paul Jones, Wyeast Forestry</i> <i>Bobby Douglas, Green Diamond</i></p>	<p>Not present:</p> <p><i>Ed Fallon</i> <i>Irene Jerome</i> <i>Chris Johnson, Shanda Forest Management</i></p>
<p>ODF Staff:</p> <p><i>Josh Barnard, Deputy Division Chief</i> <i>Eric Hartstein, Acting Deputy Chief</i> <i>Keith Baldwin, FP Field Coordinator</i> <i>Scott Swearingen, Field Support Coordinator</i> <i>Greg Wagenblast, Policy Analyst/Civil Penalties</i> <i>Jay Walters, FP Field Coordinator</i> <i>Thomas Whittington, Water Quality Specialist</i> <i>Terry Frueh, Monitoring Coordinator</i> <i>Adam Coble, Monitoring Specialist</i> <i>Paul Clements, Training and Monitoring Specialist</i> <i>Ryan Gordon, Family Forestlands Coordinator</i> <i>Logan McCrae, Unit Forester, LaGrande</i> <i>Joe Hessel, District Forester, LaGrande</i> <i>Jamie Paul, EOA Assistant to the Area Director</i> <i>Hans Rudolf, Stewardship Forester, Pendleton</i> <i>Jason Pettigrew, Stewardship Forester, Klamath Falls</i> <i>Susan Dominique, Private Forests Admin Support</i></p>	<p>Guests:</p> <p><i>Seth Barnes, OFIC</i></p>

Transcript

1. Welcome and Introductions – Bob Messinger

Messinger: Are there any additions to the agenda?

- **Approval of Minutes**

Messinger: Is there a Motion to approve the minutes of Oct. 17, 2019?

Barnard: ... we'll hear more about that later in the agenda, we have about 45 minutes allocated to that. Another significant thing that other parts of the Private Forests Division and other parts of the Agency have been working through I believe when we met last fall which was the last time we met with the Regional Forest Practices Committee we were dealing with some of the budget implications relating to our budgeting around fire and how we pay for fire. And we had just entered cost containment for the Agency. So we were trying to only do things pertaining to core business. And as that evolved and we moved into the COVID-19 era there was another set of budget reductions that the Agency was planning for within this biennium. And the Agency went through the process of putting together those reductions for the Private Forests Division that was mostly being solved by vacant positions both in the field and in Salem. So, holding open a Technical Specialist in Salem and Stewardship Forester positions in the field as those became vacant and as we moved through the summer and we worked through the recent wildfire events the Governor has vetoed those cost-saving measures that we had put in place and we now have that money back in our budget. We are currently working through several different planning processes given recent events over Labor Day and the fire response, put a plan together on how we will spend those funds that we have available to us. We are in a little bit of a challenging situation in the fact that we don't know what the next biennium is going to bring in terms of a budget for the Agency overall. So, through some of our response to this large fire effort as you can imagine there is a fairly large salvage response as well there is a significant amount of private industrial and private non-industrial acres involved and so

through that process we are trying to figure out how we cover all those gaps and cover it with our Stewardship Forester capacity and do that in a way that we don't necessarily hire all those positions in the long term role at this point with all the uncertainties with the future biennium. So, that's been a significant piece of workload as well that we have been working through. The other piece that was interesting relative to our budget in the overall Agency is that the way they look at the overall budget for State Government is there's quarterly revenue projections so, when we originally received the direction to put cost-cutting measures in place for this biennium, there was a revenue projection that had a pretty negative outlook back in May. In September there's been another revenue outlook for the State and it shows if we continue the trajectory that we would have 1.7 billion in the ending balance for State Government which would help with what the budget would look like for the next biennium. So, it's more positive but for any solid outcomes for Private Forests and the next biennium we don't have any solid insight into that. But it was a positive outlook in terms of that revenue projection. I'll pause there on the budget ups and downs we've had this past year because I don't think we have any space in the agenda dedicated for it today. Seeing no questions, I'll keep rolling here.

So, as it intertwines here with everything else the most recent event impacting the work of the entire Agency is the Labor Day fire events which will, I'll have Jamie give an update on the overall status of that later, but it dominos now into we are shifting pretty hard into the post-fire effort. Which is both salvage and some of our Landowner Assistance and Incentive Programs and that is really on the upswing right now. It's probably on the magnitude of scale that we haven't seen before in this State. I think it is over 1/2 million acres ODF-protected. Some where's north of 300,000 acres possibly of private acres impacted in that. And then the other piece that we haven't lost sight of as an Agency is that we are still working in a COVID environment. You notice that we are holding this meeting virtually today. We are holding all our Board meetings in a virtual environment. And that is likely to last, the last official guidance I saw it is extended through the end of the year. So operations are operating the same as they were last spring. Most of our offices are open by appointment only. And most staff are working remotely as that fits their job description. That's a brief overview of the things I have highlighted. One other piece I will note that is a potential for more Special Sessions I've heard later this year. There is nothing locked in but as we have had a dynamic year I would just note that for the Committee. That there is a potential for another Special Session even before the Regular Legislative Session next spring. So those are the various pieces that I am aware of. I will pause there and see if Jamie or Joe relative to the Area Director role have any other relevant updates.

Jones: Hey Josh, I have a quick question for you. What was the total acres lost of ODF-owned ground? Do they have that estimate out yet of what ODF has lost on their own timber ground?

Barnard: They have an estimate of what was in the fire footprint, but they are currently going through a rapid assessment of those acres to see what the actual damage is. I don't have that number in front of me but if you are interested I might be able to find that here in some of the materials unless Jamie or someone has it.

Paul: No total ODF-acreage lost, not necessarily State Forest lost. In so much of incidental comments from a field aspect, the Agency is just running short of Stewardship Forester capacity in all of the Areas and it's a world of hurt in that arena and trying to find...to get that capacity not only for regular work but also for the additional workload on the west side of the State. It's a challenge and we are trying to find opportunities to make that happen. Unless Joe has something to add?

Barnard: And I'll pause there and see if Eric, as he is sliding into the new role, has picked up any other conversation that is important for the Committee today?

Hartstein: Maybe just a quick update around the BOF. There were three new members that were slated for Senate confirmation last month, but they were removed the day before the confirmation hearing. And so the upshot is the next opportunity for that to occur will be in December during the December Legislative Days. And at that point there will be four new Board members up for confirmation.

Messinger: Okay, thank you. Then Josh, so is there any other questions for Josh or anyone else on the Private Forests Update? Hearing none, Greg you are up, Operator of the Year.

Wagenblast: Okay, thank you. Jason Pettigrew and I are going to tag team this for you today. I wanted to say thanks for everyone's consideration and understanding with the 2020 Operator of the Year Program. As Josh mentioned it's been a challenging year with the COVID and the fires and everything else going on we chose not to do the tours. We had five different ideas of trying to do something. But trying to keep everybody healthy and safe we chose to do this this year and hopefully next year, we'll be able to get back to the old process so we'll go through this one this year with the videos and brief discussion. So with that I am going to do a quick reminder of the Operator of the Year process. The objectives of the Program are: for public recognition of the operators for the great work that they are doing out there; this year Eastern Oregon Region had one Operator of the Year nomination. We did have 10 total within the State. Four nominations, which is probably one of the highest I can recall, and most people are recalling as a group of nominations in one year. There were no other nominations for Eastern Oregon that I was aware of. So with that, the Program, there's one Operator of the Year within each Region. There are Merit Awards that can be awarded by the Committee from other nominations if there are multiple nominations within the Region. Districts also have the ability to recognize operators through awarding a Letter of Commendation. And that is always handled at the District level. Typically, I request getting copies of those but we don't see those come through Salem so I'm not able to give you guys any numbers on how many Letters of Commendation the Districts issue out each year. As always I did put together the Tour Packet. You guys should be able to download that off the ODF website. Hopefully you guys were able to do that. And inside that it has got as always the criteria for your rating of each of the nominations. This year shouldn't be too difficult for you as there is only one. And then, just as a reminder, we did modify the timeline for this Operator of the Year Program. This is the first year that we actually applied the new timeline and probably the perfect year to apply this new timeline in the fact that we opened up nominations in November 2019 and then closed them in June of 2020, just before fire season got rolling with the intent that our hope was to have people focus on getting nominations in prior to fire season when they are more distracted or activity picks up and they don't have the time and that sort of thing to be able to get those put together. So it did pay off in the respect of my guess is, we probably wouldn't have seen much of any come in this year if we would have been closing in September as we have typically done in the past. Most people were engaged with fighting fire and didn't have that time. So, overall this year we had 10 total. 6 were in NW Oregon. 3 nominations came in from the SW. And 1 for Eastern Oregon. The interesting thing this year was there was a good mix of nominators. We had 3 nominations that came in from landowners only. And then a couple more that came in a combination of landowner and the local stewardship forester putting this together as a team. And the rest came in from Agency staff nominations. So, once we get through all this here in October with the different regional committees we will be going to the BOF for the recognition ceremony which will occur in January 2021 which is a change also from the late spring meeting that we would do in the spring. That will kick it off and the Board will actually recognize them in January before we do the AOL and the Oregon Logging Conference recognitions in front of their peers that way as well. So the background on the OOO program. So with that does anybody have any questions before we kick it off with the nomination itself? Okay. I guess the one question with 10 nominations it has been a challenge for our Public Affairs folks to get out and videotape and do all the editing stuff. So, they've been working hard at getting these things pulled together and last night about 4:30 I got the first YouTube link which was the Eastern Oregon video and I sent that out. Did anybody get a chance to watch that video that I sent last night? The link that was strictly the ODF Operator of the Year video?

Messinger: I watched it Greg, it was well done. Thank you. How about others? Patrick did you get to see it? Or Paul? Bobby?

Douglas: No, I didn't see it.

Jones: Yes I watched it this morning. Very well done.

Yeah I also watched it. Thank you.

Wagenblast: Okay, so I guess a question for you guys, I let Jason go forward and go ahead and talk about the nomination. With that I will go ahead and turn it over to Jason to talk about the nomination since he was the nominator with this and has been involved with it. It's all yours Jason.

Pettigrew: Okay, thank you. The video is a representation actually done by Dana Armintrout, she is an OYT student who also works on an ODF Fire Crew. But she put that video together as an OIT project. We really appreciate her video and it was for the class but really recognizes the work that the Klamath Lake Forest Health Partnership has done. And with the Operator of the Year recognition is, as the Stewardship Forester I nominate because Darryl Jacobs, I recognize his work. Working across a complex landscape of well over 100,000 acres. But with the Partnership, with my experience as forester, I always represent the partnership. And so they encouraged me to nominate Darryl in recognition in working in more and more complex wildland... multiple landowners who are not in the timber industry. They are small non-industrial private landowners who don't quite understand forest health and the issues with that. And we initially with the nomination, if you read that, we started out with identification of a landscape well over 100,000 acres, an area across boundaries. Good Neighbor Authority, Federal Forest Restoration and then focusing on private lands. And the work that Darryl Jacobs Company did was working with Lee Ann Greenberg and the Klamath Watershed Partnership and the non-profit organization and they had over \$500,000 to treat private lands for forest health administration for a lot of different values, wildlife, mule deer habitat, in conjunction with adjacent federal lands working under a landscape treatment. It's difficult to find an operator willing to work across such a diverse landscape, small tax lots, managing commercial timber, sub-merchantable timber, a lot of different values. And Darryl was up to the task. Actually had to readjust his logging operation a little bit. As he bought a masticator head for his Timco. Incurred some additional risk cost for uncertainty of working with all these landowners and the difficulties. We really appreciated the work he did. Great work, well above minimum Forest FPA. Really addressed landowner needs. If you watched the video, a couple of the landowners there, super grateful, great work overall and ironically we identified that landscape as complex fire-prone landscape and it has seen fire. 44 acres in May of 2019 demonstrated, Darryl came in and treated that and now we are just faced with another 12,000 acre fire burning across that same landscape. So the place is burning down faster than we can get in there and do this. And our operators are really challenged to market burned timber and work across all this and so it really exemplified the value of companies such as Darryl Jacobs and these operators willing to work on these small tax lots. Try to merchandize and it's difficult. A lot of these landowners are generally unaware of forest management techniques, don't manage their forestlands for that beyond the intent of manipulating their living space for the residential interests. Local markets for biomass, saw logs extremely challenging as well as relative to other parts of the State. It takes additional effort by the operators to really facilitate the economics of operators. A lot of hours spent listening and working into the different scenarios and it's costly. Wrapping things up it really exemplifies the operators, loggers out there that they are working in an environment that takes a lot of communication coordination and education. The nomination is recognition, not so much that logging environment that they operate in, but economic and social environment that a lot of these operators are operating in right now. This project also coordinated with our federal Forest Service partners, the GNA projects underway by our State Forests staff immediately adjacent on the landscape. We are moving biomass, mastication, commercially thinning and all of that takes a lot of patience and thoughtfulness and expertise. And Darryl Jacobs, his crew really exemplified that. So Klamath-Lake Forest Health Partnership and ODF wanted to honor and recognize the work that was done. Any questions for me?

Wagenblast: I think one of the other things I picked up in the nomination and maybe you covered it Jason, was it sounded to me like Darryl Jacobs was always bending over backwards working with the landowners but also with the agencies and supporting the fire program and helping out with that kind of thing as well. And just one of those operators that are always there, always available and supporting the community as best he can to promote forestry and forest practices and doing the right thing and protecting the resources and keeping the community happy and being...forestry in that local area. And I think that adds to that Operator of the Year designation that he is being nominated for.

Pettigrew: Yeah, and he moved entire logging sites to the Miles Fire this year assisting on the 242 Fire commitment to the community in the local area. The Watson Fire he was assisting on that, so he does answer when the fire bell rings as well. And also working with (Armintrout) local student. She had a project and he was happy to assist her in that project with OIT. He does reach out and does fulfill his obligation to the local community.

Messinger: So Jason how many additional private landowners did he work with? Do you remember?

Pettigrew: There was 8 specifically. And then he is moving back in right now to work with 2 more on the OWEB project. And then it's my understanding that Collier State Park is over 400 acres and he's been in contact because they are immediately adjacent across the fence that he may be doing a Collier Park salvage as well. And trying to reach out and branching out. I think it started with 8 and the addition of 2, and now with the 242 Fire it might be endless for him.

Jones: Jason I wanted to also thank you for your time and effort to putting the nomination together. I know it is a heavy lift sometimes to do this stuff, but I think recognizing the operators that are doing this stuff really resonated with me during that video was people don't understand, here's a logger sitting around a breakfast or dinner table with his operators trying to understand the landowner's needs. I think that really hit home of the hand holding that needs to happen with some of these small non-industrial landowners of what it takes to get these projects off the ground.

Pettigrew: Yeah, and I think it is the focus of this nomination is really focusing on the cost of listening and communicating just for a few loads of logs, if that. And working for these folks and leaving them with a really better product that is not necessarily focused on commercial value necessarily but longer term wildfire risk reduction, wildlife and meeting objectives.

Messenger: Jason, do you know how he was compensated for his work? How did that relate to the \$500,000 dollars that OWEB granted.

Pettigrew: He was compensated price by acre agreed upon with OWEB and then working with the Klamath Watershed Partnership, reimbursement for a price per acre.

Messenger: So not by the private landowner?

Pettigrew: Correct. Those landowners are benefiting from OWEB dollars to treat their lands.

Messenger: So from the Committee are there any questions for Jason?

Wagenblast: Okay that wraps up, we are way ahead of time for you, since we didn't do the video and everything but basically we are at the point then for the Committee to have discussion and take an official vote on Operator of the Year, and give us direction. If you guys do want to award him Operator of the Year, that will give me the instructions then to move forward to getting the plaques put together and getting them on the Board agenda and that kind of thing. So, that's what we've got for you guys today on the Operator of the Year, so I'll turn it back to you Bob. Thank you.

Messenger: Thank you very much, thanks Jason and Greg both. It goes to the Committee, any comments or discussion on this?

Douglas: I worked with Darryl Jacobs quite a bit over the years. He's a good operator, nothing but positive things to say about him so I'm in support of the nomination.

Jones: I also support the nomination for Operator of the Year too. And a lot of this stuff that Jason was saying resonates with some of the stuff we try to do up here. And already with a couple of small fires we've had up here on Mosier, fires trying to help these landowners through the process of the burnt timber. It is such a different 'beast' compared to working with industrial landowners through the years and these small, these operators...are so needed. And the acres to be treated across this landscape is so accelerated so I completely agree with the nomination.

Marolla: I support the nomination as well. It's a little different not just the typical good logging job, it's the social aspect of the private landowner. It's something a little different and something that needs recognition in our industry.

Messenger: So I will entertain a Motion for Operator of the Year.

Jones: I make a Motion for Operator of the Year.

Marolla: I'll second.

Messinger: Are there any further discussions on the Motion? So all those in favor of the Motion say aye. Any opposed? Hearing none the Motion has passed. Thank you very much. Greg I guess you can move forward now with what you need to do?

Wagenblast: Thank you we'll make that happen and get it out to the Board then. I appreciate you guy's time and participation with this and hopefully next year we'll be back to doing some road trips and looking at some hillsides together!

Messinger: I'm hoping you are right! The next item is Fire Season. Jamie it looks like you are ready.

Paul: Absolutely! Good morning again everyone. It's always nice to be seeing you as part of this Committee. Travis is not able to be here. He's currently assisting our sister agency Oregon State Fire Marshal filling in as Deputy State Fire Marshal through the end of the year so... then Joe Hessel will be taking over as Area Director through the end of the year until Travis returns. So a fire season 2020 update, sometimes I feel like I don't want to relive fire season 2020! But definitely can give you guys and update. So, I'm actually going to go back kind of to that late March and April timeframe when COVID became the creature that it is. And we started planning really early about how we were going to do normal business and fight fire with telecommuting with telecommuting and social distancing, whole new kinds of PPE that we weren't accustomed to. And basically moving forward through the year in the COVID world. Part of that planning was we deployed all 3 of our Incident Management Teams (IMT) through assignments in Salem working to navigate through multi-Agency strategy development and plans pre-season. So that was an interesting thing that we did this year. As we got into May and June, it seemed like a pretty quiet beginning to fire season, perhaps I would classify it as normal. We were fighting fire for sure but it was just the usual May and June sort of level of work for us. Then in July and August a series of lightning events came through and what started was a really tough and sustained weeks long fire suppression and initial attack efforts in both Southern and Eastern Oregon. There were some IMT deployments during that time. And that seemed like it was a long grind at the time. And it didn't let up and then we came into Labor Day and the unprecedented and very historic wind event. Not really wanting to relive that night per se, but after that event, ODF was tracking 17 major fires on the landscape. As of today we are still tracking 5 of those fires in NW and Southern Oregon. Kind of some interesting stats. The Oregon IMTs deployed 11 times this year. That would be COVID times 3 in the same early season and then the **Mosier Creek Fire, the Step ...Complex, the Green Ridge, Sweet Creek, Echo and Holiday Farm Fire** twice. So kind of a staggering stat is that statewide this year a total of 43 IMT have been deployed in Oregon. That doesn't include Area Command or NEMO teams but does include OR State Fire Marshal's Office. And in fact, ODF IMT 1, Joe, just transitioned off Holiday Farm on Tuesday of this week! So, into some more stats, as of last week, all of Oregon, all jurisdictions had over 2000 fires for 1.2 million acres burned. The 10 year average on that comparatively is also about 2000 fires but the average over 10 years is typically about 500,000 acres. So 500,000 acres compared to 1.2 million acres is staggering. On ODF-protected lands we've had just over 900 fires and about 500,000 acres burned. Our ten-year average is comparable at about 800 fires. But only about 41,000 acres burned so doing a visual comparison, the combined Tillamook Burns consumed 340,000ish acres of ODF-protected lands compared to the 500,000 acres this year. Which gives this year the honor of most acres burned in our over 100 year history! Statewide on all jurisdictions there is about 1500 miles of control lines established. Many of the fires especially those in heavy timber will have interior burning for sometime this fall at least until the heavy rains come. And interesting enough we are likely to see smoke from these fires in the spring of 2021. ODF's gross large fire costs for 2020 are estimated right now at \$125 million and that is an estimate on gross. With cost-recovery from the Forest Service and BLM and 17 fires that were FEMA-eligible, net costs are estimated to come in about \$48.1 million. And so for next steps we reconcile costs, December Legislative Days is when we go before the E-Board for fire season 2020 fire funding asks. And continue to refine those estimates and firm those up for that timeframe. Not going into fire season to much more in detail, this has just been one of Oregon's most destructive years as far as natural disaster. You all recall the smoke impacts this year with people spending weeks in hazardous air quality. Transportation routes shut down. Industry and private timberlands devastated. Large scale and long term evacuations. And thousands of folks experienced horrible

losses in property and business and tragic loss of life. The recent rains have resulted in some reprieve a bit. There has been lowering of fire danger and reduction of regulated use and IFPL restrictions in many Districts. Some Districts are out of fire season altogether. Although there are some lingering weather patterns with warm, dry and stubborn fuel conditions that are keeping some units and districts in fire season yet. There might be another rain event next week, but it's not really a confident forecast. So, to close we are kind of transitioning from that emergency mode, suppression repair, holding lines situation into recovery. And then we will be transitioning in to long term recovery. The Division will give you an update of all those efforts just after this. There is immediate work on the ground. There is hazard tree removal, public safety along roadways, salvage, repair, hazardous waste removal, debris removal, cultural resource protection and helping to get people linked in with resources that can provide them assistance over the next few months. It's kind of an All Lands, All Agency approach we are working with the Forest Service and BLM, FEMA and other agencies to coordinate all of those efforts towards recovery. An interesting fact is that about half the land that needs recovery is federal. So, looking ahead we will lean in on agreements and partnerships that we have in place already, such as the Shared Stewardship Agreements, Federal Forests Restoration, and Good Neighbor Authority and there is interest in looking at work that has already been done. Along the lines of recommendations from the 2015-2016 Fire Program Review the Secretary of State Audit, sounds like a broken record. As well as the recommendations from the Governor's Wildfire Council. As you recall the Governor's Wildfire Council focused on that concept of the before, during and after of a fire so think of topics coming up such as ODF and OSFM fire suppression capacity. The lingering question of ODF's fire structure and what needs to happen there. We had the Fuels, Planning and Mitigation, at a landscape, statewide scale. Forest Restoration and Recovery. WUII protection is going to become a very important conversation and community resiliency. You'll see a lot of new groups being formed and some existing groups are being reinvigorated. They exist now at all sorts of levels of government and non-government agencies, public/private partnerships, you here these key words all the time. Things such as the Governor's Wildfire Economic Recovery Council and the Governor's Disaster Cabinet. Again the Division will update you on programs and partners that may come into play in private forest areas. You'll hear names like NRCS and OSU Extension, partners like that. It should be a good time to make progress on a lot of fronts. Cooperative conversations, bringing old partners, new partners to the table. I see it as a time for innovation and efficiencies, big picture collaborations, big picture funding opportunities. So, without more stats about fire season or anything like that I think since we are running ahead a little bit if it is okay with the Committee, Joe Hessel did spend almost 2 months in Salem and in the field not only as Incident Commander on more than a few deployments but also as Area Command and he may have a few more thoughts on fire season from an aspect that I didn't see, if that is okay with the Committee and Joe's willing.

Hessel: Hey all, yeah... just got back Tuesday... I think I've been out 63 to 64 days from the initial start of this. Forestland acres burned is just shy of 300,000 and on the Holiday Farm Fire alone we were in the neighborhood of 120,000 acres of forestland. That's just an example. That's going to be the bigger story when it is all said and done and the firefighting itself was. Also of interest, I think to the group was, close to 900,000 acres of the Labor Day fires burned within 72 hours! And it was an east wind-driven event, and if you look at the fire footprint and the progression map of these fires it's really unprecedented. It's actually hard to imagine. I've been in fire for a long time and we just never have seen rates of spread like we had for that 2 or 3 day wind event. And a bit unusual for us is that literally the first 3 days to almost 4 days was more of a life-safety mission and not so much a fire fighting perimeter control mission. And that was very unique. Another contributing factor I think was that the entire Western U.S. was on fire. Nationally we were at a preparedness Level 5 and there just weren't any resources in the mix from the national standpoint and even with all the fire on the landscape we were still only 3rd nationally in terms of priorities for geographic areas behind both Northern and Southern California. So the private sector stood up to help as they always do. Multiple fires were staffed by many, many pieces of industrial forestland owner or contractor pieces of equipment. I think sitting with Kyle Williams one day in Salem we had over 340 pieces of equipment working the fires at one point in time I'm sure it got to be a little bit more than that. I don't remember how many folks were working, but the majority of the line that was put in once we could start building line was done with industry equipment on several of the fires. So without the complete coordinated system that we have and the help from the private landowners and forest industry these fires would have been a lot larger I think. And eventually the system caught up and brought a bunch of resources to Oregon I think at one point we had about 10,000 folks in and assigned to these fires. And which is on the order of about where we were in 2017 & 18. We had the National Guard in play. We had Canadians down so it was truly a really big effort. And you know, I'll probably leave it at that. I could answer some questions,

certainly an unprecedented season in terms of the scope of the damage. I put some numbers up there, I think Seth asked. The acres burned is a big piece of this but certainly the structure damage, the loss of life is tremendous. And if you haven't driven up Hwy 126 or Hwy 22 yet, you'll see some things... in Oregon and hopefully we never see them again. But certainly I think as it has opened some eyes I think in terms of what the potential is out there.

Jones: I have a question, Joe or Jamie, what's ODF's response with helping to change the narrative with some of the stuff that was coming out of the Oregonian in the spring of ODF and budget crisis and kind of where they are at? And all of a sudden we come through this year of here's private industry, the loggers helping with this, here's ODF. Is there anything on the PR side that can be to change what was out there 5 or 6 months ago? Is there any kind of talks about that?

Paul: I think...the budget end of it. If you remember the Governor directed DAS to hire a company to look at our finances and essentially audit, called an NGO, I couldn't say what that stands for. And they spent pre- and into fire season talking to... field unit offices talking about that budget crisis, as much as those bills we were leveraging out there for so long. Payments and reimbursements from federal agencies. Much of that is cleaned up and those old years are put to bed at this point. But the MGO recommendations remain because there are still some structural things that can be improved within the Agency and how we do our finances. And currently those recommendations have been back and forth between MGO and us and refined. There is a deadline to kind of come to an end to the recommendations. So, now our Executive Team is in there developing some management responses that will kind of say, here's our take on these recommendations and our plan moving forward as we have spent time on the recommendations. And they are good recommendations. There is nothing in there that is a surprise to us that we didn't know. I think we will be able to get those to those people that want that information, remember it came from the Governor's office and eventually it will go to the Legislature for some sort of comment, or something like that. But I think that part will move forward. What hasn't changed really as far as that process is that one, we are designed for a \$10 million dollar fire season and we are not having \$10 million dollar fire seasons. And so there is a kind of expectation that we act as a bank and carry funds moving forward. So the MGO recommendations will certainly help us shorten the timelines hopefully in as far as cost-shares and reconciliation and things like that. But then there is the dependency on partners. And there timeframes and that is the part we don't have control over. Other than improving our communication and frequent meetings and things like that. But I do know our partners are committed to assisting and improving that process as well so as far as the budgetary aspect of that I think we are in a good spot to do better moving forward. And Joe, I don't know if you had anything on the industry involvement?

Hessel: You know I think you did a good job, Jamie. I'd just add that going into the legislative session one of the messages that we will have is that our books have been balanced so to speak in terms of accounts payable in the last accounts payable given the last fire seasons going back to 2013. And that's a real key thing for us as Jamie alluded to. I think going into the session we'll be able to tell that story. And then with the NGO recommendations that she talked about in addition to the processes and systems we have already changed to get to where we are in terms of improvements that we are actually are looking forward to that and I think that will be a part of the story as well. And I'm not sure, Paul that I understood the other part of your question. The industry piece.

Jones: My question was it was such a good time to highlight industry and ODF working together on these major fire events. People that came out and helped didn't even have ODF contracts or VIPER contracts but ODF was the relationship that we had with these operators basically were able to with 3 to 4 days of phone calls get 300 – 500 pieces of equipment because of relationships. And I think it is another story piece that can be told of here's this catastrophic event and here's the relationship that ODF has with these partners here. And here is how we were able to help with this situation because of what we are doing.

Hessel: Yep, that's definitely. That story is out there now. I was sitting with Kyle Williams and we were talking about this over a month ago now when this all started. And folks brought everything they had to bear honestly. So we have to figure out a way to tell that story. I think the pieces at the beginning of that story have already come together. I know that our Public Affairs shop is working on some things and I would expect that to be one of the highlights coming out of the season. One of the silver linings if nothing else is when there was nothing

else to bring to bear, certainly industry and other landowners showed up and our system is designed to allow that and encourage that in some respects and we certainly needed that this summer no doubt.

Paul: Yeah, I agree with that and I also agree with Seth's comment in the Chat that the in-kind contributions from so many years ago shouldn't be a sticking point any longer. It's proven. I certainly agree with that.

Jones: One other comment from me and I'll be done. But I think that the overall this year with the COVID response with fire, I wouldn't be surprised if I had crews out pushing 90 days this year. A couple of guys. And with COVID and things needing to be changed across the board with check-in and check-out and some of the stuff, but from a private contractor's point... I think that stuff was done extremely well this year. I hope it is the new way we do a lot of this stuff on fire. And then I had a couple of conversations with Jason Miner as well too, the turnaround for payment this year, normally ODF is the slowest to pay their contractors, and the feds are a little bit quicker which is kind of mind-boggling. But this year ODF has been very quick with their payment system. Which is significant as well too. And I have multiple conversations with Jason Miner letting him know that system was working well.

Messenger: Joe were you going to give a District update or Logan or Area update on fire?

Paul: It wasn't on the agenda per se Bob. I would leave it up to Joe.

Messenger: Just 30 seconds Joe? Or Logan? How many fires in NEO?

Hessel: Yeah I'll have to defer to Logan for that Bob, he's been acting for quite a while. So I'm going to kick the can that way and if there are some other folks from the other Districts they can pitch in or Jamie.

McCrae: Yea Bob. For the NEO District I don't have the exact number for fires, acres burned in front of me Bob. About average for NE. Our drought conditions we had good rain in the beginning of the spring and carried through July that helped keep us green locally. We were kind of the lucky ones of all the Districts in the State I would say with their fuel conditions. And when we did have fires we were very successful in keeping them small. So I would say that it was an average number of fires this year if you are looking at the 10-year averages. Especially if we throw out the anomalies of 2015. And then the size and acres burned was I would say on average. Probably in the neighborhood of 3 to 400 we did have fire on the landscape but we were fortunate with the response we had and the limited number of resources that were able to come together and I would say overall very successful here in our District. So, is that good enough for you, Bob?

Messenger: That was fine. I look at Inciweb every day to see how many fires we have so I wanted to give the District kudos because most of the fires... it bears...

McCrae: One more thing in there, you heard ODF team deployments this year, which meant locally we were drawn down in our ODF ranks. We used all of our cooperator partnerships that we had here locally to stay successful. And Severity Funds coming from the State and Area level. All the tools that we had helped us be successful here even though the rest of the State was on fire.

Paul: Bob, kind of the nuance to that is from the Area standpoint, this year 314 fires to date and about 14,000 acres. The 10 year average is about 295 fires on a 10 year average and about 19,000 acres. So it was a comparable fire season. Some deployments on the eastside an unusual aspect to this year is for Severity Resources we extended those longer than their normal contract period but, in some instances, we let things go but many of those things we extended twice, which was Tanker 60, just to finish their contract yesterday so that was an interesting season for us with Aviation resources as well.

Messenger: Thank you very much Jamie, Joe and Logan. I see Elwayne has joined us. Hello! Welcome. Is there anything else relative to that Fire Season update someone would like to speak to?

Barnard: Bob, the other piece that we had on here was a little bit on the post-fire recovery side and we'll do this in a little bit of an adhoc manner. We have a little bit of time to have Ryan Gordon speak on the Incentives side

and also I'll open it up. I didn't know how much we'd have to share this week because things are spooling up fast. But I'll make a couple of comments relative to what Jamie mentioned earlier about the imminent workload that this is going to generate for ODF. When I think about this every major drainage on the west slope of the Cascades had fire in it and some form and portion of the landscape impacted. And so we have several Districts and several of those were already short on Stewardship Forester capacity or had 3 out of 5 Stewardship Forester positions vacant. So, starting in a tough spot to begin with. There is internal conversations going on currently on how we shift from one District to the Districts most significantly impacted by fire. Just with the startup of the salvage logging and be able to process those notifications and field calls to get assistance to landowners or just be able to process notifications on the salvage side of things. So a tremendous workload there. That is still playing out as we speak. Folks are making plans and that is a very large effort. We are also considering at the Salem level because we have some of our technical specialist positions vacant, and/or there is also an increased need there if you think about the magnitude of salvage that may occur and some of our water quality and wildlife things on the landscape. We may be preparing to pull in from other agencies to help at the Salem level as well. I just wanted to set that as context. I didn't know if Jamie wanted to add anything more to that. I know she's been in those conversations as well in terms of capacity, field capacity and how we accomplish all that. Any more detail to add to that Jamie?

Paul: Well, as far as both Southern Oregon and NW Oregon, there is a large laundry list of immediate needs. Everything from Stewardship Foresters, Safety to Finance people and I think that is out there to see how we can fulfill those needs from within the system. It's difficult when in the system where everyone has limited capacity or less capacity than we are used to in the Private Forest world and then realistically everyone is very much spent following a fire season like this. So, immediately, pretty quickly we will wrap up looking for capacity within the system. If we don't have it, we don't have it. And then we'll start, I've heard conversations about starting to look at partner agencies that might have some ability or knowledge in the forestry field to help assist, Fish & Wildlife kind of folks or Natural Resource type folks. Everything is short term-long term but with the budget situation and the Private Forests Program as well as agency-wide I know that on the eastside we are down 3 Stewardship Foresters, Area-wide. I think in the North Cascade District alone out of 5 Stewardship Foresters they have 2 or 1? We are doing some work around some limited duration positions. It's a moving concept and its fluid and complex and it's happening as we speak. We are working around the clock to try to get the capacity back where we can.

Jones: I have one question in regards to post-fire, cause we ran into this in 2015 across the landscape, there is not going to be any seedlings available in this region for years and years. And when you talk about the whole carbon footprint and what trees do, is there any talk within ODF of you guys operating your own nurseries or working with some of these other nurseries to be able to get grants or funding to increase their overall trees. I think of Stewardship Foresters and just whatever size landowner you are, we've had this conversation multiple times on this Committee. Is post-fire, let's get ahead of this curve, because in 3 years Jason is going to be down in Klamath Falls with the landowner that is supposed to be re-planting saying we can't get any trees. What does that look like in 2023? And what can ODF do to help some of these nurseries out about that? So, anyway if there is a comment about that I would like to hear that.

Gordon: I can jump in, I can just address that and circle back to the other stuff depending upon where the conversation goes. So, I'm Ryan Gordon, I'm the Family Forestland Coordinator in the Private Forests Division and I don't know if I have had the opportunity to meet with this group before or not, I can't recall. But my primary focus is on non-industrial private forestland owner assistance and I work with a lot of the partnerships statewide that help to support that. And of course work closely with the folks in the field to help deliver those programs. So, there are a number of challenges ahead of us in that arena. And I was just scribbling them down here, Seedlings is certainly one of them and definitely something that we are thinking about and concerned about. And Jamie was just saying there is a lot of stuff that is fluid and in the works right now on all of these topics. But some process we've been talking about is, one is we are in the process of working with the Forest Service and State & Private Forestry to put together a large funding ask related to post-fire recovery. And a component of that would be Seed and Seedling Availability. We are looking not just a shortage of seedlings but probably also challenges of finding seed. Enough seed for some of these seed zones. Even with what we have in the Seed Bank out at Schroeder and some other places. So, in that ask we are adding funding there to potentially assist with, maybe leasing additional land where nurseries could grow more stock. That's one strategy that we've

picked on again. These are all preliminary ideas. Also have started a couple of years ago, started a little pilot project with the J. Herbert Stone Nursery down in southern Oregon. They have a lot of unused capacity there and they still do, so we also have the potential there to leverage funding to grow seedlings and make those available. I believe there is also some conversation and I may invite Seth to speak to this, if he knows more. I think there is some conversation about trying to work some legislation in the next session that would also help to create some funding or incentives for nurseries to be able to increase production. I see Seth turned on his camera, so go for it!

Barnes: I just put a couple of things in the chat. I've been thinking a lot about this as well. We do have a concept that is out there that is going to be put into a bill and filed early which is the idea is to incentivize through some sort of a grant program private nursery expansion, rather than trying to launch a whole other venture. It seems it might be more prudent and efficient to just slightly increase the capacity of those already out there to help in this short term need. So, we've had preliminary discussions with a couple of legislators that were really interested in that concept. But we, actually the day before yesterday had a meeting, over the last few days had a couple of meetings with some private nurseries. They were actually a lot more optimistic than I had anticipated that over a period of a few years that we could actually sell this need. They said they always have an over-run. There is going to be a shifting and I've already heard that from the large industrial private landowners that seedlings that would have been planted in other areas, so long as the seeds don't match up, those areas are the ones held over. In other words, the clear-cut harvest on the Coast Range might be the one that actually is going to wait to get seedlings because it's got some watershed things that can hold the soil down and things like that. And they will shift those seedlings over to the foothills of the Cascade area where they are needed for soil stabilization and those sorts of things. So there is a lot of private companies that are thinking along those lines that are going to be able to help. Weyerhaeuser is planning on shipping a lot of their seedlings from those going to Washington down into Oregon this next year. So there is going to be a lot of that balancing around and through talking to IFA nurseries and others it sounds like they are fairly confident that over a three year period of time that we'll be able to bump up capacity. They might be smaller seedlings, they won't be the 2 year but might be the 1:1s and that sort of thing. But we will be able to bump up that capacity internally. They will anyway and have seedlings available. And the other thing to think about here a lot of the small forestland owners that I think are the biggest concern. Those guys are going to take a little bit longer likely to be able to get to their stuff but not everything that needs to be planted is salvageable. Some, a lot of the stuff is in 10 to 15 year old plantations, not really salvageable in a traditional sense. They are going to have to figure out how to get rid of that material before there are plants on top of it or underneath it. But that's going to take some time to work through all of that because there is just so much of it. And a lot of those landowners for better or worse won't be trying to do that right away. There will be a sort of slow march to recovery for a lot of this land. Just because of the size. So there are some ideas from the legislative standpoint and we will continue to push those, but I was actually encouraged to hear from private nurseries that they just based on preliminary numbers, 100 million seedlings needed. They are actually pretty confident that they can handle it. And the one thing they did ask for Ryan and this might be helpful to think about (and I put this in the chat) with OSWA and others, the one thing they said is from a small forestland owners standpoint, one of the challenges is small forest landowners often don't know how to plan ahead, most of them. And in a fire you can't plan ahead anyway. But you can a little bit knowing, I want to plant this year, or want to plant next year so what they asked is if we can get some assistance from ODF or OSWA or some of these groups to help put together orders for these people as much as possible and that's really all they need is a number and some commitment in terms of what is likely to be needed for these landowners x amount. We can worry about this once the time comes but sowing those seeds and planting those trees we have to do that a year in advance at least and we really rely on having those orders coming in to do that. And the sooner we can do that getting a conglomerate of small forest landowners in a given area the better. And I know that's easier said than done, but maybe through your program and trying to get grants for some of the recovery work and other things there may be some opportunity there to get some orders in.

Gordon: Batching the orders together is huge and in some of our initial thinking and planning and in the funding request we are putting together, we are also thinking about transportation and storage. Being able to potentially rent some freezer trailers and other things for storage and getting seedlings transported out to landowners. And in terms of incentive programs some of that is still coming together. One of our kind of go-to programs is the Emergency Forest Restoration Program (EFRP) which is actually through the Farm Service Agency (FSA), and

kind of in the process of working through that we ought to be able to get a good sense of the need for the landowners that are participating there and be able to batch those orders together. And what we would love to have is something like PLFN up in NE Oregon, if we could have networks like that in every part of the State that would be a lot easier. But we don't so we will do our best to make that model work or make that model happen in other parts of the State.

Jones: That's a great update guys! I appreciate that, because that's always been a concern post-fire for this Committee has talked a lot about re-planting and sideboard rules that are coming up as well, thank you.

Gordon: You want me Josh to talk about some other things? Or where should we go next?

Marolla: I have a quick comment about the seedlings. I guess the optimism around getting seedlings is a little bit of a surprise to me. For Hancock Forest Management and Inland we probably sell about 3 million trees a year. Even like this coming season we were having trouble finding enough nursery space for our trees. I think the nurseries might be giving you a more optimistic view than really is there. From my experience nursery capacity is something we have been battling for years. With this amount of land being reforested I think we are going to run into, across industry we are going to run into problems there with nursery capacity.

Barnes: That's good to hear, Patrick, well not good to hear but I appreciate that feedback. So, the concept we originally thought of because I have thought the same thing for a while. I was a bit surprised at the optimism we've been hearing. But from the nurseries. Before we talked to the nurseries we came up with the concept of trying to boost their capacity in some way. Try to help see if there was a way to incentivize through some sort of infusion of money to increase capacity to help with a lot of the burned area. I still think that is a concept to move forward. Maybe that helps with availability in normal situations.

Messinger: So from the Committee are there any more questions regarding post-fire recovery at this time? Josh you are still up, 1602 next.

Barnard: I might ask Ryan do you have anything else in particular you wanted the Committee to hear about on the post-fire recovery piece.

Gordon: I can quickie mention a few things. Again I don't know exactly where the interest is not having met with this group before. So I'll just be really high level. I've already talked about the EFRP, and that's just starting to come on line. Looking to get some sign-ups running probably November and December. NRCS, the Natural Resources Conservation Service has an emergency EQIP offering that is open right now for folks to access, it's been streamlined with cost-share immediately available. Well, I shouldn't say immediately there is of course a sign up period and contracting process as it is a federal program but in relevant terms, "Immediately available" for folks to look at removing hazard trees and access to a variety of practices to deal with erosion-prone areas and concern. Jamie kind of talked already about the FEMA response and I won't go into a lot of that, but the one thing I will highlight kind of on top of all this is that through FEMA and their response we are working with the U.S. Army Corp. of Engineers and the National Weather Service to begin to complete what, I guess the easiest analogy would be some BAER-like investments on the private ground that has been impacted by these fires. So the BAER teams come in on federal lands and put some pretty comprehensive analysis together and we have the opportunity with FEMA funding and backing to do the same thing on the private land side. And we are hoping to get that spooled up here ideally in the next week or so. They have already been working on it has some preliminary Burn Severity Maps and other things done. But trying to get all of that lined up and get that work done over the next month or so, so that we have access to that information in terms of thinking about how to prioritize investments across the landscape on both sides of the fence, the federal side and the private lands side. Kind of taking that All Lands Approach to focus the limited resources we have in the areas where the need is greatest.

Barnes: Can I ask a question Mr. Chair, I'm sorry to jump in so much! I'm trying not to, but. Ryan one of the things that could be helpful, and maybe Eric something common in your wheelhouse at OWEB? Your OWEB days, but when you talk about assessments about where you can expend limited resources one of the things left in my mind, all the areas that were burned pretty severely that had a lot of water intakes in and around on

them, you have the McKenzie, the Santiam, big system with a lot of water intakes, I have to believe that a lot of our private landowners small and large don't really know where a lot of those intakes are. So, I'm wondering if there is something our Agency partners could do to help identify where those sensitive sites are and help us get that information to the landowners. They do have, are going to be sending crews out there with hay bales and grass seed and things to shore up areas of sensitivity around streams or cut-banks, and so if we knew where those sites were and that was also on their radar that would be very helpful. You know right now I think the landowners are left scrambling to find them themselves or to identify that is a need. It seems to me like that is a public need, a public interest thing that would be really good to just hand to the landowners and say here, if you have an ability please try to help us protect these areas as well.

Gordon: I think that would be the type of information and type of product that would come out of this analysis that I am talking about and all that stuff. And without getting too much in the weeds there are still of questions to be ironed out around what FEMA funding can be used for. And in case of whether that nexus with public infrastructure it's likely we would be able to access some FEMA funds there as well. So that is one of the reasons why this analysis is so important, because it does help to guide our conversation not just with the resources that we've got and know we have and those programs we traditionally use but also in terms of being able to access additional FEMA assistance. The other thing that I guess I would highlight with this effort is there's also a sub-group that is working across State and Federal Agencies to look at all the different programs and funding opportunities that we've got to fill in that puzzle if you will, to help us not just think strategically about where the highest priorities are but also think about which program works best. And I think of small landowners it's good to have a variety of tools in the toolbox because not every program works for everybody. They all have different objectives and concerns so we are really trying to build up that side of things. Again it all takes time and nothing ever moves fast enough! But certainly doing the best we can there. And maybe I should just conclude since this is, this group has the forest practices focus, I just conclude probably by saying in terms of these incentive programs, particularly looking at those smaller landowners, we typically don't offer cost-share for anything required by law or by rule. And when we get into post-fire recovery it gets a little tricky because of the standard set of rules doesn't always apply if we think about salvage for example. Salvage harvest might bring in some revenue but generally never enough to cover the full cost of getting the forest re-established. When we start talking about roads and road maintenance and culverts and some of the things Seth was referring to we might find some challenges there as well so as we start to roll out some of the incentives and assistance programs we will work in closely with the forest practices folks in the programs and thread that needle as well. I'll just pause there, if there are any questions and again not knowing this group I don't know if that is of value or not. I appreciate the time.

Messinger: Any questions for Ryan? Ryan thank you very much for the update. I think from this group that is about the kind of the update we appreciate.

Gordon: And I am going to peel off to join another meeting here. So it is great to join you 'all and I'll move on to the next ZOOM meeting.

Barnard: Alright. Okay what I will do is walk through an overview of 1602 and we can come back and dig into any details or questions. The other thing I wanted to do is save a few minutes towards the end to let Terry Frueh to provide an update because SB 1602 has an impact on some of the active work that the Monitoring Unit was working on. I'll go through the Bill first and kind of talk about the pieces there and see if there are questions. And we already do have work underway and I can provide an update on that as well.

So as I stated at the beginning SB 1602 is an outcome of the timber and conservation MOU that was signed in conjunction with the Governor's Office back in February. So in June 2020 the OR Legislature did hold a Special Session and one of the items they did take action on was Senate Bill 1602 which passed both Chambers with broad support. And the Governor did sign it into law on July 7th. So it is in place and in effect. Both the Conservation and Timber Industry groups supported the Bill and if you were to go back and look at the MOU they have a commitment in there, and I'll talk about it a little bit more to propose some further changes to the Forest Practices Act. So, if you were to look at that MOU it's got 2 pages worth of signatures of representation from both the timber and conservation industry. The first focus I will go over is: it proposes, and this is statewide, so applies in all areas of the state, new requirements for helicopter pesticide spray buffers. So it is

specific to helicopters and pesticide spraying. The law increases buffers around homes, schools, water intakes and some streams for helicopters spraying pesticides. Those new statewide rules go into effect January 1, 2021. So the first of this year there are new rules that will apply to applying herbicides by helicopter. And at a high level a quick summary of what that looks like, is the new buffers will be 75' from streams with fish or domestic use and 50' from all other streams with surface water present. So that means a Type N stream or anything like that that has surface water present so that is Type N stream or anything that has water present at the time of application. And then it also increased the buffer around schools and inhabited dwellings to 300'. And there's also what they define in the bill as a qualifying water use. Basically, somebody using water for domestic use that they are taking from surface water. It adds a 300' buffer there as well. So, there's a couple of different categories there but those are new buffers in effect January 1. Another effect of this bill are the stream buffer rules are expanded in the Siskiyou Georegion. This is a part that has a nexus with what some of the Monitoring Unit work was, but we will come back to that. But the bill includes, basically directs the Department and the Board of Forestry to generate rules to include the Siskiyou in the SSBT rules. It point blankly lays that out and those are to be in effect by January 1, 2021 as well. And so we are already underway with that process and I'll come back and give an update specifically where we are there. But basically says, take and adopt SSBT rules in the Siskiyou Georegion. The other piece that this bill set up is helicopter pesticide spray communications. So, it basically says in the bill that the agency must develop, in its e-notification system that would be FERNS, a system to notify neighbors and water users when there is a pending pesticide spray operation by helicopter. So a lot of this bill focuses specifically on helicopter applications. It provides funding for us to go in and modify FERNS over the next year, year and a half to allow the operator to go in and provide notice if they are going to do a helicopter operation by 7 pm the day before they are going to do it. And it allows folks to sign up to receive those notifications and they will receive those notifications if they are within 1 mile of that proposed operation. Water users with a qualifying water use as well will be able to sign up. So if they have a water intake of some sort for watering lawns or a garden or for domestic use at their home, those are all qualifying uses where they can sign up to receive that notice. It also narrows the window for pesticide notifications to 90 days, so when an application or landowner or whoever is doing the notification is going into the system and is identifying within the 90 day window within which they think the application is going to occur still have to identify the pesticide likely to be used and where it's going to be sprayed but narrows the window. There's some required information that has to go in for the notifier as well. There's some requirements for when neighbors and water users sign up and this is going to be a bit of a manual process for ODF. So, when you think about this the intention of the bill is to provide this information to folks that live within a certain area or have a water intake within a certain area. So they are going to have to provide ODF with information with enough substance that we can determine that they live on the said property or that they have a water intake in the said location that they are describing. And we are actually going to end up, we have the funding in a bill to hire one additional staff person to do that processing. So, that's going to be a bit of a manual process where we receive information from landowners and folks with a water intake that are interested in receiving those notices and they will provide that information to us and we will input those into the system. So it's one more step to being a subscriber in the system. This part of it will go into effect somewhere between July 2021 and July 2022. Basically whenever we can give the green light that the system is ready to go. The bill also lays out a couple of other features. It provides the opportunity for non-department messages so like messages from operators to reach out directly to landowners through this system. It also requires the system to be mobile-friendly. So, the idea would be that if the operator is out in the field and wanting to provide notice they aren't at their office and desktop computer that they have the ability to file these notices that they are going to spray the unit the following day. So there is a mobile requirement to this. That's pretty much the Helicopter Pesticide Spray Communication in a nutshell. But there is quite a bit there when you think about building that into FERNS and making it a notification system to let someone know the day before a spray is going to occur. There are several reporting components in there that we can dig into if we want to but it gets pretty detailed and there is some pretty detailed timeframes. The other two pieces that it does establish is there are penalties for not providing information in a timely manner for operators and there are also penalties for any of the folks that sign up to receive these alerts if they directly interfere in an operation. The other significant component of SB 1602 is that it lays out a forum for mediated discussions for improving the FPA for the parties that did sign that MOU. These are mediated sessions to be led by the Governor's Office. They were to be conducted in the next 18 months. The ultimate desired outcome of that would be to pursue an Aquatic HCP but it may result in other changes to the FPA along the way. So that does set that in motion as well. That's a quick overview of the bill, there's quite

a few different details of the bill, but I'll stop there and see what folks might have questions first on what this bill requires.

Messinger: So, Josh if this is the appropriate time to ask the question but, maybe the other committee members are wondering as well, if this is the new process for changes in the Forest Practices Act, where does that leave the Committees such as ours in the process?

Barnard: Thanks, Bob. That's a good question. The way the process has worked out so far, this was done even external to ODF so we weren't at the table even for the MOA or the generation of this first set of rules that we were getting directed to do by statute. So, basically the way it's played out so far is that we get into rules and we need to consult with the Regional Forest Practices Committees, if we are directed to develop rules through statute. But at this point, ODF really hasn't been a part of the process and as I understand it going forward we may get invited to the table to provide information as they work through what they think what the proposed changes should be but it's really looks like a negotiated process at that level of... to sign that agreement. Anyhow it's really something that is being negotiated at a higher level. And as its playing out now the only direct role that the Committee would probably have is if we are directed to develop some rules and there was, as we worked through that process, as we always do we would consult with the Regional Forest Practice Committees. But so far it's been at that higher level and the direction has been coming from statute.

Messinger: Thank you. So do you have more about that now, Josh?

Barnard: So I will walk through where we are in the process, so for us, first and foremost the piece that we picked up and started moving because of all the required steps in the process was the bill directed us to go through rulemaking for the Siskiyou Region for SSBT rules. So we still needed to go through an official rulemaking process there so we got that direction July 7th when it was initiated. We pulled things together pretty fast and we got direction from the Board at their July Board meeting which is usually towards the latter half of the month to embark on permanent rulemaking to get those rules in place by January 1st here starting the first of next year. And so we did that and have met with the Advisory Committee, we met, we used the Siskiyou Advisory Committee which was already convened by some of the initial work the Board had been doing around the Siskiyou Georegion. We met with that Committee and got their input. We opened public comment period in the month of September and held a public hearing and have closed the public comment period on those rules now. So we are in the process. We have a set of rules we believe the Board will approve in November and if they do that we will be set to have the SSBT rules in place for the Siskiyou January 1 of 2021. So, with that comes training. We didn't have any training on the SSBT rules in the Siskiyou region. The other component in effect January 1 are these new helicopter spray buffers. And so we also are going to need to do some education and outreach relative to those new requirements as well because they will have an overlay with our existing stream rules as they are currently. So we will be doing education and outreach. And probably try to hold some training sessions here November/December timeframe before those rules go into effect both internally our Stewardship Foresters and staff are prepared to help implement those rules and there will be training for external folks as well to make sure they are ready for the implementation of those rules. So those are the two pieces we are focused on getting rolling right now with the short term deadline but we are also in a place of putting together a contract with the original contractor for our FERNs program, the online notification system. We have about \$840,000 allocated to build this day before notification to interested neighbors that could qualify over the next year or so. So we are getting that rolling as well. So, any questions on the mechanics of any of those pieces? So just a quick few pieces about workload. The way this looks internally for ODF right now. This was additional work. This was on our plate before the salvage so as you can imagine, both in Salem and we do have a request out to the field to pull in some field folks to help us on this project, we really need their help in terms of assistance to get to success on this project. I noted at the beginning of the meeting, I've been asked by Kyle to take this on as the project lead. We pulled staff from our Field Support Unit. And with our Business Analyst kind of formulate a project team and then we've also got folks coming in from the field and Jamie was kind enough to suggest from the Eastern Oregon Area that Jana Peterson would help us out on this project from the Eastern Oregon Area. So we formulated a small project team and we are moving forward. Those are pretty much all the updates I have on Senate Bill 1602 at this point.

Messinger: Okay Josh, thank you very much I think Seth has something he thinks would be helpful to the Committee.

Barnes: I would just answer if this was the way to move forward in the future with rulemaking what does this Committee... the only thing I would add to the narrative to Josh's answer, this is really not meant I don't believe as an alternative to rulemaking per se. What it is, it's an alternative to ballot measures and legislation that we were seeing over a series of years ballot measures that have been put together from both industry as well as conservation community and those were reflective of various legislative pieces that were getting some traction anyway over the last several years. And so this was seen as a better alternative than determining statute by ballot measure. So that is kind of the impetus for this and I would say by way of an update on the process moving forward they are trying to choose a mediator, the groups they have agreed upon one, they reached out to that person and he initially agreed to do it and they were trying to set time to have their first meeting and then that person got cold-feet and decided they would rather not be involved. So they are going back to the drawing board on trying to figure out who the mediator is. I think it is also safe to say that both sides have had some initial meetings internally trying to figure out what this might look like. But the focus is clearly on riparian management not so much upland. And with the goal of trying to achieve a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) or some sort of incidental take permit to satisfy the Endangered Species Act for Aquatic Species.

Messinger: My point I think Seth, and the other Committee members is that, this process appears to be bypassing this Committee. That also has some Legislative enforcement if you will, we act on all the legislation. If there is one statute that says we're in and another that says we're out that's problematic for me. The other thing that might be problematic is that having that HCP for Eastern Oregon doesn't appear to have been considered by this opportunity if you will.

Barnes: Yeah, that's a good point! And that is part of the discussion I can tell you right now. And Hancock Forest Management is in the middle of these conversations as you know and Patrick can attest, you have a big footprint on the eastside of the State there. They along with some other members as well, OSWA is a part of it as well, have continuously brought up that very point regarding the Committee for east side consideration.

Messinger: Because there are so many small private landowners from the eastside that, belonging to OSWA, so they have no voice in this process. So somehow, somehow those folks need to have a voice in that process and at least at some level this Committee has been that voice. And we are bypassed and those folks will no longer have that voice. So if you can carry that message on Seth that would be great.

Barnes: Yeah, yeah for sure.

Messinger: Hancock is important to the east side of the state but they are not the only forestland owner.

Barnes: Yeah, understood for sure.

Messinger: Any other comments from the Committee, any questions? Concerns about 1602 we should be thinking about?

Barnard: I think one thing I would add on to the end there, and partly because I think you all had an interest, Bob, in tracking the Siskiyou process where it was at previously? So I thought I'd have Terry provide a little closure on where that ended up in this process. And how that was treated with the implementation of 1602 at this point.

Frueh: Yeah, thanks Josh. So, just to bring folks up to speed as a reminder, Board directed us to assess the sufficiency of our FPA rules on Small and Medium Fish Streams down the Siskiyou working at are we meeting Water Quality Standards for Stream Temperature and Desired Future Condition? And so we were in progress of doing that. We brought information to the Board in June of 2019. A Literature Review and they said that's not good enough. That's not enough information for us, not information bring us additional information. And we had several conversations with them and they directed us to bring a Literature Review with an expanded geography to bear on the question of what's happening regarding the sufficiency of these rules in the Siskiyou, and so we

were motoring along in that process and aiming for a Board July position on sufficiency question. And this legislation came along, resulting in legislation SB 1602 put an end to that Siskiyou work. Expressly in regards to extending SSBT rules as Josh mentioned to the Siskiyou. In terms of the Monitoring Group what that means is we went ahead and finished up a report we were working on stream temperature and shade. We delivered that to the Board as information-only in September. So the rest of that work on the Siskiyou focused in terms of Siskiyou-only manner is over. So I will touch a little more about Monitoring's other work here in a moment. And then in terms of Josh had said. With this process, exactly how ODF will participate in that remains to be seen. But we are, like Josh said, we didn't drive it, we weren't even a part of the conversations, or setting it up but was handed to us and so there's a chance that intermediate group might reach out to ODF and say hey we want information on practices on the ground, or monitoring-type information. But that remains to be seen. HCP often have a monitoring component to them so that may impact Monitoring but that's down the road. So that's sort of a quick summary of ODF's Monitoring Group's involvement, impact on monitoring and monitoring's involvement in the SB 1602's work. Any questions about that? Comments? Seeing no hands I'll send it back to Josh.

Messinger: Josh you have anything additional on there?

Barnard: Nope nothing further from me.

Messinger: Anything else on 1602? So moving on to the Field Support update? Scott?

Swearingen: Good morning everybody. I'm Scott Swearingen, Field Support Unit Manager for ODF here in Salem. Just wanted to... I haven't interacted with the Eastern Oregon Committee so, just wanted to give you an update of who I am. I came to Salem in January in an interim position and was hired permanently in April in my current position. Prior to that, I was in Southern Oregon Assistant to the Area Director down there and interacted with the Southwest and also some with the NW Committees. So I am pretty familiar with how the Committees work and that sort of thing. So as I said I came permanently to Salem in April and kind of right of the bat we were mining out some of the core work and projects we were doing. So I'll go through where we are on those. We did have a re-direct with the Senate Bill 1602 that created a bit of extra work for us. Also more recently the fire salvage and restoration that's going to be a big project for us and kind of drive some of our core work here right now. So, with that as I mentioned with Senate Bill 1602 we're supporting the 1602 Project team with several folks from the Field Support Unit. So, other than having to pick up some of the normal work and then providing support to the Field with the Post-fire Salvage guidance and some of the restoration guidance that Ryan went through. So just going through some of the core work we have been doing. We've been going through our guidance, our Forest Practices guidance for the past, it's been a continuous process but we've been coming to completion on quite a bit of the guidance updates. So we've had several Divisions that we have completed. Most recently we are working on a nearing completion on is the Division 623 having to do with the shallow, rapidly moving landslides and public safety. HLHL rules. So, with that the guidance on that wasn't ever officially adopted. It was still in draft format since it was created. We had been using them throughout before we formally adopted them so really hasn't provided any major changes to how we have been administering the rules. There was a small group put together including ODF's geotechnical specialists, several field staff and several... to get this to the finish line. Right now it's in its final stage of review by Division leadership prior to posting that. Really, basically we looked at some of the further review areas. We had identified those, especially those having a sand deposit. Added some guidance about what a habitual structure is for downslope public safety. And then put in some references to the technical notes, Forest Practices Notes number 2 and number 6. Number 2 is being reviewed and updated a bit in the lineup with the rule guidance a little better. So those, that's what we are doing there. The other one we are currently working on and trying to finalize is Division 645 the riparian management areas Significant Wetlands. Really not a lot of change in that. We're changing how we interpret the policy for agricultural wetlands. So we've got that finalized and waiting for a final review from Division leadership and that will be finalized. Those two when finalized will be posted. We do have several updates to date are posted on our external website [Oregon.gov/odf](https://oregon.gov/odf) and it's under Publications. If you want to look at those, there are a few that have not been completed yet that we are still working. The rules to do with some of the stream stuff, updating the SSBT... some of the rules dealing with roads and harvest are about done but we've been slightly delayed on getting those to completion and out the door. Been working on some of the technical notes also, getting those updated. So I will pause there. Are there any questions or comments on the FPA guidance? Okay, just a couple of other quick things that we have been working on. Given some of these

updates to the other committees but I don't think you guys have met since those before those. We did complete the Wildlife Food Plot rulemaking and got that through the Board of Forestry and all the stuff we had to do there. Submitted the report to the BOF in July. They approved the final and the final was submitted and posted to the Secretary of State. So those, all the rules are official that are associated with that. So that's... we have guidance out on that. We haven't any guidance on the rules. I think what we have out there is sufficient for implementation of that. We may look at developing more guidance for the rules in the future. I did mention the agricultural wetlands policy. We've been working on that. Basically we had a memo back in 2009 that changed how we viewed Significant Wetlands that were in agricultural use. Looked at that and created a report an issue paper was developed and we've looked around, looked at that memo and are considering rescinding that memo and then re-writing into a Plan for Alternate Practices in cases where those are needed. So we can waive the buffers in some situations where the wetland conditions are significantly altered or degraded due to agricultural use. I think that is it for...unless you have questions on that. Thomas is going to talk about the ODF-ODF&W MOA and the fish passage stuff. If there are any questions or comments on anything that I've shared? If not, Thomas are you up?

Whittington: Good day everyone, I'm Thomas Whittington, Water Quality Specialist for the Private Forests Division. And I was going to get everyone updated on the fish passage work that has been going on for about 2 years now so we have some progress updates there. I think the last time you received anything was at the last meeting. I think Josh gave you a quick update on where we are at. There have been some accomplishments regarding some agreements and work on Tech Note 4. So first off the MOA regarding fish passage on non-federal forestlands, that's a foundation for interagency coordination between ODF and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. That MOA affirms ODF's role in ensuring fish passage is provided when we are doing stream crossings, constructing, replacing, maintaining or abandoning those crossings in conjunction with forest operations under the authority of the FPA. So updating the MOA, that was a little of the background there on what the MOA provides. So that's been worked on through multiple meetings over the last couple, last 2 years. That has been finalized and is currently working its way up to both Peter in our Agency and Kurt Melcher is also, should get it pretty soon from our Fish and Wildlife, he's the Agency Director. We are working to get that agreement signed here very soon. So once I get it signed it will be in effect. The key piece is recognizing this is an agreement that sets the foundation of us working together regarding fish passage between the two agencies. So the implementation of the MOA will come through the revised Forest Practices Technical Note #4 that we are working on. And I'll give you some further updates on that here in a minute. Once that is reviewed and final that will be the implementation for the MOA and fish passage working forward. I'll pause there, I see there is a question from Seth. I believe the Committee has received a copy of the draft MOA previously and maybe Josh can help me, did we send that out before? Last fall?

Barnard: I thought we did, we can check the records if we haven't we can send it out but I was thinking we had distributed that to the Committees. But we can check the record on that.

Whittington: And we can also, that was a draft and hasn't changed much. There are a few changes since last fall. But it hasn't changed significantly since then but we can definitely send out the final draft if that was something Seth or others wanted to see.

Messinger: Yes, can you please send it? Please do.

Whittington: I'll get that out through Susan and make sure you get copied in. So moving ahead I'll get into a little bit more details on Tech Note 4 and where we are at with that. We've been working on that pretty hard through last spring and over the summer as we have had time. There is a small group working on revising and updating that and that's myself, Greg Erb, a Stewardship Forester down in Coos who has a lot of background on fish passage; and then ODF&W staff person, the Assistant Fish Passage Coordinator. His name is **Craig Smith**. So the three of us have been working on drafting that, adding content, trying to get that ready to go. And we have been working under an outline that has been approved by the working group that has RFPC members on that group that approved the outline that we are working under. That's coming along and we are progressing, had a couple of speed bumps over the summer but we are getting close to 75% done, the goal is to get that early in November out for a wider distribution for review and edits and then share that out with the Fish Passage Working Group, with the RFPC selected members and plot it on from there. If we remain on the plan timeline as

we talked about in the past. Getting the Tech Note reviewed and getting feedback and basically get it ready for the 2021 project season. And that is what we are really pushing for right now. So the message there is that we are making sure and communicating the expectations that the projects in 2021 will be completed under the revised guidance, Tech Note 4 and the BMPs. That are going to be out there. Also realizing there is going to be full flexibility and adjustments especially rolling it out for the first year of implementation of Tech Note 4. So, a quick update on the workgroup. We did have a meeting earlier this week to discuss a specific section within that revised Tech Note 4 regarding hot topics within the Tech Note and that's fish salvage and rescue. And work area isolation. So we had a meeting dedicated to that and there has been a lot of work getting that where we have that now. So we had that meeting Monday with the group and talked about where we are at with the draft updates of Tech Note 4 and then shared a section of Tech Note 4 where we have fairly complete regarding fish rescue and salvage. We shared that out and got feedback on that. And the other big piece of that is there was part of the discussions with previous workgroup meetings earlier in the spring about having some kind of programmatic letter from ODF&W and we had a draft we shared with the group as well. That will allow basically it's a letter from ODF&W giving landowners and operators programmatic approval to do some of that fish handling work that needs to be done when the project warrants. So if the project has a stream that's going to isolate the work area to prevent, remove the water and get everything out of there so it may require handling fish or herding fish is another term we use. So we have approval to do that. Certain practices are outlined within Tech Note 4 and that's what we reviewed Monday. The Letter is the approval from ODF&W for us to do that as long as we are following those BMPs that are described in the Tech Note. One piece that we talked about that I wanted to share with everybody that, since ODF&W is a State Agency they can only give State Approval for doing certain things it doesn't provide any kind of ESA coverage or protections so ODF&W staff are continuing to work with federal services on getting an approach that will work. They are not seeking any kind of permit from them we are seeking a consult to ensure practices we are outlined in the revised Tech Note 4 would suffice for some of the ESA and what their requirements would be. So that is an ongoing discussion occurring with ODF&W, and the federal services, NIMS and Anadromous Species. So we are just making sure we are in alignment with federal requirements that may be required under the ESA. So that's where we are at with the fish passage work and it's something that we want to make sure that the goal is to continue that work even with other things with the Agency with fire, salvage, recovery. But this is something we want to continue to work to get things done in the in-water work period as well. And when we get progress updates we will share that with the RPFC committees each of them especially as we get the Tech Note 4 form that is ready to share out with everybody and give updates to the working groups and the RPFC members as well. Probably a lot of details there but I'll answer any questions.

Messinger: Any questions for Thomas? I guess moving on, Terry, are you the next person up again?

Frueh: Okay. Thanks Bob. So I am going to do a little update on the Monitoring Group in Private Forests. Part of the picture is that we have 5.5 FTE positions also the Unit Manager. Marganne Allen was the manager, she left to take a position with ODA the beginning of February or so and then two of the other staff position had an LD and two left. Ariel Cowan took a Stewardship Forester position, she was a Monitoring Specialist. So, we went from 5.5 FTE plus a manager. To 3.5 FTE so we are down a few folks and we have been holding those vacancies as part of the whole budget situation. And we will be holding those open for a while yet because of the uncertainty regarding next year. So that's part of our staffing picture. Like I mentioned under the 1602 discussion, the Siskiyou project is done and we are moving on with other work. The Implementation Study looking at the compliance we've got a pilot study where we are looking at reforestation but for a variety of reasons we are focusing that only in NW Oregon. Part of that is the COVID situation not wanting to have staff, moving far and the funding overnight. And we are just looking at private industrial ground and that's easy to get permission on to work. It's a very limited pilot study to sort of test the protocol and then we can take that and get more feedback on the methods down the road. From both the external team...as well some staff, professional feedback on that pilot study. And some of you folks may be aware that we had some concerns raised, probably like a year ago now maybe a little bit more about what we did previously. Some questions about are our results skewed by not having access to all properties and some not giving us access to collect data on their property as well as some of the statistical concerns. So, we hired a consultant to do sort of a preliminary look at that summarizing the concerns and potential ways to address those concerns and also laying out a framework if we wanted to do an RFP to look at that previous data collection effort and so we want to re-analyze the data and how would that meet programmatic needs? So that work by Groom Analytics, there are two 5 pages reports that

were presented to the Board in September as part of the Monitoring Unit update which had been planned as an agenda item but because of the wildfire situation that was moved to a consent agenda. We had been planning on not moving forward with that look back, we don't have the money right now to hire contractors to do that look back at the previous data collection efforts. However with the Governor changing our budget situation by vetoing the cuts. We now have some money to do an RFP. To hire a contractor. So we are in the process of drafting that RFP and we'll be getting some feedback from our External Review Team on that. So that's a bit about the Implementation Monitoring, and before I touch on anything else are there any questions about that? Okay, given that there are no questions about that, we are also collaborating with DEQ on trying to revise our 20 year old MOU to update our processes so we have a smoother process for how we work together in addressing the sufficiency of the FPA and their Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) how they go about developing and implementing those. So we are in a big series of facilitated conversations with them and making some progress there. There is an update coming to the Board in November from Kyle Abraham and his counterpart at DEQ discussing that at the November Board meeting. And then as I mentioned earlier, we are unsure of our involvement in the SB1602. We don't anticipate a big workload there but we are at the beck-in-call if you will because that is an important process and if the parties in that mediated discussion process want to have some technical input we will be ready to prove that when requested. Any questions about either of those before I hand the baton to Adam to discuss some of the West Oregon effectiveness monitoring work?

Messinger: So the MOU with the DEQ is there a new draft or anything like that that we could have a look at?

Frueh: No, we don't have a draft yet, we are still in the conversation stage.

Messinger: Do you think about it, that there will be significant changes to the current MOA?

Frueh: I suspect there will because a lot of things have changed, from some of the processes of how they do things and how we do things and we are trying to make it as smooth a process, so expect there will be some significant changes to that MOA.

Messinger: I may have missed it, but what is the schedule for...

Frueh: That's a good question. I suspect it will probably be on the order of mid-2021 by the time we've got something together. Mid to late 2021. Okay, if there are no other questions I'll hand it over to Adam.

Coble: Thanks Terry. I am Adam Coble, Monitoring Specialist with ODF. I'm going to provide a quick update on the Western Oregon Streamside Protections Review. Real quickly the objective for this project is to determine if the rules are effective for achieving the goals for both Desired Future Conditions and Riparian Management Areas and also for Large Wood in Streams. And that would include Small and Medium Fish-bearing Streams in Western Oregon. The FPA rules on vegetation retention of streamside stands provides more details on the goals for DFC so you can look to the FPA if you want to learn more about specific goals. The project is focused on streamside buffers and more specifically we want to identify whether the streamside stands are on track to meet the goals for DFC and for Large Wood put into the streams. For this project there are 3 main components and I can briefly describe those and provide an update and our next steps mainly for your awareness. So the first component is the Field Study and Data Analysis, I completed this portion of the study. This is a very technical report that focuses on an analysis of RipStream vegetation data and we focused on sites on private land. The report was issued as an ODF Technical Report and that will soon be available for download on the ODF website. And before we completed the draft we received comments from stakeholders and tribes and made revisions to the Technical Report based upon those comments. Sort of a supplementary material I am developing a two page summary of the Report. This is for stakeholders and the general public who don't have time to dive into a 40 page report. The Summary hits the main findings from that Report. So then the second component of the study is a Literature Review that covers DFC and Large Wood. That is currently in progress. Terry and I have developed a protocol that describes the methods and approach which is pretty similar to a Systematic Review but we dropped a few components from the Systematic Review methodology mainly because of limited resources that Terry described within Monitoring and to help speed up the process. Regarding the Literature Review, a lot of the relevant studies on riparian forests including RipStream as well have a fairly narrow window of time when data was collected so kind of limits our inferences about how riparian

stands develop. So, presents a challenge to conduct a really thorough assessment of long-term changes in riparian stand conditions. That brings me to the third component of this project, the modeling analysis. That will help us to understand how riparian stands develop over time. Based on information that we have such as the RipStream Study and so through the modeling analysis we are looking to contract that work out. And so part of the process we have to develop a strong RFP, that gets opened to the public and then we receive bids. So we have made pretty good progress on that request for proposal and we are pretty close to getting that out for bid. So moving forward for the Literature Reviews we are barely starting to extract data from the literature, we plan to have the drafts completed by late spring/early summer of 2021. At that point the drafts will be sent to stakeholders and tribes. And then for the modeling analysis we are fairly close as I have mentioned before to getting that posted and opening that up for bid. We anticipate selecting the contractor in getting the contract signed by January of 2021 and after that we will work with the contractor to start the modeling analysis. We'll be focusing mainly on modeling riparian stand growth regeneration and mortality that model will also feed into the Large Wood modeling. That's all I have, I am happy to answer any questions that you have on this project. Thanks.

Messenger: Remind us of the geographic scope of it, Adam?

Coble: So that would include, FPA regions of the Coast Range, Interior, South Coast and basically everything west of the Cascades except for the Siskiyou.

Messenger: Okay thank you. So are there any questions from the Committee for Terry or Adam? Hearing none. I have a couple of administrative things. I completely skipped Approval of the Minutes from our last meeting so you all received a copy of that via email. So I would entertain a Motion for Approval of those minutes.

Henderson: This is Elwayne, I move that we approve the minutes from 2019.

Jones: I second that.

Messenger: Susan is that a tight enough Motion for you?

Dominique: That was Paul that seconded?

Henderson: And Elwayne that made the Motion.

Dominique: Thank you.

Messenger: Any discussion on the minutes? All in favor say aye. We are good. Then it came to our attention that maybe we didn't have a quorum when we voted for Operator of the Year. So, I need to re-vote that if we can. So now there are 5 committee members on. So, Paul I think it was your Motion?

Jones: I make a 'second' motion to approve the Operator of the Year for 2020.

Messenger: Bobby did you second that?

Douglas: I didn't but I would be happy to this time.

Messenger: All in favor of that Motion, say aye. Okay, any objections or nay votes on that? Okay the Motion stands approved thank you very much. So next is for the Good of the Order, so opening it up for the Committee if there are any issues or things you want to talk about? Things on your mind or comments? Whatever. Quiet bunch!

Henderson: Hi, this is Elwayne sorry I wasn't on earlier. The internet wasn't working so I came down to the State Forestry Department and finally got on.

Messinger: That was creative, good for you! I guess next meeting we'll hope for an in-person meeting but if not we will do another virtual meeting. I don't know when that will be sometime in the spring unless we have something else come up?

Barnard: I was going to suggest the same approximate time frame, Bob. And we will do like last year and see if there where policy topics and other items are headed by that point. I guess in springtime unless something significantly changes between now and then.

Messinger: Does that meet with everyone's approval on the Committee? It looks like it. So we'll just keep you up to date as best we can as things move along? And if there is something worthy of a meeting we'll call one. I promised early on that we wouldn't meet unless just for the sake of meeting but have to have something substantial to talk about. So, I guess with that unless someone has something else to add to the meeting, or conversation I'll adjourn the meeting. Hearing none I adjourn the meeting. Thank you very much for attending I appreciate all the staff updates and all the work you do. I find it most informative. Thank you very much.

Barnard: Thank you for taking the time to meet with us.