

Oregon Board of Forestry – Public Meeting

Oregon Department of Forestry -
2600 State Street, Salem OR, 97310

Wednesday, January 8, 2020

Prior meetings' audio and this meeting's written material available on the web www.oregon.gov/odf. The matters under the Consent Agenda will be considered in one block. Any board member may request removal of any item from the consent agenda. Items removed for separate discussion will be considered after approval of the consent agenda. Public comment will not be taken on consent agenda items.

Consent Agenda

- 9:00 – 9:01 A. **November 6, 2019 Meeting Minutes** State Forester Peter Daugherty
- 9:00 – 9:01 B. **November 7, 2019 Workshop Minutes** State Forester Peter Daugherty
- 9:00 – 9:01 C. **Emergency Fire Cost Committee Appointment**..... Nancy Hirsch
- 9:00 – 9:01 D. **Wildlife Food Plots Rulemaking** Nathan Agalzoff and Josh Barnard

Action and Information

- 9:01 – 9:30 1. **State Forester and Board Member Comments**
 - A. **Public Comments** [topics not on agenda – see over] Sign in at entrance
- 9:30 – 9:45 2. **Forest Trust Lands Advisory Committee Testimony** David Yamamoto
The FTLAC is a statutorily established committee that advises the BOF on State Forests policy.
- 9:45 – 10:50 3. **Siskiyou Streamside Protections Review** Kyle Abraham, Marganne Allen, Ariel Cowen, and Terry Frueh
The Department will present a progress report on work that addresses sufficiency of rules regarding temperature, shade, and desired future conditions for small and medium fish streams in the Siskiyou geographic region. Additionally, the Department will present draft advisory committee objectives for the Board's approval, and the Board will affirm the project outline.
- 10:50 – 11:00 Morning Break
- 11:00 – 12:00 **Siskiyou Streamside Protections Review (Continued)** Kyle Abraham, Marganne Allen, Ariel Cowen,
..... and Terry Frueh
- 12:00 – 1:00 4. ***Executive Session and Working Lunch** Chair Imeson
The Board will meet in executive session for the purpose of conferring with legal counsel regarding the Board's rights and duties related to current litigation likely to be filed pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(h).
- 1:00 – 1:30 5. **Agency Budget Development** Bill Herber and James Short
The Department will present proposed guiding principles for developing the 2021-23 Agency Request Budget.
- 1:30 – 3:15 6. **2020-2021 Board Work Plans Discussion** Division Chiefs and Program Directors
Board to review draft Board work plans developed by Divisions. This is the first step of a two-step process, to refine and approve Board work plans. The second step is projected to be part of the March Board meeting, and will seek Board approval on the work plans.
- 3:15 – 3:30 Afternoon Break
- 3:30 – 4:00 7. **2021 Legislative Concepts** Chad Davis
Board will review potential legislative concepts for the 2021 Legislative Session. This is the first time the Department will seek feedback from the Board on potential Legislative concepts. The Board will review a second draft and approve concepts projected to be presented at March Board meeting.
- 4:00 – 5:00 8. ***Executive Session** Chair Imeson
The Board will meet in executive session for the purpose of reviewing the State Forester's Annual Performance, pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(i).

Times listed on the agenda are approximate. At the discretion of the chair, the time and order of agenda items—including addition of an afternoon break—may change to maintain meeting flow. The board will hear public testimony [*excluding marked items] and engage in discussion before proceeding to the next item.* A single asterisk preceding the item number marks a work session. Public testimony/comment will not be accepted.

BOARD WORK PLANS: Board of Forestry Work Plans result from the board's identification of priority issues. Each item represents commitment of time by the Board of Forestry and Department of Forestry staff that needs to be fully understood and appropriately planned. Board Work Plans form the basis for establishing Board of Forestry meeting agendas. Latest versions of these plans can be found on the board's website at: www.oregonforestry.gov

PUBLIC TESTIMONY: The Board of Forestry places great value on information received from the public. The board accepts both oral and written comments on agenda items except Work Session items [see explanation below]. Those wishing to testify or present information to the board are encouraged to:

- Provide written summaries of lengthy, detailed information;
- Recognize that substance, not length, determines the value of testimony or written information;
- Endorse rather than repeat the testimony of others;
- Sign-in at the information table located near the entrance.

Written comments for public testimony provide a valuable reference and may be submitted before or during the meeting for consideration by the board. Please bring 10 copies for distribution. Written comments received before or during the meeting will be distributed to the board. Oral or written comments may be summarized, audio-recorded, and filed as record. Audio files and video links of the board's meetings are posted within one week after the meeting at: www.oregonforestry.gov

The board cannot accept testimony on a topic for which a public hearing has been held and the comment period has closed. If you wish to provide comments to the board, you must sign-in on the sheet provided at the Information Table, located near the meeting room's entrance. (Note: All persons attending a board meeting are requested to sign in, whether or not they intend to provide comment.)

Three minutes will be allotted for each individual. Those wishing additional time for testimony should contact the Board Support office at 503-945-7210 at least three days prior to the meeting. The maximum amount of time for all public comments under this agenda item will be thirty minutes.

WORK SESSIONS: Certain agenda topics may be marked with an asterisk indicating a "Work Session" item. Work Sessions provide the board opportunity to receive information and/or make decisions after considering previous public comment and staff recommendations. No new public comment will be taken. However, the board may choose to ask questions of the audience to clarify issues raised.

- During consideration of contested civil penalty cases, the board will entertain oral argument only if board members have questions relating to the information presented.
- Relating to the adoption of Oregon Administrative Rules: Under Oregon's Administrative Procedures Act, the board can only consider those comments received by the established deadline as listed on the Notice of Rulemaking form. Additional input can only be accepted if the comment period is formally extended (ORS 183.335).

GENERAL INFORMATION: For regularly scheduled meetings, the board's agenda is posted on the web at: www.oregonforestry.gov two weeks prior to the meeting date. During that time, circumstances may dictate a revision to the agenda, either in the sequence of items to be addressed, or in the time of day the item is to be presented. The board will make every attempt to follow its published schedule, and requests your indulgence when that is not possible.

In order to provide the broadest range of services, lead-time is needed to make the necessary arrangements. If special materials, services, or assistance is required, such as a sign language interpreter, assistive listening device, or large print material, please contact our Public Affairs Office at least three working days prior to the meeting via telephone 503-945-7200 or fax 503-945-7212.

Use of all tobacco products in state-owned buildings and on adjacent grounds is prohibited.

DRAFT Board of Forestry Meeting Minutes

November 6, 2019

INDEX

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Page #</u>
A. SEPTEMBER 4, 2019 MEETING MINUTES.....	2
B. OCTOBER 9, 2019 RETREAT MINUTES	2
C. EAST OREGON FOREST PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION AGREEMENT REVISION	2
D. NEHALEM RIVER SCENIC WATERWAY RULEMAKING.....	2
1. STATE FORESTER, BOARD MEMBER, AND PUBLIC COMMENTS	3
2. WICKED PROBLEMS IN POLICY MAKING	5
3. SOCIAL CONSTRUCT FOR SCIENCE AND POLICY.....	6
4. GOVERNOR’S COUNCIL ON WILDFIRE RESPONSE REVIEW.....	7
5. FOREST TRUST LANDS ADVISORY COMMITTEE	8
6. SPECIFIED RESOURCE SITES RULEMAKING FOR MARBLED MURRELETS	9
7. WESTERN OREGON STATE FORESTS HCP AND FMP UPDATE	10

Items listed in order heard.

Complete audio recordings from the meeting and attachments listed below are available on the web at www.oregonforestry.gov.

- (1) Handout, [Fire Finance Information for State Forester, Board Member, and Public Comments](#), Agenda Item 1
- (2) Handout, [Memorandum of Understanding Pacific Coast Temperate Forests for State Forester, Board Member, and Public Comments](#), Agenda Item 1
- (3) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Niemi for State Forester, Board Member, and Public Comments](#), Agenda Item 1
- (4) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Cafferata for State Forester, Board Member, and Public Comments](#), Agenda Item 1
- (5) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Peralta for State Forester, Board Member, and Public Comments](#), Agenda Item 1
- (6) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Bell for State Forester, Board Member, and Public Comments](#), Agenda Item 1
- (7) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Aster for State Forester, Board Member, and Public Comments](#), Agenda Item 1
- (8) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Thompson for State Forester, Board Member, and Public Comments](#), Agenda Item 1
- (9) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Van Dyk for State Forester, Board Member, and Public Comments](#), Agenda Item 1
- (10) Presentation, [Wicked Problems in Policy Making](#), Agenda Item 2
- (11) Presentation, [Social Construct for Science and Policy](#), Agenda Item 3
- (12) Presentation, [Governor's Council on Wildfire Response Review](#), Agenda Item 4

- (13) Handout, [Written Testimony by Sullivan for Forest Trust Lands Advisory Council Testimony](#), Agenda Item 5
- (14) Presentation, [Specified Resource Sites Rulemaking for Marbled Murrelets](#), Agenda Item 6
- (15) Presentation, [Western Oregon State Forests HCP and FMP Update](#), Agenda Item 5
- (16) Handout, [Oral and Written Testimony by Jones for Western Oregon State Forests HCP and FMP Update](#), Agenda Item 5

In accordance with the provisions of ORS 526.016, a meeting of the Oregon Board of Forestry was held on November 6, 2019 at the Oregon Department of Forestry Headquarters on 2600 State Street, Salem, OR 97310.

Chair Imeson called the public meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

Board Members Present:

Nils Christoffersen
 Cindy Deacon Williams
 Joe Justice
 Jim Kelly
 Brenda McComb
 Mike Rose
 Tom Imeson

CONSENT AGENDA:

- A. SEPTEMBER 4, 2019 MEETING MINUTES
 Approval of Board Meeting Minutes.

ACTION: The Board approved minutes from the September 4, 2019 Board meeting.

- B. OCTOBER 9, 2019 RETREAT MINUTES
 Approval of Board Retreat Minutes

ACTION: The Board approved minutes from the October 9, 2019 Board retreat.

- C. EAST OREGON FOREST PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION AGREEMENT REVISION

Approval of a revision to the forestland protection agreement in accordance with the Board’s statute ORS 477.406, and rule OAR 629-041-0100. Oregon Department of Forestry and East Oregon Fire Protective Association met legal sufficiency in this revised joint agreement.

ACTION: The Board confirmed the revision to the East Oregon Forest Protective Association Agreement in adherence to the requirements of statute and rule as required by OAR 629-041-0100.

- D. NEHALEM RIVER SCENIC WATERWAY RULEMAKING

Oregon Department of Parks and Recreation (OPRD) administers the State Scenic Waterways Program and required to adopt specific rules under Oregon Revised Statutes chapter 183. ORS 390.845 requires consultation with the Board of Forestry on rules governing the management of state scenic waterways and related adjacent lands. Approximately 75 percent of the designated

scenic waterway is on Board of Forestry lands, with the remainder being industrial forestland and scattered private parcels.

Information Only.

Mike Rose motioned for approval of the consent agenda items. Joe Justice seconded the motion. Voting in favor of the motion: Nils Christoffersen, Cindy Deacon Williams, Tom Imeson, Joe Justice, Jim Kelly, Brenda McComb, and Mike Rose. Against: none. With Board consensus Items A through C were approved, and the motion carried. Noted item D was an informational item.

ACTION AND INFORMATION:

1. STATE FORESTER, BOARD MEMBER, AND PUBLIC COMMENTS

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 – (1 hour, 1 minute and 32 seconds – 28.1 MB)

Chair Imeson commented on:

- Public Meeting will be live streamed, and is experiencing technical difficulties.
- Public comment open for each topic and not to exceed 30 minutes, with exception agenda items two and three.

State Forester Daugherty commented on:

- The overarching themes from the Board of Forestry October 9, 2019 Retreat. Highlighted the Board's structural and operational processes, working relationships and decision making, strategic planning and work plans.
- The Fire Finance background, summary of Department actions to address financial issues, and formation of the Forestry Financial Oversight team. Provided the Board a handout ([attachment 1](#)) highlighting the Department, Board, Department of Administrative Services, and the Governor's office collaborative efforts to respond to the financial situation.
- The Department's actions in addressing climate change, by mentioning the release of the Forest Carbon report and the inter-state collaborative efforts in developing a Memorandum of Understanding on Pacific Coast Temperate Forests ([attachment 2](#)).

Board Members Comments:

- Joe Justice attended a meeting with Environmental Quality Commission (EQC) and Board of Agriculture (BOA), to discuss water quality roles and responsibilities. Highlighted themes from the meeting, like reasonable assurance and accountability on the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) plans, agency rules and regulations, and Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) pursuit to further identify how shade and temperature impacts land use. Complimented the EQC members on their commitment to the commission. Listed some research areas related to the Siskiyou region, he is working on learning with the help of the Private Forests Division. Stated how complimentary the work by DEQ and the Department are, and optimistic about the outcome of this interagency effort.
- Brenda McComb reviewed the latest Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) meeting she attended and highlighted OWEB actions, like fund distribution for streamside restoration projects across the state. Commented on committee structuring areas that may overlap with the Board's strategic plan. Listed themes of climate change and diversity, equity and inclusion, and

commented on OWEB consideration to integrate into all work or address through a subcommittee function.

- State Forester Daugherty reviewed the Department's current efforts in collaborating with other natural resource agencies to address these issues, and described how disparities can limit an agency's commitment to work on these areas. Stated he will continue working with OWEB to see where the two Boards can coordinate efforts.
- Jim Kelly reviewed his latest tour at Green Diamond Resource, and explained how this company participates in the California cap and trade program. He highlighted some program themes like tree species diversity, fire response preparation and accountability, management planning for a working forest, and application costs for private land owners. Commented on latest press that the Department has received, and shared his perspective on the multi-faceted issues in front of the agency, and the political players involved that intervene or negate the agency from resolving funding issues.

Public Testimony:

- Ernie Niemi from Economics Resource provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 3](#)) to the Board about three climate-related events. Urged the Board to assess any carbon-related and liability damages that may result from a timber sale. Recommended the Department to suspend all timber sales until risk assessments are complete and management plans are made.
- Fran Cafferata from Cafferata Consulting provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 4](#)) to the Board on the positive outcomes from working forests and wildlife. Offered her perspective on sustainable forest management and timber harvest practices that are implemented to promote wildlife and biodiversity across the Pacific Northwest.
- Sal Peralta provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 5](#)) to the Board on the Oregon Forest Resources Trust origin and statutory authority. Explained how the program can be used to develop a protocol for carbon sequestration offsets. Commented on how the trust program is underfunded and underutilized. Asked the Board and Department to review the statutes and rules related to the trust, to determine if the program scope can be broadened to better meet climate policy needs, and described an approach for them to take for optimal engagement.
- Jill Bell provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 6](#)) to the Board on the Oregon Women in Timber (OWIT) organization background and objectives. Highlighted OWIT's successful student program and community educational campaign in Lane County. Expressed loggers and foresters commitment to ensure working forests are around for future generations.
- Anna Yarborough from OWIT provided oral testimony to the Board about advocating for active forest management and recreation in forests. Shared her perspective on balancing water quality and protecting wildlife habitat with working forests and rural community economies.
- Amanda Astor from OWIT provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 7](#)) to the Board on the benefits of a working forest for families, communities and local businesses. Asked the Board to recognize climate benefits from wood construction and products, higher yields of carbon sequestration from young stands, and mitigate loss of high density, old growth stands.
- Melissa Thompson from OWIT provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 8](#)) to the Board on the value of the timber industry. Shared her perspective on OWIT and the importance of sustainable forestry and active forest management.
- Kyle Williamson from Oregon Forests and Industry Council (OFIC) provided oral testimony to the Board on fire on the landscape and the increase of acres burned. Commented on fire

management on Department protected lands and private land owners versus Federal lands. Reviewed the benefits of active management and suppression.

- Bob Van Dyk from the Wild Salmon Center provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 9](#)) to the Board on the Forest Practices Act 2017 compliance report. Questioned the report's validity of the study design and data analysis. Noted how this reporting issue was brought to the Board and Department's attention in the past, and sought clarification on next steps.

Board member commented on public testimony:

- Stated understanding on compliance audit review next steps as an analysis to be completed on study design and statistical analysis. State Forester outlined actions taken in response to this issue, and explained how he asked the Division staff to re-evaluate options for a past review. Stressed the importance to communicate with the Board and the Legislature if report contains margin of error. Board summarized request to the State Forester for an external statistical review of the compliance audit sampling design and analyses.

Information Only.

2. WICKED PROBLEMS IN POLICY MAKING

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 – (48 minutes and 8 seconds – 22 MB)
Presentation ([attachment 10](#))

Craig Shinn, Professor from Portland State University, provided background on his professional and academic pursuits. He explained resource sociology as the study of how society produces and creates meaning about the things in nature and arbitrates the differences among those meanings, which can result in tension. Described the constructed set of assumptions within which society operates. He commented on the system of governance in place, how leadership is challenged in making determinations for the greater populous when only hearing from a few, and coalescing differences in similar political arenas, but scale of agreement is not universal.

Shinn reviewed the enhanced model of public service leadership, noted how value propositions underlies decision making, and reviewed specific themes present in public officials decision-making space. Commented on leadership and followership roles, the work associated with those roles and their implications. Reviewed network governance and the multi-faceted nature of wicked problems. Described elements of these problems as polycentric, interrelated, and borderless. He defined wicked problems and noted how these problems are normally present in natural resources. Provided an illustration of emerging wicked problems and further explained each component of a wicked problem.

Shinn transitioned to decision making, and explained how making a decision is not objective, but subjective in nature. Explained how criteria and set of alternatives are created to make a decision, noted how criteria are essentially values reified, and posited that a beholder values interprets the criteria's meaning differently, so reaching an agreement as a group can be problematic. Explored how social scientists can assist policymakers. Noted how most systems have routinized mechanics, and how important it is to sort out these mechanisms to determine appropriate techniques that can address the problem. Listed science based aspects considered by policymakers. Suggested for the Board to determine how science assessments are used and credibility of that science, to define science architecture they can support and cautioned not to rely on design alone for their decision making. Offered tricks of the trade

in decision-making to transform the decision-making space. Closed by thanking the Board for their service.

Board commented on the presentation:

- Shared that sometimes the Board defines a solution using an ‘and’ approach, but it can create a challenge to implement. Shinn noted how he can introduce how new public governance operates across a political economy in a power shared world.

Public testimony was not available on this topic, part of November 7, 2019 Board values, science and policy workshop.

Information Only.

3. SOCIAL CONSTRUCT FOR SCIENCE AND POLICY
[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (43 minutes and 35 seconds – 19.9 MB)
Presentation ([attachment 11](#))

Denise Lach, professor from Oregon State University, provided her background as a sociologist and shared her area of expertise. She described climate change as a wicked problem with various implications with potential outcomes. Reviewed the definition of value, the overlaps of principle with worth, and how values are brought into decision making. She clarified how values link with normative science, and defined normative science as it relates to wicked problems. Noted the different types of values, from deep core beliefs to policy core beliefs and explained how secondary beliefs can lead to common ground. Stated how complex problems are dynamic and ever-changing, in turn, suggested evaluating problems based on level of uncertainty and importance of the stakes. Explained how high decision stakes and systems uncertainties within applied science can lead to post-normal science implications and wicked problems. Described the characteristics of post-normal science, provided examples of each component, and explored post-normal science approaches. Highlighted the benefits and caveats of a transdisciplinary approach in using science to address a wicked problem.

Lach defined clumsy solutions and described how this cultural theory is used in planning or policymaking. She reviewed the importance of an individual position versus a group position, outlined four aspects within this spectrum and connected these aspects to how people work with choice restrictions. Commented on the relational understanding and attitudes that exist in each spectrum, listed the four quadrants and implications these quadrants had on group dynamics in decision making. Offered an example to help illustrate utilization of clumsy solutions for a California multi-water district decision process, and explained the outcomes had fulfilled a need for each quadrant type. Elaborated on how these quadrant types may perceive climate change as a wicked problem.

Lach commented on the co-production of knowledge approach, outlined the parameters of this approach, defined knowledge within this construct, and how this approach is utilized by decision-making groups. Provided a step-by-step example of a co-design and co-production approach used for an Idaho action network in Big Wood Basin and explained how the various stakeholders involved worked through the approach. Reviewed the lessons learned and key takeaways in using this approach in planning and policy making. Noted that the issues identified change overtime as a planning project continues and to build in that flexibility. She reminded the Board that there are many tools and techniques available to help provide clumsy and collaborative solutions to wicked problems.

Board commented on presentation:

- Stated the two presentations will lend to the foundation for the Board conversations at the November 7 workshop. Thanked the presenters for their time and presentations to the Board.
- Appreciated the emphasis and value of local knowledge, for science is abstract and moves away from the work done on the ground. Recognized in any planning endeavor, practices and systems need to be in place to integrate local knowledge into the decision-making process.

Public testimony was not available on this topic, part of November 7, 2019 Board values, science and policy workshop.

Information Only.

4. GOVERNOR'S COUNCIL ON WILDFIRE RESPONSE REVIEW

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (52 minutes and 24 seconds – 23.09 MB)

Presentation ([attachment 12](#))

Matt Donegan, Chair for the Governor's Council on Wildfire Response, provided an overview of his ([presentation](#)) for the interagency and stakeholders effort in 2019. He expressed gratitude to the Department for their dedicated work on the council, and to the Board and State Forester for their support. He provided background on the council's origin, mission, and objectives under Governor Brown's Executive Order 19-01. Described the wide breadth of knowledge on the council, which provided a strong representation of those impacted by wildfire. Outlined how the council developed a committee structure for planning, collaborating, and reporting back to the council over the year. Commented on the integral efforts of multiple committees ensuring the key elements from the national cohesive wildland fire management strategy are thoughtfully discussed over the year. He reviewed how each committee worked under the key elements of fire-adapted communities, resilient landscapes, and wildfire response to produce sufficient and sustainable recommendations for the Governor. He reviewed the timeline of work, report cycles, and end goals.

Donegan reviewed the preliminary findings and recommendations as a product of the subcommittee and council work under mitigation, protection, and recovery lenses. Discussed how the systems in place were built for another era, outlined how opportunities, needs, and risks have evolved. Explained how each key finding has social, environmental and economic implication. Commented on the rigor in finding the right strategy to implement that can withstand midcourse corrections, be applied appropriately, and incorporates systems that are working for Oregonians.

Donegan highlighted what aspects of the overall public system are working sufficiently and how it will need to be maintained into the future. Reviewed the 11 areas for moderate course corrections, described the degree of the recommended course correction for each area, and prospective next steps for each area. He commented on the six significant course corrections, explaining the magnitude of scope and complexity of issue would require some political ownership and perhaps alternative funding models.

Donegan commented on the importance of framing the debate around wildfire, by focusing on primary issues under each subject identified as areas to address. Reviewed the potential implications for the Department, from suppression cash management, GNA staffing, public engagement, to budgeting for a cohesive strategy. Closed by discussing next steps with the Board and how legislative guidance will be needed.

Board commented on Governor’s Wildfire Response Council presentation:

- Asked if anything was surprising to the Chair. Council Chair noted the level of engagement across the council, knowledge sharing, and critical thinking exceeded expectations, which produced a diverse and comprehensive body of work.
- Discussed how the militia model may need to be added under the moderate course correction category. Observed this model as not sustainable with the current funding structure and to consider modifications to insulate Department staff and to help maintain operational core duties. Donegan clarified this is not necessarily an endorsement of maintaining status quo, but that it will need to be adaptive to the fluctuating fire seasons, and provide adequate resources to the Divisions. Board member Christoffersen highlighted that this recommendation is based on the policy option package (POP) created by the Department and approved by the Board. Reviewed how resources may increase overtime to match the longer durations of fire seasons.
- Noted the implications beyond fuel treatments that contribute to landscape and ecological resiliency, pre and post fire. Donegan stated these items are part of a greater set of objectives approved by the Council. Expressed the focus of resilient landscapes for ecosystems and communities was a charge to the mitigation committee, and were considered in a much broader context as they developed recommendations.
- Recommended to consider the public policy perspective to include rural economic health, jobs, cost savings, and safety. Mentioned how Department staff levels have not recovered since the recession, and to include this piece into the overall strategy for increasing resources and capacity.
- Commented on what themes are emerging politically and are prudent to maintain momentum and support. Listed the main themes that emerged: strengthening utilities, suppression expansion, land use, and improving resilient landscapes. Listed the wider ranged themes that emerged: health systems for low income communities, disaster recovery, and wildfire preparation.
- Discussed the different schools of thoughts around gathering, maintaining, and communicating out information on resources and management of structured buildings on the landscape. Reviewed various scenarios, but ultimately proactively planning for these fire events and prioritize firefighting response.
- Explored fire risk interface modeled by current climate conditions, and what is considered as an investment moving forward to proactive planning. Established the modeling efforts strategy is a priority but may require improvement to address the evolving environment and technological advancements. Noted how one ask may be to support the council’s overall funding ask, but this does not include maintenance of the systems that may be put into place.

Public Testimony: None

Information Only.

5. FOREST TRUST LANDS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (49 seconds – 383 KB)

Board Chair Imeson asked if any county commissioner or Forest Trust Land Advisory Committee (FTLAC) member would like to provide in-person testimony. No one stepped forward, but noted Clatsop County Commissioner submitted written testimony for the agenda item.

Public Testimony:

- Kathleen Sullivan, Clatsop County Commissioner provided written testimony ([attachment 13](#)) to the Board on FTLAC and State Forests Division topic number seven. Supported a balanced forest management plan and the HCP efforts. Stated minimal to no support for the FTLAC Chair’s testimony. Expressed that the HCP is a priority, and how it may be the best balance between conserving resources, protection from lawsuits, and as a next step in updating the Forest Management Plan (FMP).

Information Only.

6. SPECIFIED RESOURCE SITES RULEMAKING FOR MARBLED MURRELETS
[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (19 minutes and 2 seconds – 8.71 MB)
 Presentation ([attachment 14](#))

Josh Barnard, Private Forests Deputy Division Chief, provided a [presentation](#) overview, and introduced fellow presenter Jennifer Weikel, Private Forests Division Biologist. She reviewed the rulemaking timeline and anticipated next steps. Barnard described three components for the next phase of plan development. He reviewed the Division 680 rules, outlined when Board input will be needed to define resource sites for marbled murrelets with a corresponding protection strategy.

Barnard noted that the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 629-665 creates sideboards for the rulemaking purpose and protection goals. He mentioned the utility of a matrix to populate a range of approaches identified in the technical report, both regulatory and voluntary, and as a method to seek input from focus groups on resource sites and protection strategies. He commented on how a facilitator will be enlisted to work with the Division staff and groups, then summarize outcomes and report to the Board. Closed by reviewing the rulemaking next steps projected over the next two years.

Board commented on the specified resource sites rulemaking for marbled murrelet presentation.

- Inquired about OAR 629-665-0010 (1), whether a period of time is implied with site protection and whether productivity is maintained. Discussed how these factors are determined on a species by species level, and stated the definitions for abandoned or active sites will need to be flushed out in the focus group process.
- Revisited the Division 680 Rules and provided further clarification on the purpose to move forward on the highlighted items, A and C.
- Discussed how the Board will have time in January to review Division work plans with a corresponding schedule. Stated the Board may also want to explore work priorities and workforce capacity in addressing new requests.
- Shared observation on the times allotted for Division work and inquired about the timeline’s flexibility. Discussed how these are an estimated range. Reviewed how there are next steps after the final phase, and described those steps to the Board.
- Inquired whether staff recommendations will be brought to the Board. Division commented that this will be assessed, dependent upon stakeholder and focus group feedback, additional research may be needed to bring the Board a suite of alternative options.

Public Comment:

- Sristi Kamal from Defenders of Wildlife, provided oral testimony to the Board on the marbled murrelet rulemaking process. Appreciated the engagement with the Division staff, and asked that future engagement continue to be as inclusive, with opportunity to assess the matrix and provide

additional inputs. Shared her hope that this work will produce a precautionary approach and provide protection beyond voluntary tools, and result in a functionally and scientifically acceptable definition of habitat use for the species.

Information Only.

7. WESTERN OREGON STATE FORESTS HCP AND FMP UPDATE
[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (2 hours, 2 minutes and 59 seconds – 56.2 MB)
Presentation ([attachment 15](#))

Brian Pew, State Forests Deputy Chief, introduced the presenters and provided an overview of the [presentation](#) order. He outlined the scope of the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), stakeholder engagement and FTLAC disengagement. Summarized the adjustments made on the Forest Management Plan (FMP) and HCP work schedule.

Cindy Kolomechuk, State Forests Division HCP Project Manager, outlined the HCP three-phased approach, explained which phase has been completed and listed the work objectives for each phase. She reviewed the stakeholder, advisory committee, and public feedback process for the work products developed. Noted the work planned for completion in the current phase. Recognized the indigenous people were the original stewards of the lands that are managed by the State, explained the outreach efforts and how the division plans to continue cultivating relationships with the tribes in the forest management process.

Brett Brownscombe from Oregon Consensus, explained his role in the HCP process, reviewed a timeline graphic that illustrated the HCP process with stakeholder engagement and relationships, as well as meeting facilitation. He explained the cyclical, iterative public process for HCP work products with staged gates in place to ensure a full review. Noted if the Board decides to enter the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, then there will be a separate public process. Reviewed the current status on work development for the biological goal and objectives (BGO), as well as conservation strategies. He offered a summary of the current stakeholders perspective on the HCP process thus far, highlighted themes, and general understandings. Explained how the work products drives the timeline. Emphasized the high-level nature of the mission, vision, and goals (MVG), the purposed behind MVG, and how it is connected to the HCP outcomes.

Troy Rahmig from ICF, explained his role in the HCP project, provided an update on the HCP covered species listed in HCP, and the current status of the project overall. Reviewed the planned efforts for the conservation strategy, explained the concept and outlined the associated objectives. He explained how the biological goals and biological objectives are a requirement for the HCP, then described how each operates and tracked through a planned monitoring program. Expanded on biological goals and objectives purpose as the HCP is being drafted, adopted, and maintained. Reviewed the conceptual draft being developed by ICF and ODF technical teams, the modification and review process including public engagement. Described how in the reviewer process key terminology was defined and agreed upon before the HCP draft is assembled. Provided two terminology examples created on covered fish and wildlife, and explained why each example includes individual goals and goals. Noted how this terminology may become tenants for the conservation strategy and can apply towards the timber management strategy. Described how the comparative analysis is an extension of the business case analysis, and explained the design stage of the analysis that will lend to the development of

methodology and variables used across all planning efforts. He closed by reviewing his team's next steps and outlined when the project team plans to present next to the Board, scheduled in 2020.

Board commented on Western Oregon State Forests HCP and FMP presentation update.

- Sought clarification on the terrestrial species and whether species are bundled or individually identified with biological goals and objectives. Confirmed species are individually defined, but can be bundled in the biological goals and objectives, when appropriate
- Discussed whether economic aspects will be assessed in the social aspect of the comparative analysis. Rahmig explained how revenue generated will be a part of the HCP, and a more thorough impacts analysis will be conducted through NEPA.
- Reviewed the importance of applying the terminology framework of conserve, maintain and enhance with the defined terms included with the HCP. Expressed value behind clarity of each definition and the words included with each term, as it relates to the plan. Provided feedback on the biological goals and objectives listed in the presentation, and listed various areas to consider revising. Rahmig appreciated the feedback and stated the teams are working on further clarifying the definitions and terminology used in the HCP. He also explained that monitoring implementation, compliance and effectiveness will be included as part of the technical portion of the analysis. Board member mentioned integrating thresholds into the monitoring plan.
- Encouraged the project team to keep the Board informed as the products are developed.
- Discussed how resilient the HCP planning and stakeholder engagement timeline is in adapting to the changing priorities of the agency. Division stated a level of confidence that the schedule will be maintained as they adapt with the Department's critical needs. Noted the importance in maintaining the schedule outlined as Board member transition is forthcoming.

Pew explained how the HCP is a tool to help comply with the Endangered Species Act (ESA), but is not the whole plan to manage State Forests or to implement Greatest Permanent Value (GPV). He outlined how a companion FMP plan would need to be developed using the best elements of the revised draft FMP, the current FMP and also integrating elements of the HCP. Pew reviewed the origin and purpose for the FMP revision. He noted the value of the original goals set for the revision process, and listed additional goals that would improve the plan's outcome. Highlighted the utility of the revised plan and how it can be implemented across a greater geographic area in a way that is effective and efficient in managing Oregon forests. Reminded the Board that the plan revision was one piece of a greater whole, emphasizing the work completed on internal business improvements and organization restructuring, as well the next steps to diversify revenue streams.

Justin Butteris, State Forests Policy Analyst and Manager for the FMP project, reviewed the progress made on the revised draft FMP and listed the suite of information that will be presented to the Board. He outlined the draft FMP improvements and described how each aspect lends to meeting the revision goals. Explained the role and value of public engagement as the draft FMP revision is considered, outlined the series of events planned, and stakeholders set to be involved. Noted the comparative analysis will also be comparing the outcomes of the current FMP with the proposed FMP. Commented on the scope of the science review process, contractor to be hired to coordinate science panels, and outlined the contractor's objectives. Closed by reviewing the proposed timeline for the proposed FMP revised plan.

Board commented on Western Oregon State Forests HCP and FMP presentation update.

- Reviewed the projected work product timeline for the HCP and FMP. Expressed the value of evaluating all versions of the FMP concurrently versus working through one plan at a time. Aired desire to hear from the public regarding this topic.
- Recognized a lot of changes occurred over the last two years that may alter the pathway of the decision on the FMP. Reviewed the schedule possibilities for the HCP and FMP decision, how any changes would shift work product timelines, and when Board action is the most appropriate. Discussed the implications of accepting or rejecting the HCP has on the FMP and staff work efficiency. Commented on how the comparative analysis can be adjusted as needed. Board could see benefit from a science review and comparative analysis, but sought feedback from Division about preferred timing to complete work products that would best support the Board in making a decision. Pew stated preference to bring FMP topic in April as an informational item, to think through what the Board decision would look like in September, and discuss what the Board needs to make this decision in January.

Public Testimony:

- Seth Barnes from Oregon Forests Industry Council provided oral testimony to the Board on State Forests HCP and FMP update. Commented on the need for a viable and durable FMP. Explained how the current plan is not a take avoidance plan, and how the current plan allows for a corresponding programmatic plan to be established. Mentioned the comment periods planned for the FMP and outlined some stakeholder concerns in providing response.
- W. Ray Jones from Stimson Lumber provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 16](#)) to the Board on State Forests HCP and FMP update. Concurred with Barnes concerns on providing baseline information, accountability, and measurability. Highlighted a lack of transparency over the years as the FMP revision work progressed. Stated the revised plan needs a robust annual inventory, a maintenance program, yield more revenue, and measurable outcomes.
- Bob Van Dyke from Wild Salmon Center provided oral testimony to the Board on State Forests HCP and FMP update. Concurred with Barnes and Jones concerns on lack of revised plan details, definitions, and baseline information available. Agreed with Jones on the need for a monitoring strategy. Urged the HCP to include language on restoring aquatic ecosystems.

Board provided additional comments:

- Inquired with Division if any issue in extending public comment period for FMP. State no issue, and the comment period can be extended for another month to the end of January, beyond that board material deadlines limit incorporation of feedback.
- Discussed how presenting revised draft FMP information in April 2020 to the Board may provide a longer duration for public comment and additional time for Division staff to create more substantive information for the stakeholders to review. Further discussed what information would be provided to the Board if the decision is set for fall 2020. State Forester explained the balance between receiving, responding to and incorporating public comment.

Board member McComb stated she would like to propose a motion, but would like to outline what was discussed. Inquired if feasible, to bring back a draft of the revised FMP with some stakeholder feedback in April 2020, but would exclude the comparative analysis and scientific review with the expectation that these items will be available before the Board makes a decision in fall 2020. Pew acknowledged Board member McComb's outline, and mentioned it is unclear what information would be necessary

for the decision in front of the Board in October 2020, but further discussion can be explored in January 2020 with the Board to flush out these scheduling details.

Board member McComb motioned that staff bring a draft revised FMP to the Board in April as an informational item. Board member Deacon Williams seconded.

Board discussion followed motion:

- Inquired that if time was available for the Division team to review timelines, would an alternative course of action be brought to the Board in January. Pew explained the need around meeting with his team on what the decision space will be in October, and stated it would be unlikely their team would present an alternative option in January.
- Sought clarity from Division team on how long the public comment period will be extended to. Pew responded with the expected extension of time and reminded the Board that in April the comparative analysis and scientific review will not be complete. Board asked to further discuss these items in January to better understand anticipated timelines and staff workloads.
- Discussed whether the revised draft FMP will consider Swiss Needle Cast and alder species monitoring, as well as address inventory type. Pew responded and stated these are included with the draft, as well as public meetings are scheduled in December to receive feedback.

ACTION: Directed the Department staff to bring a draft revised FMP back to the Board in April as an informational item.

Voting in favor of the motion: Nils Christoffersen, Cindy Deacon Williams, Brenda McComb, Mike Rose, Joe Justice, Jim Kelly, and Tom Imeson. Against: none. Motion carried.

Board provided meeting closing comments:

- Announced location and time for Subcommittee of Federal Forests to take place following the Board meeting.
- Inquired whether the Department can do a shallow dive review of the Oregon Forests Resource Trust and report to the Board if any value to revitalize this program. State Forester noted a review can be done, explained that this program has not yielded a carbon credit to date and has been shelved since Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) have responded to this market. He commented that a response to this inquiry may best addressed in the Department's work plan development discussion on climate change. Board members agreed.
- Anticipated the Department to respond to the compliance audit discussion and potential board involvement in future audit design with the Divisional work plans.

With no further business before the Board, Chair Imeson adjourned the public meeting at 4:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Peter Daugherty



Peter Daugherty, State Forester and
Secretary to the Board

DRAFT November 7, 2019 Board of Forestry Science, Values, and Policy Workshop

In attendance:

Board members:

Joe Justice
Jim Kelly
Nils Christoffersen
Brenda McComb

Cindy Deacon Williams
Tom Imeson
Mike Rose

Salem Staff:

Peter Daugherty
Chad Davis
Mike Shaw
Hilary Olivos-Rood
Sabrina Perez
Jennifer Erdmann
Kristin Dodd
Brian Pew
Josh Barnard
Terry Frueh
Ariel Cowan
Robbie Lefebvre
John Tokarczyk
Adam Meyer

Andrew Yost
Doug Grafe

Facilitators:
Robin Harkless
Kristen Wright

Presenters:
Sherri Johnson
Bob Bilby
John Bailey
Dana Skelly
Matthew Betts
Carlos Gonzalez-Benecke
Chelsea Batavia

Michael Nelson

Public:
Doug Cooper
Mary Scurlock
Dan Brown
Seth Barnes
Mike Cloughesy
Robyn Woods
Diane Travis
Barrett Brown
Scott Harris
Joseph Youren

Meeting called to order at 8:05 am

Chair Imeson announced that no decisions will be made at the Board workshop, even though a quorum is present, and proceeded to take a roll call for the Board to begin the public meeting.

State Forester Daugherty commented on the frameworks presented from the previous day as a backdrop to understand wicked problems, while the Board engages in workshop discussions and exercises. He outlined the workshop's format and explained the workshop's purpose. He shared some ground rules to ensure everyone genuinely and equitably participate throughout the day, and transitioned to the facilitator.

Welcome and Workshop Overview

Robin Harkless from National Policy Consensus Center introduced herself and colleague Kristen Wright to the Board, and provided an overview of the workshop's objectives for the day. She challenged the Board to identify their favored techniques and consider alternative approaches in decision making as they engage throughout the day. She expressed how the workshop has time built in for Board member dialogue and space to explore procedure and relational aspects of the decision making process with each other.

Review Wicked Problems Homework ([Attachment 1](#))

Jennifer Erdmann, Department Stewardship Forester, provided a review of the wicked problems homework, and distributed a [handout](#) to the Board. She highlighted areas of shared commonalities and areas of opportunities among the Board members in how they viewed complex decision making. She asked the Board members to think about how they function as decision makers and whether they can identify with the quadrant framework included with Denise Lach's presentation. Erdmann thanked the Board for their participation and planning feedback for the workshop.

The facilitator asked the Board to think about the previous day and share their observations or take-aways from the day. Board members offered feedback.

- Commented on the challenges and limitations of public forums. Discussed the polarized perspectives and formalities associated with many complex issues presented to the Board. Consider opportunities among peers and stakeholders to engage in less rigid discussions.
- Reflected on the limitations of the quadrant framework. Discussed how context, tone, and formality can influence quadrant identification. Commented on how people can shift quadrants to adjust to circumstances, if not engage in all four quadrants concurrently as emotions can influence the decision making process. Members shared life experiences of when they used a specific quadrant in making a decision, how they identify with each quadrant, and what personal limitations they have to navigate in making a decision.
- Described factors that can impede decision making, and expressed the value in hearing other member's perspectives before making a group decision. Discussed how predilections and blind spots are ever present, but are parts of the human experience.
- Linked how optimum decision making can be messy and may not align with the governance structure it is made within, which can lead to series of unforeseen circumstances and other policy or implementation challenges.
- Discussed how complex issues have layers of stakeholder groups with their own perspectives and positions. Proposed seeking solutions that include something for the range of groups involved in the decision making process, and how paths of agreements can craft these solutions when stakeholders are heard.
- Commented on the feasibility of solutions from an informal community setting to a formal governance setting, and how individuals who are impacted by a decision are more likely to think about tradeoffs when policymakers engage with them in the field. Discussed the value of communication from policymakers to stakeholders on the constraints of the governance system when seeking solutions and in meeting public demand.

The facilitator highlighted what was discussed by the Board. She reviewed the aspects that make up policymaking, from structural to social spectrums, and the challenge between balancing values with substance. She asked members to continue sharing their perspectives as discussions and breaks are scheduled throughout the day, and shifted to introducing the science presentations.

Kristin Dodd, Department Unit Forester, commented on the design of the workshop to set the stage for the series of science presentations. She introduced the Trask Paired Watershed Study presenters and provided background information on each presenter's field of study. The facilitator reminded the Board about the purpose of hearing these presentations, as not to inform future decision making but to stimulate thought around the challenges that come up when gaps or areas of uncertainty arise in science.

Trask Paired Watershed Study ([Attachment 2](#))

Bob Bilby from Weyerhaeuser Company provided background on the Trask Watershed Research Cooperative including who was involved in the original set of studies, the collaborative nature of the studies, and how the studies were funded. He reviewed the study design, scope, and objectives. Explained the treatment types conducted on private lands, state lands, and BLM lands during the study duration. He outlined the study's timeline and the linkages of the treatments to the riparian vegetation areas. He commented on how suspended sediment yields was measured in the study, relevant to roadways and culverts, as well as the sediment deposited on stream beds at harvested sites.

Sherri Johnson from U.S. Forest Service, commented on water quality metrics relevance, the linkage to water quality regulations and the thresholds used to quantify effects of land use. She explained how scientists can provide findings with a level of certainty, but policymakers deem how results are used to determine policy scale and applicability. Outlined some thresholds included in the studies and the implications associated, from change in light and temperatures in streams. Reviewed how invertebrates, wildlife, and fish can provide additional data when assessing riparian areas. She listed some riparian area components, and explained the headwater differences between treatment areas with and without buffers. Bilby reviewed fish response, biomass, and growth at downstream sites, as well as the patterns observed.

Bilby listed different mechanisms that can be utilized to help determine if a study's results are applicable for other research studies and policy determinations. He reviewed watershed classification and how modeling can provide some form of certainty, but has to be accepted as the base model with underlying assumptions in order to be applicable for policymaking. Stated as data becomes more sophisticated to consider incorporating site variability by developing a set of management prescriptions. He explained how scientific communities do a poor job in communicating study results in a way that policymakers can apply information for policy analysis and determination. Johnson highlighted the limitations of scientific studies, commenting on how temporal studies with short windows may not be accurate in assessing long-term recovery.

Board members commented on presentation:

- Inquired on study's sample size and statistical applicability. Johnson commented on how homogeneous the areas were and that the study will be peer-reviewed. Reviewed policymakers' role in extrapolating results, determining applicability to the broader landscape, and risk appetite.
- Discussed the value of stewardship foresters in helping landowners make site specific decisions pre and post-harvest under the Forest Practices Act (FPA). Stated common forest practices to deploy additional protection measures to achieve conservation and financial goals. Listed the value behind non-prescriptive management to allow space for decision makers to talk with landowners and stakeholders about potential tradeoffs or address site-specific conditions.
- Reviewed the implications and data from the Trask study as it may link to other climate change models on watersheds impacts into the future. Bilby stated this linkage was made as it related to fish bearing responses and the findings were published through the US Forest Service.
- Explored the thinking behind using distribution of data versus mean in the Trask study, and the implications for future studies.

The facilitator challenged the Board to step back and review the questions posed to the presenters or the comments made by other members, and consider where they land on the risk spectrum as they assess how science informs their decision making process, and consider how they reconcile differences expressed.

Board members commented on Facilitator's proposition.

- Considered what aspects of the information provided influence to their interpretation of the results, and understanding that influence can help reconcile uncertainty around a decision.
- Inquired about whether Trask study findings would be similar if fish bearing stream systems were assessed versus headwater stream systems. Bilby stated he does not have the answer to this question, and mentioned an ODF current study may provide an answer when it concludes.
- Described how policymakers attempt to distill the information received from scientific findings into generalized outcomes and apply it to decision-making across the landscape, but through application uncover limitations to the science and reconciles these information gaps by gathering other data or inquiring further on data results. Expressed value in knowing the origin and purpose for the data collected to help validate the information used in the decision making process.
- Uncovered how the decision-making process can be bogged down by emotive or complex topics and can overwhelm the policymaker to maintain their lens on the specific topic at hand.

The facilitator encouraged the Board to continue their morning conversation before moving onto the next science presentation. Board members provided additional insights.

- Recommended infield opportunities to be integrated into the Board work, and give Board members an opportunity to converse with one another while they learn how the FPA is implemented on the ground.
- Offered suggestion to improve process on presenting scientific findings to policymakers, by outlining the scope and limitations of the study by the scientists who conducted the study.
- Observed how each Board member brings their own values, life experiences, and expertise into the decision making arena. Discussed how complex of a process this is for each Board member, all while trying to interface with new information and learning to understand each members' perspective on the issue. Commented on how important it is to touch base with one another as they work through a decision and process the information heard from a presentation.

Terry Frueh, Department Monitoring Unit Coordinator, reminded the audience to sign in for public record and introduced the presenters for the fire topic presentation.

Fire ([Attachment 3](#) and [Attachment 4](#))

John Bailey from Oregon State University began his [presentation](#) by outlining what is known and not known about Fire in Oregon. He reviewed the top fire topics in current science, and provided examples to illustrate each topic's relevance with Board policy work. He explained how fire is a wicked problem and consider how to implement change when the fire landscape is losing ground in protection and suppression efforts. Reviewed the fire conceptual framework that is widely accepted when assessing fire behavior, from a low to high range of severity. He offered an alternative framework that incorporates planning practices to better prepare for high severity fires, like managed large prescribed burns and defined containment lines. Bailey explained that large wildland fires will occur into the future. He urged to learn from fire ecology and to understand the range of fire behavior, and explained how this will be a social lift and potentially a human paradigm shift in adapting to fire on the landscape.

Dana Skelly from U.S. Forest Service commented that fire is a comprehensive conservation tool available, and outlined in her [presentation](#) how an adaptive fire management is the most effective approach. She explained wicked problems as making hard decisions with limited resources under limited time scales by policy or decision makers. Reviewed fuel accomplishments in the Pacific Northwest

(PNW) region for the past 16 years, from prescribed fire, mechanical treatments to wildfires and stated treatments alone is not enough without considering wildfire as a treatment. Highlighted the Quantitative Wildfire Risk Assessment (QWRA) interagency effort to assess the probability and risk of fire across the landscape and linked it to National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) project readiness across the state. She described how treatment effectiveness is evaluated after fires to improve future treatments and listed the types of treatments assessed per acre. Explained how treated areas can help define decision space for management to better plan and prepare for high risk areas, which provides opportunity to explore the highest probability of success with the lowest risk exposure to firefighters.

Board members commented on presentation:

- Inquired how acres are counted for thinning versus pile burns treatments and clarified that mechanical treatments are not considered a fuel reduction, unless active fuels are treated (i.e., burned).
- Discussed how more wildfire on the landscape may impact the habitats of protected and endangered species. Noted how proactive fire treatments, with thoughtful planning and moderate weather conditions, can create mosaics that supports wildlife endurance and evolution over time.
- Reviewed ODF mandate to suppress unplanned fires as quickly as possible with best practices to guide management decisions. Skelly commented that U.S Forest Service has a bit more decision space than what ODF has, and adaptive management is a more strategic approach to engage with fires more effectively with the limited resources available.
- Discussed the inevitability of larger fires with continuous fuels on the landscape, and the strategies available. Reviewed how mechanical treatments may not be enough to minimize fuels and how wildland fire does the majority of the large landscape restoration.

Robin paraphrased what was discussed among the Board members and presenters.

- Mentioned broadening the decision space for fire response and advancing management planning.
- Discussed the needs for public education around fire issues, expand learning opportunities beyond fire communities and better gauge the social license around acceptable response to fire. Noted how awareness can grow from severe fire events, and how social or industries respond.
- Discussed the challenge for small rural community buy-in to use wildfire as a fuel treatment tool. Reviewed a step-by-step approach to engage the community and firefighters, be transparent with the process and establish space for people to speak up throughout the process.
- Commented on the challenges with neighboring lands on fire, defining source of ignition versus who bears the cost of the fire, and tensions flare up if these risks are disproportionately addressed.

Robbie Lefebvre, Department Seedling and Reforestation Coordinator, introduced and provided background for the Young Stand Management presenters.

Young Stand Management ([Attachment 5](#) and [Attachment 6](#))

Carlos Gonzalez-Benecke from Oregon State University opened his [presentation](#) by describing the Vegetation Management Research Cooperative (VMRC) program and how his team assesses how herbicides are used in the PNW Forestry. He explained how alternative treatments can be used on the landscape to reduce fire severity and post-fire, how herbicides are necessary in reforestation efforts. Described the Competition x Site Interactions Experiment (CoSInE), to evaluate vegetation management treatments on conifer seedlings survive, grow and respond across the PNW. He explained the CoSInE study scope, methods, and results. Outlined the study's results related to soil moisture, seedling water

stress, seedling height, seedling mortality, and drought resistance. Noted that abundance of treated plots can be tracked by years of rainfall and species classification. He noted that vegetation management results can be used to predict how tree species may evolve over time on the landscape.

Matt Betts from Oregon State University commented on the collaborative efforts and programs that study biodiversity in managed early seral forests. [Presented](#) on the relevance of plantations as wood supply for the timber industry worldwide, reviewing production and conservation implications into the future. He explained the subject of study is to look at different young stand types and the effects of intensifying forest practices on biodiversity populations within these stand types. Reviewed the confidence level of the study. Betts commented on the biodiversity effects detected and measured among plants, trees, and shrubs in areas with different herbicide management intensities. Outlined the 10-year study scope, methodology, and range of inference for each block studied across Oregon. He reviewed the abundance and species richness metrics used to measure biodiversity impacts within the study blocks, and provided an overview of the results. He listed there were more tradeoffs than neutral effects, and explained how many biodiversity impacts had linear results based on the level of intensive treatment.

Betts provided context beyond this study and identified greater need to study biodiversity and temperature in mature versus young seral forests on a landscape scale. He offered recommendations to provoke thought around gaps of science, like what are the intensive management thresholds that tips the scale for biodiversity decline or what are the tradeoffs at a landscape scale. Explored the wicked problem behind effective land management in balancing production goals with wildlife diversity and ecosystem services. He explained land sharing and land sparing concepts, and closed by thanking the contributors to the study.

Board members commented on presentation:

- Stated the program has a suite of hypothesis to respond to different landscape level treatments and wildlife level of sensitivity.
- Discussed the effects of landscape level treatments on ungulates. Commented on how ungulates act as a biological herbicide to manage vegetation increasing tree growth in rich biodiverse areas.
- Inquired how to extend study results applicability to a landscape scale analysis. Noted the better the mechanisms behind these effects are articulated by scientists can increase the likelihood for policymakers to better understand the results extrapolated from the study.

The facilitator reviewed the anticipated group work in the afternoon presentation, and informed the audience that part of these activities will not include microphones. Erdmann clarified the intention behind the workshop's science topic selection, explaining how it was purposed to hit on topics that cross all three primary department programs and to stimulate Board discussion on how they individually and as a group navigate through gaps, assess risk or areas of uncertainty.

Ariel Cowan, Department Monitoring Specialist, introduced the two presenters and provided background on each presenter's career and current field of study.

Integrating Facts and Values to Support Robust Decision Making ([Attachment 7](#))

Chelsea Batavia from Oregon State University introduced social scientist Hannah Gosnell from OSU, as a colleague who may provide additional commentary through the scenario planning portion of the presentation. Batavia provided an overview for the afternoon session and set of objectives for argument

analysis and scenario planning. She explained how these tools and approaches are offerings for policymakers to utilize as a part of a structured decision making process.

Michael Nelson from Oregon State University provided the definition, purpose, and benefits of an argument analysis. He explained the process to analyze an argument, to better understand the claims and assumptions made to support the prescriptive conclusion. Described the framework for practical syllogism and explained how arguments are built with sound premises to produce a valid conclusion. He reviewed and deconstructed complex arguments to illustrate that many claims are value based statements not based on scientific rigor.

Batavia practiced the argument analysis through multiple examples with the Board, growing in the complexity with each example. She outlined an argument table of reasons and reviewed the table implications in uncovering value indicators and underlying intentions. Batavia explored a table of reasons with the Board as a group, after the reasons were listed, separated the Board into small groups to formulate a sound and valid argument in support and opposition of the hypothetical issue.

Board members were asked to report back to the larger group on their positions and offered feedback on the usefulness of the argument analysis as a Board.

- Discussed delegation of issues and use of argument analysis process. Commented on whether it was a good use of Board member time to deeply dive into argument analysis, but highlighted how this exercise could help the members evaluate arguments brought to the Board.
- Commented on the dynamic with others, suggesting that when premises are not necessarily agreed with and are challenged, it can produce a non positive response. Noted the response can negate any common understanding built for seeking an alternative conclusion or solution.
- Reviewed the complex process of decision-making and how it has a range of risk, resource allocation and can be filled with slippery slope arguments.

Batavia explained the integrative nature of scenario planning, purpose, and applicability. She outlined what scenario planning is and is not, and identified how this planning can be utilized for complex issues or strategic planning. She reviewed scenario planning preparation, scoping, and participatory elements with stakeholder goals. Provided examples of scenario planning utilization and the larger scale efforts that can help formulate principal questions for planning. She addressed the use of driver identification in scenario planning and how to elevate areas of high uncertainty or high impact to be flushed out by the stakeholders or policy makers. Explained how to identify drivers, how to assemble scenario logics, and outlined scenario narrative building. She provided examples of how scenarios can be measured through quantitative, qualitative, and modeling products. Proposed scenario planning as an informing management tool for monitoring protocols, identifying indicators of change, and highlighting critical gaps of understanding or consensus. Batavia offered a [handout](#) to the Board with additional scenario examples.

Batavia outlined the process to define drivers and how to matrix information to define parameters of issue scope for the Board afternoon activity. Noted how scenarios can be communicated and used for outreach when working with public, partners, and stakeholders. She asked the Board to select two areas of high uncertainty and high impacts regarding State Forests in 2070. The Board responded with climate change effects, measureable by low to high CO₂ emissions and social license, measureable from polarization to consensus. She challenged the Board to write a narrative and report back. As the Board reported back, they discussed how the social, technology, economic, environmental, political (STEEP) analysis framework provided a uniform lens to work through and create a scenario narrative as a group.

Cindy Deacon Williams left at 3:39 p.m.

Board members were asked to offer feedback on the usefulness of scenario planning and their experience in completing the afternoon activities.

- Considered how the state forests would look in 50 years, how this style of planning can influence State policy formation to meet short to long-term future goals. Discussed how the activity forced them to think outside of the boxes, expanding their purviews to come up with new ideas.
- Discussed how difficult it can be to ensure policy is going the right direction without a shared vision on the future state of the forests. Commented on what a shared vision looks like with a range of social license in play. Reviewed what scenarios can provide a public entity more social license, and how these scenarios can help understand what the future could look like under certain assumptions, but maintaining credibility is difficult when everyone critically assesses the planning outputs. Stated value in incorporating stakeholders with planning process but acknowledged caveats of working with stakeholders as a longer drawn out process.
- Described how this type of planning can lend to a forward thinking process, if durations of time to revisit planning efforts are built in, allowing for current social values and contexts to be integrated into scenarios and can help inform if not adjust planned trajectories. Stated value in scenario planning, as an effective mechanism towards compromise. Considered how mechanisms can be used to measure areas of uncertainty over time, and be in place with the policy process to track unintended consequences or predict threshold events. Discussed how any mechanisms that are considered need to be adaptive with complex issues and have sliding scales of applicability to help create viable options for the future.
- Thought back to the October 9, 2019 Board retreat discussion, where the Board members laid out their values and areas of interest, can utilize an abbreviated version of scenario planning to better understand how flexible their position may be, what influences are in play, and consider what motivates them to make a decision.
- Allowed the Board members opportunity and space to express their thoughts on forward planning and to hear other people's values. Stressed how important it is to involve stakeholders within any initial first steps in planning or project preparations. Addressed how technology solutions may evolve to provide clearer metrics that can be used by natural resources boards and commissions. Listed potential Board issues that scenario planning and other decision support processes could be suited for, especially ideal for longer-time horizon planning.
- State Forester stated a future discussion with the Board on the Forestry Program for Oregon will be coming. He was pleased to see the Board's commitment to lean in and engage with one another throughout the workshop.

Wrap-Up/Next Steps

The facilitator asked the Board to provide feedback on the workshop overall, and offer next steps for the Board as a whole to work on.

- Commented on how the workshop was well-structured to have open conversations and discussion among the Board members to build working relationships by better understanding each members thought process and communication preferences. Resulted hopefully in a positive experience for all Board members. Appreciated the amount of talking opportunities available to the Board.
- Recalled the November 6 conceptual frameworks presented as useful tools for policymakers. Explained the relevance of context when making a decision, and as policymakers the importance of time to step back and revisit context when discussing complex issues.

- Explored the need for in field tours to expand relational understanding and continue to build working relationships as a Board. Considered planning more events with a work group setting to facilitate communication among the Board as new members join. Commented on the value of offline and in-person communication opportunities that can occur at two-day meetings and tours.
- Appreciated ODF staff work in selecting science topics that framed the day's discussion on the complexity that exists in studying, analyzing and understanding these issues in order to make policy decisions. Suggested to revisit these topics to learn how gaps or uncertainty are addressed.
- State Forester appealed to the Board to think about his November 6 opening comments about the October Retreat, and for the Board to offer their thoughts on process or Board work next steps.
- Board Chair suggested to be mindful of time during meetings to ensure there is time at the end of a topic or a meeting day for Board members to dialogue and gain common understanding.

The facilitator summarized the potential next steps in Board work and relational development. Board Chair shared his appreciation for work by staff and presenters on the workshop, as a follow-up to the October Retreat. Acknowledged the project team and leads that planned the workshop for the Board.

Adjourned the workshop at 4:24 p.m.

Agenda Item No. :	C
Work Plan:	Fire Protection Work Plan
Topic:	Ongoing Topics, Appointment to Emergency Fire Cost Committee
Presentation Title:	Appointment of Brennan Garrelts to EFCC
Date Presented to Board:	January 8, 2020
Contact Information:	Nancy Hirsch, EFCC Administrator 503-881-5255, Nancy.Hirsch@oregon.gov Doug Grafe, Chief – Fire Protection Division 503-551-5391, Doug.Grafe@oregon.gov

SUMMARY

The purpose of this agenda item is to recommend appointment of one candidate to a position on the Emergency Fire Cost Committee.

BACKGROUND

ORS 477.440 directs that the Board “shall appoint an Emergency Fire Cost Committee consisting of four members, who shall be forest landowners or representatives of forest landowners whose forestland is being assessed for forest fire protection within a forest protection district (Attachment 1). At least one member shall be selected from each forest region of the state.” “Members of the Emergency Fire Cost Committee shall be appointed by the board for four-year terms.”

ORS 477.445 gives authority to the Emergency Fire Cost Committee (EFCC) to “supervise and control the distribution of funds from the Oregon Forest Land Protection Fund”. The Oregon Forest Land Protection Fund (OFLPF), established by ORS 477.750, is used to equalize (reimburse) emergency fire suppression costs expended in protecting forestland statewide by forest protection districts, both state and association. The annual expenditure limit of the OFLPF is \$13.5 million which includes up to \$10 million for emergency fire suppression costs, up to \$3 million for statewide severity resources, administration/operating costs and up to a fifty-percent contribution towards the annual premium for the catastrophic suppression cost insurance policy.

Due to a resignation by one committee member, the EFCC has one vacancy. The EFCC chair and administrator have coordinated with Oregon Department of Forestry to identify and move forward a new appointment. Brennan Garrelts is a landowner representative for Lone Rock Resources within the Douglas Forest Protective Association, which is part of the Southern Oregon Region. Brennan’s brief biography is in attachment 2.

RECOMMENDATION

The Department recommends the Board make the following appointment:

Appoint Brennan Garrelts to the Emergency Fire Cost Committee to a four-year term expiring the end of January 2024.

ATTACHMENTS

- (1) Emergency Fire Cost Committee Membership
- (2) Biography – Brennan Garrelts

EMERGENCY FIRE COST COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP
January 2020

	Forest Protection District(s)/ <u>Region</u>	First Term Began	Current Term Began	Term Expires
Ken Cummings, Chair Hancock	Southwest Oregon <u>Southern Oregon</u>	1/96	4/16	4/20
Steve Cafferata, Landowner	West Oregon, Eastern Lane, Western Lane <u>Northwest and Southern Oregon</u>	3/11	4/19	4/23
Chris Johnson, Shanda	Central Oregon, Walker Range, Klamath Lake <u>Eastern Oregon</u>	7/18	7/18	7/22
Brennan Garrelts, Lone Rock	Douglas, Southwest Oregon, Coos, Eastern and Western lane <u>Southern Oregon</u>	1/20		1/2024

Bold is position recommended for appointment. Appointment would be through January 2024.

Brennan Garrelts Biography

Brennan developed a passion for Oregon's forests early in his youth and spent much of his spare time exploring the public and private forestlands behind his childhood home in Southwest Oregon. He sought to continue that passion formally and after receiving his B.A. in Environmental Science from Willamette University in 2006, he went on to earn his M.S. in Forest Science from Oregon State University's College of Forestry in 2008.

Brennan spent the first decade of his professional career working for the Bureau of Land Management as a Public Domain Field Forester in the Redding, CA Resource Area and later as a Timber Manager for the BLM's O&C forestland on the Roseburg, OR District. In 2015, he transitioned to the private sector and began working for Lone Rock Resources, in Roseburg, Oregon as a harvest administration forester. Currently, Brennan serves as the Manager of Lone Rock Logging Co, as well as the Director of Government Affairs and Policy for Lone Rock Timber Management Co., both of which are subsidiaries of Lone Rock Resources. Lone Rock owns forestland within Douglas, Southwest Oregon, Coos, Eastern and Western Lane protection districts.

Throughout his forestry career Brennan has grown his professional wildland firefighter experience and qualifications. He has spent 13 seasons fighting fire in various positions from crew member to landowner representative. Beginning in the Douglas Complex fires in 2013, Brennan has seen action on six large fires and numerous small fires in Oregon. He has worked extensively with all three ODF Teams on separate large fires and fully supports the complete and coordinated system within his duties as Lone Rock's Fire Prevention and Suppression Program Manager. Brennan also serves as Vice-President of the Board of Directors for the Douglas Forest Protective Association.

Agenda Item No.:	D
Work Plan:	Private Forest Work Plan
Topic:	Wildlife Food Plot Rule Making
Presentation Title:	Rules for Wildlife Food Plots – Proposed Rule language
Date of Presentation:	January 8, 2020
Contact Information:	Nathan Agalzoff, Incentives Field Coordinator 503-945-7349, Nathan.V.Agalzoff@oregon.gov Josh Barnard, Deputy Chief, Private Forests Division 503-945-7493 josh.w.barnard@oregon.gov

SUMMARY

As directed by the legislature and the Board of Forestry, the Department has developed draft rules for implementing HB 3013 originating from the 2015 legislative session, Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 527.678 “wildlife food plots” (Attachment 1).

The purpose of this consent agenda item is to notify the Board that the Department is initiating the public comment period for rulemaking and provide the Board with a copy of the draft rules.

CONTEXT

During the 2015 legislative session, HB 3013 was introduced, made its way through the legislative process and was signed by the Governor. Legislation took effect January 1, 2016. This statute requires the Board of Forestry to adopt rules to allow the implementation of wildlife food plots as an approved activity under the Forest Practices Act (FPA). Wildlife food plot means a small area of forestland that, instead of being used for growing and harvesting a forest tree species, is planted in vegetation capable of substantially contributing to wildlife nutrition (ORS 527.678(1)(c)). Small forestland is defined as ownerships greater than ten acres and less than 5,000. For these ownerships, there is a sliding scale for the amount of acreage that can be converted to food plots based on ownership acreage ranges as follows:

Oregon Forestland Ownership Acres	Percent of Ownership	Maximum Combined Acres
10 to 500	2.5%	.25 to 12.5
501 to 1,000	2%	10 to 20
1,001 to 5,000	1%	10 to 50

The statute also requires consultation with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) on rule development.

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The Department developed interim guidelines and an approval process in 2016. To date, there have been three landowner applications and one which qualified for this activity.

The Department, in preparation for developing new rules, identified the Committee for Family Forestlands (CFF) as the advisory committee for this rulemaking. Staff have

presented information to the CFF to familiarize them with the enabling statutes and gathered input on the draft rules. Similar outreach has been conducted with the Tribal Cultural Resources Cluster and the three Regional Forest Practices Committees (RFPCs). Staff have consulted with ODFW about the process, goals, and outcomes for the rule making as described in statute. Input from these groups and lessons learned from the interim guidance has been consolidated in proposed draft rule language (Attachment 2).

RECOMMENDATION

Information only

NEXT STEPS

- 1) Open for public comment and hearings spring 2020.
- 2) Summarize and review public comment in a report to CFF spring/summer 2020.
- 3) Present final proposed rules to Board of Forestry for adoption summer 2020.
- 4) Rules effective fall 2020.

ATTACHMENTS

- (1) 2015 House Bill 3013 (now ORS 527.678)
- (2) Proposed draft rule language – available 1 week before board meeting.

2017 ORS 527.678¹

Wildlife food plots

(1) As used in this section:

(a) “Forest tree species” has the meaning given that term in ORS [527.620 \(Definitions for ORS 527.610 to 527.770\)](#).

(b) “Small forestland” means forestland as defined in ORS [527.620 \(Definitions for ORS 527.610 to 527.770\)](#) that:

(A) Has an owner that owns or holds common ownership interest in at least 10 acres of Oregon forestland but less than 5,000 acres of Oregon forestland; and

(B) Constitutes all forestland within a single tax lot and all forestland within contiguous parcels owned or held in common ownership by the owner.

(c) “Wildlife food plot” means a small forestland area that, instead of being used for growing and harvesting a forest tree species, is planted in vegetation capable of substantially contributing to wildlife nutrition.

(2) The owner of a small forestland that is subject to reforestation requirements under ORS [527.610 \(Short title\)](#) to [527.770 \(Good faith compliance with best management practices not violation of water quality standards\)](#) may, notwithstanding any contrary provision of the reforestation requirements for the forestland, establish wildlife food plots within the boundaries of the small forestland. The combined size of the wildlife food plots described in this subsection may not exceed:

(a) 2.5 percent of the small forestland, if the small forestland is 500 acres or less in size;

(b) 2.0 percent of the small forestland, if the small forestland is more than 500 acres but not more than 1,000 acres in size; or

(c) 1.0 percent of the small forestland, if the small forestland is more than 1,000 acres in size.

(3) (a) The State Board of Forestry shall adopt rules for carrying out this section. The board shall consult with the State Department of Fish and Wildlife to identify vegetation capable of substantially contributing to wildlife nutrition.

(b) The establishment of a wildlife food plot as provided by board rules is a forest practice providing for the overall maintenance of forestland resources as described in ORS [527.710 \(Duties and powers of board\)](#) and supersedes any contrary reforestation requirement under ORS [527.610 \(Short title\)](#) to [527.770 \(Good faith compliance with](#)

[best management practices not violation of water quality standards](#)) for the wildlife food plot.

(c) Notwithstanding ORS [527.670 \(Commencement of operations\)](#) (1), the establishment or relocation of a wildlife food plot, and the reforestation of a location that ceases to be a wildlife food plot, are forest operations requiring notice to the State Forester under ORS [527.670 \(Commencement of operations\)](#). [2015 c.64 §1]

Note: [527.678 \(Wildlife food plots\)](#) was enacted into law by the Legislative Assembly but was not added to or made a part of ORS chapter 527 or any series therein by legislative action. See Preface to Oregon Revised Statutes for further explanation.

State Forester and Board Member Comments

STAFF REPORT

Agenda Item No.:	2
Topic:	Forest Trust Land Advisory Committee
Presentation Title:	FTLAC Advice to the Board of Forestry
Date of Presentation:	January 8, 2020
Contact Information:	David Yamamoto, Tillamook County Commissioner

On behalf of the Forest Trust Land Advisory Committee (FTLAC), comments and additional information provided on State Forest Lands business.

STAFF REPORT

Agenda Item No.:	3
Work Plan:	Private Forests
Topic:	Water Quality
Presentation Title:	Update on Siskiyou Streamside Protections Review
Date of Presentation:	January 8, 2020
Contact Information:	Kyle Abraham, Division Chief, Private Forests 503-945-7482, Kyle.Abraham@Oregon.gov Marganne Allen, Manager, Forest Health & Monitoring, Private Forests, 503-945-7240, Marganne.Allen@Oregon.gov Ariel Cowan, Monitoring Specialist, Private Forests, 503-945- 7332, Ariel.D.Cowan@Oregon.gov Terry Frueh, Monitoring Coordinator, Private Forests, 503- 945-7392, Terry.Frueh@Oregon.gov

SUMMARY

This agenda item presents 1) an update on work completed since the September 2019 Board of Forestry (Board) meeting on the Siskiyou Streamside Protections Review (Siskiyou Project); and, 2) lays out three decisions for the Board to make regarding the implementation of their direction to the department.

CONTEXT

The Board's 2011 *Forestry Program for Oregon* supports an effective, science-based, and adaptive Oregon Forest Practices Act (FPA) as a cornerstone of forest resource protection on private lands in Oregon (Objective A.2). The discussion of Goal A recognizes that the FPA includes a set of best management practices designed to ensure that forest operations would meet state water quality standards adopted under the federal Clean Water Act. Similarly, the discussion of Goal D recognizes that the FPA is designed to protect soil and water resources, including aquatic and wildlife habitat (Objective D.6). The Board's guiding principles and philosophies includes a commitment to continuous learning, evaluating and appropriately adjusting forest management policies and programs based upon ongoing monitoring, assessment, and research (Value Statement 11).

BACKGROUND

The Board and the Department of Forestry (department) are committed to using adaptive management in reviewing (and revising, if necessary) FPA rules using available science, monitoring and research. In November 2015, the Board increased streamside protection standards in most of western Oregon. The Siskiyou region was not included because of different vegetative and geologic conditions, and the Eastern Oregon regions were out of the scope of the science used in the rule analysis.

At the November 2016 meeting, the Board finalized the Private Forest Division's Monitoring Strategy. In conversing about the Strategy, the Board discussed the need to address riparian issues in the Siskiyou and Eastern Oregon regions. The Board directed the department to:

- Develop potential monitoring questions regarding streamside protections in the Siskiyou and eastern Oregon regions;
- Estimate the timeline and resources to address questions for various methods of study; and,
- Work with stakeholders to inform the department and the Board.

At the March 2018 meeting, the department presented information based on the aforementioned direction: The Board directed the department to conduct a review of streamside protections on small and medium fish-bearing streams in the Siskiyou region focusing on stream temperature, shade, and stand structure component of riparian desired future conditions, starting with a literature review. The Board also directed the department to work with partner agencies to provide contextual information on fish status and trends. Since the Board directed the department to assess sufficiency of FPA rules for water quality standards for temperature, we asked DEQ to provide contextual information on status and trends of stream temperature as captured by any Total Maximum Daily Loading (TMDL) analyses and associated data.

In June 2019, the Board determined there was insufficient information from a literature review to make a sufficiency determination, and requested the department bring back additional information for their consideration. In September 2019, the Board directed the department to form an advisory committee to provide input on the project, and expand the literature review to include information from western Oregon and similar forests. Staff proposed two options to address climate change (see September 2019 meeting materials). The Board discussed these options but did not decide to move either option forward.

The expected outcome of this review will be a decision by the Board on the sufficiency of riparian rules, to decide if:

- The FPA or rules are working as designed
- FPA or rules may not meet stated objectives
- Not enough information for sufficiency decision: Additional study prioritized
- Not enough information for sufficiency decision: Other work prioritized at this time

If the Board found the rules did not meet stated objectives and that a resource is being degraded, they could consider changing the rules through a rule analysis, which could result in regulatory or voluntary measures. According to statute, effects to fish, wildlife, and water quality, and economic impacts to forest landowners and the timber industry must be considered in such decisions (ORS 527.714 and 527.765).

ANALYSIS

Attachment 1 describes the department's progress on aspects of the Siskiyou Project:

- Expanded literature reviews;
- Collaboration with the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality;
- Progress on convening the Advisory Committee; and,
- Exploration of various monitoring options.
- Completing a decision on if and how to address climate change in the Siskiyou Project

Attachment 2 contains the project workplan which details the scope, project elements, and team composition. *(Note that depending on the Board decision regarding addressing climate change, this work plan may need modification and to be brought back to the Board for their subsequent approval)*

Attachment 3 contains the advisory committee objectives and stakeholder input.

Board Decisions

We ask the Board to make three decisions regarding implementation of the Siskiyou Project:

- Decide on if and how to address climate change within this Siskiyou work (Attachment 1).
- Approve the Project Charter Workplan to ensure the department is aligned with the Board's direction (Attachment 2).
- Approve the objectives for the Advisory Committee the Board directed the department to form (Attachment 3).

RECOMMENDATION

The department recommends:

1. The Board direct the department to implement Climate Change Option 2 (comprehensive policy work) described in Attachment 1.
2. The Board approve the Project Workplan (Attachment 2).
3. The Board approve the Advisory Committee Objectives (Attachment 3).

NEXT STEPS

The department will implement the Board's direction regarding the decisions outlined in Attachments 1-3, and continue with ongoing work described in the Project Charter Workplan as approved by the Board.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Update on the Siskiyou Project
2. Siskiyou Project Workplan
3. Siskiyou Project Advisory Committee Objectives and Stakeholder Feedback

Update on the Siskiyou Streamside Protections Review

The Siskiyou Streamside Protections Review (“Siskiyou Project”) assesses the effectiveness of streamside protections on small and medium fish-bearing streams in the Siskiyou geographic region. The protections assessed are focused on stream temperature and desired future conditions (DFC; shade and stand structure components) of riparian (or streamside) vegetation.

This work is in alignment with high-priority effectiveness monitoring questions from the 2016 Monitoring Strategy (Frueh *et al.*) relating to attaining state goals for water quality and riparian vegetation future conditions.

Expanded literature reviews

Based on Board of Forestry (Board) direction from the September 2019 meeting, staff continued work on two literature reviews (temperature and DFC) with expanded geographic scope. See Attachment 2 for project scope details. Staff is currently searching and filtering studies for the DFC literature review and has refreshed the search for temperature-related literature to add any new documents completed since the western Oregon temperature review completed in 2013 (Czarnomski et al., 2013).

The stream temperature literature review yielded 13 additional studies that are likely relevant for the updated synthesis. Of these, four are from the Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) RipStream study, and three are from studies with thinning upland prescriptions. Based on previous experiences, it is likely that a few publications will warrant exclusion from the review.

Staff are determining which of the publications found are relevant for determining sufficiency of the DFC rules. More than 5,000 documents were caught in the initial keyword search and will need to be assessed for relevancy to study questions.

Unintended consequences

Board decisions regarding sufficiency for stream temperature could lead to changes to the same rule sets for the rest of western Oregon, even though that is outside of the scope of the Siskiyou Project. We feel it is important to make the Board aware of these potential consequences.

The Board has said that they want to consider extrapolating results of forests similar to western Oregon to those of the Siskiyou. It would be logical that extrapolation of results, and hence policies (i.e., rules) is bi-directional – rule review results for the Siskiyou should be applied to the rest of western Oregon if rule review results from western Oregon should be applied to Siskiyou.

ODF-DEQ collaboration

ODF and DEQ staff have met several times to discuss our collaboration. Staff began clarifying our legal and policy authorities and mandates, along with our respective agency procedures. This information will form the basis of a work charter to guide further collaboration. Department leaders are finalizing a statement of their intent for our work.

Advisory Committee

The advisory committee for the Siskiyou Project will provide a forum to vet project details and ensure stakeholder engagement. Discussions with a variety of perspectives will be facilitated and feedback will be refined into clear recommendations to guide the department in project decisions and aid the Board in policy decisions.

Completed work on convening the Advisory Committee, includes:

- Initiating a contract with facilitator
- Developing draft committee objectives, with input from stakeholders (see Attachment 3)
- Developing a draft work charter

Climate Change

At their September 4, 2019 meeting, the Board discussed addressing climate change in relation to this Siskiyou work. To support continuing that conversation, the following is a verbatim excerpt from the September 4, 2019 Board materials (Agenda Item 6, Attachment 1):

The FPA and the riparian rules were developed before the implications of climate change were widely discussed by natural resource managers. DEQ's water quality standards also do not explicitly address climate change. Therefore there are no specific, climate-change informed goals against which to test rule sufficiency. Note that the Board has recently expressed a desire to develop more comprehensive policies on climate change. If such policies were developed, they would greatly enhance the ability to test rule sufficiency in light of climate change.

Climate change is anticipated to have a variety of impacts in Oregon that relate to achieving DFC along streams and meeting stream temperature goals: increasing air temperatures (Isaak *et al.*, 2016); shifts in species distributions; changes in the timing, form, and amount of precipitation, etc. Our certainty of specific changes increases with spatial scale (e.g., we are more certain of changes at regional as opposed to local scales; Maraun *et al.*, 2010). These climate change impacts, and their uncertainty, may be problematic for assessing the effectiveness of current FPA rules which are meant to achieve goals based on more steady-state climate assumptions.

With this in mind, two options for the consideration of climate change are offered:

Climate Change Option 1: Incorporate into current rule sufficiency analysis

A high-level linkage analysis between the current FPA sufficiency questions under review and anticipated climate change outcomes in the Siskiyou region would be conducted. Information sources could include but are not limited to the NorWest model (Isaak et al. 2016), science synthesis work conducted to inform the Northwest Forest Plan (Spies et al. 2018), and a climate science synthesis produced by the Southwest Oregon Adaptation Partnership (anticipated *in press* in fall 2019, Halofsky, J., US Forest Service, pers. comm.).

Anticipated products:

- Identification of climate-induced environmental changes that may affect stream temperature or DFC in the Siskiyou geographic region
- Identification of which changes can and cannot be addressed within current FPA policy
- Predicted environmental changes at a high level, such as directions and patterns of change (e.g., expected increases in stream temperature)
- Qualitative risk assessment of climate-induced environmental changes and achievement of goals for DFC and stream temperature

Addressing climate change on a project-by-project approach may result in repeated analyses of topics and unintended conflicts or inconsistent results between project-level outcomes as opposed to a comprehensive review of FPA policies and procedures. In contrast, moving forward on climate change at a project level will more quickly advance its incorporation into department work.

Duration, cost, staff:

9-12 months of 0.5-0.75 FTE at a cost of ~\$50,000-75,000

Climate Change Option 2: Separate and comprehensive climate change policy review

The goal of this option is for the Board to develop a comprehensive and clearly articulated set of policies on climate change. Within that policy framework, the department would then conduct a complete FPA review using those policies as the lens. The Siskiyou Streamside Protections Review would continue without explicit consideration of climate change. After completing the full FPA review and any associated policy changes, subsequent FPA rule sufficiency reviews would incorporate those new climate-based policies into the regular adaptive management process as driven by the department's monitoring priorities.

Anticipated products:

A comprehensive list of climate change topics, areas of conflict and alignment with FPA policies and procedures, and proposed changes to address areas of conflict.

Duration, cost, staff:

TBD

Monitoring Options

At the June 2019 meeting, the Board discussed a range of potential tools to obtain additional information on sufficiency of streamside protection rules in the Siskiyou. In September, the department proposed a high-level framework for moving forward with this work, including a preliminary exploration of potential tools. All staff resources are focused on completing the literature reviews, preparing the advisory committee, and collaborating with DEQ.

References

Czarnomski, N., C. Hale, W.T. Frueh, M. Allen, and J. Groom. 2013. Effectiveness of riparian buffers at protecting stream temperature and shade in Pacific Northwest Forests: A systematic review.

Frueh, W.T., M. Allen, D. Olson. 2016. Update of Private Forests Monitoring Strategy.



SISKIYOU STREAMSIDE PROTECTIONS REVIEW

CHARTER WORK PLAN

JANUARY 2020

REQUESTOR	SPONSOR(S)	PROJECT MANAGER	START DATE	END DATE
Oregon Department of Forestry	Kyle Abraham	Terry Frueh	September 2019	TBD

BACKGROUND

In November 2015, the Board increased streamside protection standards in most of western Oregon. The Siskiyou region was not included due to concerns about extrapolating available studies across different vegetative and geologic conditions. The Eastern Oregon regions were outside the scope of science used in the rule analysis.

At the November 2016 meeting, the Board finalized the Private Forest Division's Monitoring Strategy. In conversing about the Strategy, the Board discussed the need to address riparian issues in the Siskiyou and Eastern Oregon regions. The Board directed the department to: Develop potential monitoring questions regarding streamside protections in the Siskiyou and eastern Oregon regions; Estimate the timeline and resources to address questions for various methods of study; and work with stakeholders to inform the department and the Board.

At the March 2018 meeting, the department presented information based on the aforementioned direction: The Board directed the department to conduct a review of streamside protections on small and medium fish-bearing streams in the Siskiyou region focusing on stream temperature, shade, and riparian desired future conditions, starting with a literature review. The Board also directed the department to work with partner agencies to present to them contextual information on fish status and trends. Since the Board directed the department to assess sufficiency of FPA rules for water quality standards for temperature, we asked DEQ to provide contextual information on status and trends of stream temperature as captured by any Total Maximum Daily Loading (TMDL) analyses and associated data.

The Board directed the department make this assessment with a literature review in March 2018. In June 2019, they determined there was insufficient information to make a sufficiency determination, and requested that the department bring back additional information for their consideration, including collaboration with DEQ. In September 2019, the Board directed the department to form an advisory committee to provide stakeholder input on the project, and expand the literature review to include information from western Oregon and similar forests.

The expected outcome of this Streamside Protections Review (Siskiyou Project) will be two decisions by the Board in on the sufficiency of riparian rules. If the Board found the rules did not meet stated objectives and that a resource is being degraded, they could consider changing the rules through a rule analysis, which could result in regulatory or voluntary measures. According to statute, effects to fish, wildlife, and water quality, and economic impacts to forest landowners and the timber industry must be considered in such decisions (ORS 527.714 and 527.765).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
<p>The expected outcome of this Project will be decisions by the Board on two high-priority monitoring (2) questions regarding the sufficiency of Forest Practices Act (FPA) riparian rules in the Siskiyou geographic region:</p> <p>(1) For small and medium fish-bearing streams in the Siskiyou region, what is the effectiveness of FPA buffers to meet DEQ water quality standards for temperature?</p> <p>(2) For small and medium fish-bearing streams in the Siskiyou region, what is the effectiveness of FPA buffers in achieving the desired future conditions of streamside forests?</p> <p>For each question, the Board will decide if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FPA or rules are working as designed • FPA or rules may not meet stated objectives • Not enough information for sufficiency decision: Additional study prioritized • Not enough information for sufficiency decision: Other work prioritized at this time.

OBJECTIVES & SUCCESS CRITERIA		
Objectives	Success Criteria	How Measured
Stream temperature sufficiency analysis completed	Complete review of FPA riparian rule sufficiency for meeting water quality standards and allocations	Board makes a final decision that ends the current stream temperature review process
Riparian desired future condition sufficiency analysis completed	Complete review of FPA riparian rule sufficiency for meeting goals for stand structure and associated outcomes (shade, cover)	Board makes a final decision that ends the current riparian desired future condition review process
Adequate stakeholder engagement	Key stakeholders affected by FPA sufficiency analyses are identified and engage in advisory committee or other public input processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful convening of and implementation of advisory committee objectives • A range of public input is received through project and Board pathways. • Board is apprised of the range of public perspectives on the sufficiency analysis process and products.
Adequate, timely, and affordable project design and implementation	Project elements align with and address monitoring questions, are completed on time, and within budget	Project elements are completed on time, within budget, and advance the state of knowledge on monitoring questions.
Project timelines and expectations for Board of Forestry Staff Reports, Attachments, and Presentations are met	High-quality, concise reports and presentation materials are provided to correct chain of command in a timely manner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board documents are received and approved in a timely manner • Presentations are clear and within allotted time

PROJECT SCOPE	
In Scope (Will be Included)	Out of Scope (Will not be Included)
Overall Project Scope (Inference of Board decisions, FPA sufficiency topics)	
Siskiyou FPA geographic region	All other FPA geographic regions
Small and medium Type F (fish)	All other FPA stream sizes and types
Stream temperature, desired future condition of riparian vegetation, resulting shade and cover	All other water quality, riparian vegetation, and other topics (ex: large wood recruitment, sediment, climate change, etc.)
FPA clearcut and thinning activities	All other FPA activities
FPA riparian basal area standard target prescriptions	All other FPA riparian prescriptions
Project Element 1 – Two (2) expanded literature reviews	
Geographic region in scope included: W Oregon, W Washington, British Columbia, and Northern California west of the crest of the Cascades; SE Alaska	All other EPA georegions
Product 1) Stream temperature literature review/executive summary (DEQ stream temperature standards, existing temperature TMDL allocations, temperature human use allowance)	All other water quality topics, water quality standards, and TMDLs (ex: sediment, turbidity)
Product 2) Riparian DFC literature review (standing riparian vegetation, shade, cover)	All other topics (ex: large wood recruitment)
Project Element 2 – Informational Board agenda item on Oregon Revised Statutes	
Board training session on ODF and DEQ statutes relevant to Board sufficiency decisions	All other statutes
Project Element 3 – Advisory Committee	
Review, discuss, and provide feedback on project design, development, implementation, and final products (Literature reviews, monitoring options)	DEQ/ODF coordination efforts, other work not identified
Receive project updates on DEQ/ODF coordination efforts, and other work (e.g., Board training on statutes) of the Siskiyou Project	Other work not identified
Project Element 4 – ODF/DEQ Collaboration	
Develop process for aligning agencies' sufficiency reviews	
Project Element 5 – Monitoring Options	
Riparian Desired Future Condition sufficiency review monitoring options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remote sensing and GIS analysis • Field study • Integrated field/remote sensing study Monitoring plan to be developed. Can include existing, new data.	
Stream temperature sufficiency review monitoring options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field study • Integrated field/GIS study Monitoring plan to be developed. Can include existing, new data.	

DRAFT ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMPOSITION (GENERAL)	
Interested Parties	Why Interested
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality	Delegator of forest water quality program

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Fisheries program affected by forestry water quality, aquatic habitat outcomes
Conservation Community	Directly, indirectly affected by decisions
Family forest landowners	Directly affected by decisions
Industrial forest landowners	Directly affected by decisions
Northwest and Southwest Regional Forest Practices Committees	Board committee charged with advisory role in review of proposed forest practice rules appropriate to forest conditions
Committee for Family Forestlands	Statutory role
Full committee composition to be finalized in consultation with facilitator	

RELATED PROJECTS
 Outreach to Tribes of Oregon

PROJECT TEAM		
Resource Name	Role	Responsibilities
Peter Daugherty	ODF Executive oversight (ODF/DEQ Collaboration)	Executive oversight, direction, coordination
Joe Justice	Board of Forestry Liaison with Environmental Quality Commission	Board liaison oversight, direction, coordination
Kyle Abraham	Project Sponsor	Division oversight and coordination, direction
Josh Barnard	Project Coordination	Facilitate intra-agency communication
Marganne Allen	Project Oversight	Support Project Manager, communications & outreach as needed
Terry Frueh	Project Manager	Project planning & management, rule language drafting, communications & outreach
Ariel Cowan	Project Implementation	Provide technical support & expertise; communications & outreach as needed
John Hawksworth	Project Support	GIS analysis, other technical support and expertise
ODF GIS Unit	Project Implementation	Lidar analysis, other GIS analysis
Jim Gersbach	Public Affairs	Support Project Manager through press releases and other public outreach
DEQ Commission Liaison, Executive, and TMDL program staff	ODF/DEQ Collaboration Project: Oversight, implementation, support	Executive oversight, direction, coordination
Advisory Committee	Public project oversight, input	Provide comment on project design and implementation

Siskiyou Project Advisory Committee Objectives

Advisory Committee Objectives

At their September 2019, the Board of Forestry (Board) approved the creation of an Advisory Committee for the Siskiyou Streamside Protections Review (Siskiyou Project). These objectives were developed based initially on the Board's discussion. Department staff also sought input from stakeholders on these objectives.

Objectives:

1. Discuss upcoming Board decisions, and then provide feedback to the Board on these decisions (e.g., selecting monitoring approaches, rule sufficiency);
2. Discuss and provide feedback to assist ODF in work (e.g., expanded literature review) for the Siskiyou Project (conceptual and value-informed support);
3. Discuss and provide feedback to assist ODF in developing methods for relevant monitoring of the effectiveness of streamside rules for small and medium Fish streams in the Siskiyou region (if the Board decides on one or more monitoring approaches as the next phase of the Project); and,
4. Receive updates on ODF work (e.g., DEQ collaboration, field work) to consider in the aforementioned points.

Attachment 2 details proposed committee membership. The appendix provides input the department received on these objectives.

Appendix. Stakeholder Input on Advisory Committee Objectives

The department drafted a set of objectives for the committee and solicited input from stakeholders. A total of 4 comments were received (from Rogue Riverkeeper, Oregon Forest and Industries Council, Southwest Regional Forest Practices Committee, and Oregon Stream Protection Coalition). The comments focused on a few themes, which are outlined in this document along with the associated responses from staff.

Theme: Ensure Siskiyou representation in Committee membership and hold Committee meetings in the Siskiyou geographic region

Number of responses: 4/4

Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) Response: The department agrees that Siskiyou representation should be required in the Committee membership, while recognizing the value of perspectives of stakeholders from outside the region and not excluding non-Siskiyou members. We will strive to hold Committee meetings in locations and through video and teleconferencing technology to make meetings accessible to those who have a direct interest in this project within available budgets (Siskiyou region locations).

Theme: Include local manufacturing interests

Number of responses: 1/4

ODF Response: The department will consider this input in the Committee membership.

Theme: Technical backgrounds should be represented on the Committee.

Number of responses: 2/4

ODF Response: The department will consider this input in the Committee membership. The Committee makeup will require membership from both technical and policy backgrounds.

Theme: Include Interior and Eastern Oregon representation on Committee

Number of responses: 1/4

ODF Response: The department will consider this input in the Committee membership.

Theme: Include small landowners with agriculture/forestry multi-use experience in the Siskiyou

Number of responses: 2/4

ODF Response: The department will consider this input in the Committee membership.

Theme: Keep Committee topics within scope of what Board has requested.

Number of responses: 2/4

ODF Response: As outlined in the Advisory Committee objectives, the Committee will only be asked to provide input on topics within the scope of what the Board has requested for the Siskiyou Project.

Theme: Committee makeup should be of stakeholders directly affected by the outcomes of changes to the rules.

Number of responses: 1/4

ODF Response: The department will consider this input in the Committee membership.

Theme: Include a Board liaison on the Committee.

Number of responses: 2/4

ODF Response: A main objective of the Advisory Committee will be to convey their perspectives to the Board. Committee meetings will be public, therefore Board members are welcome to attend.

Theme: Provide clarification regarding Committee objectives to provide feedback to the department to bring to the Board, rather than Committee provide feedback directly to the Board.

Number of responses: 2/4

ODF Response: We think both are valuable – stakeholders providing input directly to the Board, and giving feedback to department staff.

Theme: Provide clarification on the scope and timeline of the expanded literature reviews.

Number of responses: 1/4

ODF Response: Providing this clarification is part of Objective 2. Department staff will share a timeline once it is finalized.

Theme: The formal nature of public meetings may have negative consequences. Have smaller meetings to address and allow for clear and frank communication after disagreements or misunderstandings arise.

Number of responses: 1/4

ODF Response: The Committee meetings will be facilitated. It is possible small group meetings will be used in the process, however, the Committee is not expected to achieve consensus.

Theme: Have agendas planned in advance to facilitate distribution of meeting responsibilities and reach targeted attendance.

Number of responses: 1/4

ODF Response: The Committee meetings will have agendas planned in advance and point out when either or both technical or policy-related topics will be discussed.

STAFF REPORT

Agenda Item No.:	4
Work Plan:	Administrative Work Plan
Topic:	Executive Sessions
Presentation Title:	Executive Session and Working Lunch
Date of Presentation:	January 8, 2020
Contact Information:	Oregon Department of Justice

SUMMARY

The Board will meet in Executive Session for the purpose of conferring with legal counsel regarding the Board's rights and duties related to current litigation or litigation likely to be filed pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(h).

Agenda Item No.:	5
Work Plan:	Administrative
Topic:	Agency Budget Development and Request
Presentation Title:	Principles and Guidance for 2021-23 Agency Budget Development
Date of Presentation:	January 8, 2020
Contact Information:	Bill Herber, Deputy Director for Administration (503) 945-7203, bill.herber@oregon.gov James Short, Assistant Deputy Director for Administration (503) 945-7275, james.short@oregon.gov

SUMMARY

The time has come to begin the 2021-23 biennial budget development effort. As first steps in the process, agency leaders have collectively assessed the situation for the coming biennium and created an initial set of budget development guiding principles. Board consideration and shaping of these draft principles will provide needed input and direction to the agency as the next steps of budget development occur during the coming months. This agenda item seeks that input and direction from the Board.

CONTEXT

Biennial budget development begins in the fall of odd-numbered years as one component of the Department’s strategic planning effort. To be effective with budget development over the course of the next 11 months through the finalization of the Governor’s Recommended Budget, joint engagement by agency leadership, the Board, and stakeholders is necessary and is a part of the operating model of leadership at the Board and agency levels. The first steps involve assessing the current and expected situation and establishing development principles and guidelines. The principles and guidance will set the foundation for final budget development during 2020.

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Since the start of the current 2019-21 biennium, the Department’s Executive Team has been working on the initial steps of strategic planning and budget development for the 2021-23 biennium.

Guiding Principles of Budget Development

Budget development principles are important to serve as sideboards in leading the Department and the Board in both budget content and budget process development (i.e., both the ‘what/why’ and the ‘how’). These principles set the stage for how we move forward and reflect “what’s important” in the long run from a budget process standpoint.

Initial draft content and process principles identified by the Executive Team, using previous biennia principles as a starting point, is provided as Attachment 1.

2019-21 Legislatively Adopted Budget Update

The Department of Forestry's 2019-21 Legislatively Adopted Budget consists of \$388.7 million total funds and 848.99 full-time equivalent positions. Sixty-seven (67) percent of the budget is funded with Other Fund revenues, including the state's share of timber sale proceeds, a variety of landowner assessments, and forest products harvest tax. Twenty-three (23) percent of the budget is funded with state General Fund dollars, nine (9) percent with federal revenues, and one (1) percent with Lottery Funds.

As a comparison, our 2019-21 Agency Request Budget consisted of \$429 million total funds and 922 full-time equivalent positions.

RECOMMENDATION

The Department recommends that the Board review and discuss the initial proposed guiding principles and provide the Department direction on needed changes, additions, or deletions.

NEXT STEPS

Following Board discussion and input, the guiding principles will be revised and begin to be used by agency staff on initial budget development and stakeholder engagement.

ATTACHMENT

- 1) 2021-23 Budget Development Guiding Principles



Oregon Department of Forestry

2021-23 Biennium – Agency Request Budget

Guiding Principles of Budget Development

Budget development principles are essential in leading the Department and the Board of Forestry in budget content and process development. These principles set the stage for moving forward and long-term reflection from a budget perspective.

Guided by agency leadership and previous principles, the 2021-23 Budget Development will:

1. Promote an open and transparent process with employees and stakeholders and seek and encourage public input.
2. Maintain core business functions and customer service as a priority while maintaining an agency-wide perspective rather than siloed programs. Sufficient capacity must be retained to meet the Board and Department's basic mandates including fire protection, managing state forests, forest regulation, administrative and financial support as well as natural resource policy development and dissemination.
3. Identify and address service gaps that exist between the current budget and the budget needed to implement legal mandates, the Board of Forestry work plans, and key components of the agency's strategic initiatives.
4. Be creative and proactive but realistic in concept development and proposals, recognizing the balance between asking for needed resources while considering budget climate, stakeholder and legislative expectations, and revenue constraints.
5. Maintain a viable, effective, highly-skilled, and empowered workforce and organization.
6. Identify and capture opportunities to increase efficiency and effectiveness.
7. Ensure that individual revenue sources fund a fair and equitable portion of the internal service costs that are in direct relation to services and products utilized by the program.
8. Align with the Board and agency missions, legal mandates, strategic initiatives, agency/program performance measures and the Governor's priorities.
9. Partner with other state natural resource agencies on issues of mutual interest.
10. Innovate new ways for revenue generation, providing services, and stakeholder outreach and involvement that aim to reduce vulnerability to cyclical fluctuations.
11. Be responsive to changes in the situation during the development process itself and be flexible to change direction or course if needed.
12. Clearly communicate the results of budget investments or reductions that impact forest resources and prioritize services that directly benefit, protect, and sustain Oregon's forest resources.

Agenda Item No:	6
Work Plan Title & #:	Strategic Planning / Board Work Plans
Presentation Title:	2020-2021 Draft Board Work Plans
Date of Presentation:	January 8, 2020
Contact Information:	Chad Davis, Director Partnership & Planning Program 503-602-2130 chad.davis@oregon.gov

SUMMARY

Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) Division Chiefs will present draft 2020-2021 work plans for Board consideration. This is an opportunity for the Board to provide additional input to the Division Chiefs about items in the work plans. The draft work plans include both Existing Work items and Potential Topics items, the latter in response to Board discussion at the October 2019 Board Retreat.

CONTEXT

The development of Board work plans is intended to strengthen the Board's ability to be an effective policy making body, direct the Department's work, and focus the Board's and Department's efforts on the most important issues.

At the October Planning Retreat, Department staff discussed potential work plan items for 2020-2021 with the Board. Specific deliverables, processes, and time lines for each item or issue will be detailed in individual work plans for each Division (see attachments).

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The Board and Department's work plan process is designed to create a systematic way for the Board to identify issues and set priorities that lead to specific decisions and products. The process is also designed to link with the biennial budget cycle where resources are identified and allocated within the Department.

The process of developing work plans provides a number of advantages including:

- Allowing staff to more efficiently allocate time among multiple demands,
- Providing the public with a better idea about when to provide input, and
- Organizing the Board's work so that it leads to specific decisions.

The steps of the work plan development process include:

September – Staff presents information to help the Board take stock of the current situation surrounding forest issues.

October – Planning Retreat – Board and Department discuss work plan priorities

January – Department staff provides overview of draft work plans

March – Board approves two-year work plans

RECOMMENDATION

This item is for the purposes of discussion with an explicit intent to gain Board direction on priorities for the 2020-2021 Board work plans.

No decision is required.

NEXT STEPS

The Board will approve 2020-2021 Work Plans at the March meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

- (1) Private Forests Work Plan
- (2) State Forests Work Plan
- (3) Fire Protection Work Plan
- (4) Administration Work Plan
- (5) Overarching Issues Work Plan

ODF Private Forests

Background

The Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF), Private Forests Division, provides resource protection and landowner assistance on Oregon's 10.3 million acres (34 percent of Oregon's forestland) under private forest ownership. Oregon's privately owned forests are diverse in size and character, including large industrial ownerships, family woodlands of many sizes, and treescapes in cities, suburbs and rural residential areas. To support such diverse ownerships, the Private Forests program provides landowner assistance in the areas of forest and stream health protection and enhancement, urban and community forestry, enforcement of forest practices laws, research and monitoring, tree improvement, and incentive programs. These forests provide values for all Oregonians, including watershed protection, ecosystem services, economic activity, fish and wildlife habitat, and recreation.

The Board's 2011 Forestry Program for Oregon supports an effective, science-based, and adaptive Oregon Forest Practices Act (FPA) as a cornerstone of forest resource protection on private lands in Oregon (Objective A.2). The discussion of Goal A recognizes that the FPA includes a set of best management practices designed to ensure that forest operations would meet state water quality standards adopted under the federal Clean Water Act. Similarly, the discussion of Goal D recognizes that the FPA is designed to protect soil and water resources, including aquatic and wildlife habitat (Objective D.6). The Board's guiding principles and philosophies includes a commitment to continuous learning, evaluating and appropriately adjusting forest management policies and programs based upon ongoing monitoring, assessment, and research (Value Statement 11; OAR 629-635-0110).

Work in Progress

Issue: *Water Quality Topics*

Goal: *Insure that to the maximum extent practicable forest practices meet water quality standards*

Objectives:

Support the Board in making a decision on the sufficiency of FPA streamside rules for small and medium fish streams in the Siskiyou Region to achieve goals for:

1. Water quality standards for stream temperature;
2. The stand structure and shade components of DFC.

Support the Board in making a decision on the sufficiency of FPA streamside rules for small and medium fish streams in Western Oregon to achieve goals for:

1. Large wood recruitment;
2. Stand structure component of DFC.

Siskiyou Streamside Protection Review:

In March 2018, staff presented the results of stakeholder and tribal input on proposed monitoring questions. The Board voted in favor of the department's recommendation of conducting a systematic review (SR) on stream temperature and streamside desired future condition (DFC) for small and medium fish streams in the Siskiyou region, and discuss associated contextual info (i.e., fish status and trend, water quality evaluations). In September 2018, staff presented an update to the Board on this review. In January 2019, staff presented input on the SR protocol received from stakeholders and tribes, and the next steps in the review process. Partner agencies presented contextual information on fish status and trends. In June 2019, staff presented the results of the Systematic Review to the Board. The Board found there was insufficient evidence to make a sufficiency decision on either stream temperature or DFC at that time. In September 2019, the Board voted to expand the geographic scope of the literature review and recommended the department form an advisory committee.

The department will be seeking approval from the Board at the January 2020 meeting on the advisory committee objectives and to approve a charter workplan for for the entire rule review to assure staff and the Board are aligned. The department is planning to bring the results of the expanded literature review on stream temperature to the July 2020 Board meeting, and the literature review on DFC to the Board in spring 2021. Approximately 2.3 FTE are assigned to this rule review.

Western Oregon Streamside Protection Review:

In 2002, the Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) initiated the Riparian Function and Stream Temperature (RipStream) study throughout the Oregon Coast Range. The study objective was to evaluate the effectiveness of FPA rules in protecting stream temperature, and meeting DFC. Previous RipStream analyses (e.g., reports, analysis, and peer-reviewed publications) focused on harvesting effects on stream temperature and shade, as well as meeting state water quality standards. This phase of the RipStream analyses will assess the effectiveness of FPA rules at meeting large wood and DFC objectives (per OAR 629-642-0000). This analysis is one component of the larger project, the Western Oregon Streamside Protections Review, which will include data analysis of Ripstream data, systematic literature review, and modeling analyses.

The department provided an update on data analysis, plans for a systematic literature review, and future modeling work at the September 2019 Board meeting. The combined literature review on DFC (stand structure) covering western Oregon and the Siskiyou is planned to be brought to the Board spring 2021. The department will bring the full suite of western Oregon analysis results for a decision at a winter 2021-22 Board meeting. There is currently 1.2 FTE assigned to this review.

Issue: *Forest Practices Act Rule/Policy Review*

Goal: *Complete specified resource sites rule analysis for marbled murrelets*

Objectives: Assist the Board to:

1. Collect and analyze the best available information and establish inventories of resource sites.
2. Determine if forest practices would conflict with the resource sites
3. Determine appropriate levels of protection if conflicts exist.
4. Adopt rules to protect resource sites as required by statute.

In June 2016, the Board received a Petition to Initiate Rulemaking under specified resource site rules for the marbled murrelet. In November 2016, the Board directed the Department to initiate a rule analysis for marbled murrelets and as one of the initial steps for this project, to develop a technical report on marbled murrelets as guided by Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 629-680-0100. The draft technical report was presented to the Board in April 2018. Findings from an expert review of the draft technical report were presented to the Board in November 2018 and the final technical report approved by the Board in April 2019. The department will next be gathering input from stakeholders, using a facilitator, to help identify preferred resource site determination and protection strategies. This input from focus groups will be summarized and submitted to the Board.

Issue: *Forest Practices Act Rule/Policy Review*

Goal: *Complete specified resource sites rule analysis for coho salmon*

Objectives: Assist the Board to:

1. Collect and analyze the best available information and establish inventories of resource sites.
2. Determine if forest practices would conflict with the resource sites
3. Determine appropriate levels of protection if conflicts exist.
4. Adopt rules to protect resource sites as required by statute.

In April 2019, the Board received a petition to initiate rulemaking under the specified resource site rules for coho salmon. In July, the Board accepted the petition and directed the department to initiate a rule analysis for coho salmon.

The department is currently working to define the resource sites and working with other natural resource agencies to help establish the inventory of the resource sites.

Issue: ***Implement Legislative Direction***

Goal: ***Complete rulemaking for HB 3013, wildlife food plots***

Objectives: Complete draft and final rule language.

HB 3013 allows small forestland ownerships (at least 10 acres, but less than 5,000 acres) subject to reforestation requirements under Forest Practices Act, to establish wildlife food plots within the boundaries of the ownership. The bill defines “Wildlife food plot” as a small forestland area that, instead of being used for growing and harvesting of forest tree species, is planted in vegetation capable of substantially contributing to wildlife nutrition. The bill specifies limits for combined size of the wildlife food plots on an ownership and defines establishment of food plots as a forest practice and forest operation requiring notice to the State Forester. The Bill requires the Board to adopt rules to carry out these provisions and to consult with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife to identify vegetation capable of substantially contributing to wildlife nutrition.

The Committee for Family Forestlands has served as the rule advisory committee throughout this process and updates have been delivered to the Regional Forest Practices Committees and stakeholders. The department will present draft rules to the Board in January 2020 with final rule language anticipated in July 2020 for Board approval.

Issue: ***Board Updates***

Overview: The Private Forests Division provides annual updates to the Board on topics that include the following:

- Operator of the Year Award
- Committee for Family Forestlands Report and Appointments
- Forest Practices Agency Meeting Report
- Forest Health Report
- Forest Practices Monitoring Report
- Urban and Community Forestry Program Update
- Non-Industrial Forest Landowner Program Update
- Regional Forest Practices Committee Appointments

Potential Topic Items

Issue: *Implementation Study*

The Board was introduced to the Implementation Study (e.g., Compliance Audit program) in the September 2012 Monitoring Unit update. The department hired a private contractor to collect data used to determine compliance. This study provides rates of compliance with the FPA for forestlands from which timber was harvested during the previous two years. The data collection protocol and site sampling process allows for reporting results at the statewide and FPA Area, and by ownership type (industrial, private non-industrial and other (e.g., county, state)). The department reports on FPA compliance as an annual Key Performance Measure. The department presented the 2013, 2014, 2016, and 2017 compliance reports to the Board at the annual Monitoring Unit updates (note: there was no study in 2015). Annuals levels of compliance at the statewide level across all ownerships continue to be high, 97-98%. Closer evaluation of compliance at a rule level indicates low compliance ~50% for specific rule applications.

Some concerns have been expressed with the level of statistical inference of compliance rates due to landowners who choose not to participate in the study. Also, concerns with potential analysis bias with respect to lack of independent sample sites has also been expressed.

Products/Actions

At their November 2019 meeting, the Board directed the State Forester to provide for a statistical review of the previous (2013-2017) compliance audit sampling design and analyses. The review process is being developed and the first part has been contracted out. This work will require participation of Department staff to provide information and support for the third party review.

Staff had been moving forward developing a new module of implementation review, for the reforestation rules. This new phase will incorporate information from statistical professionals at Oregon State University which will help inform the new phase and future phases of the implementation study.

Estimate of Board Time

The work on previous (2013-2017) compliance audit should take several meetings. The reforestation phase may be delayed as resources are re-focused on the previous audit.

Proposed Timeline Fit

Dependent upon Board direction. Currently estimated for 2021 to re-assess existing data only.

Potential Topic Items

Issue: *Specified Resource Site Policy Review*

After more than a decade since the adoption of special resource site protection policies, Board review of such policies—related statutes and/or rules—is needed in light of changing circumstances for private forests in Oregon and species protection efforts. Changes include the development of a Federal recovery plan for spotted owls, effective implementation of the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife’s development of a statewide conservation strategy, Ballot Measure 49, and the development of a programmatic Safe Harbor Agreement for Spotted Owls. Overall there is also a growing recognition that species-by-species approaches to resource protection, as opposed to more holistic landscape level approaches, may not be the most effective or efficient means to achieve specified resource site protection goals.

A policy-level review of the current approach to special resource site protection should address the following topics:

- What is the most appropriate role of the state / Department in relation to the Endangered Species Act and federal regulations for species protection?
- Does the implementation of current policy remain appropriate given the evolution of economic, social, and environmental issues in Oregon since the policies were adopted?

Products/Actions

The Board may choose to prioritize a more holistic review which may result in specific recommendations for addressing specified resource sites and particularly threatened and endangered species.

Estimate of Board Time

Dependent upon Board direction and prioritization of this work. Existing resources are focused on rule analysis for marbled murrelet and coho salmon.

Proposed Timeline Fit

Dependent upon Board direction. Currently estimated preliminary work to begin in September 2020.

Potential Topic Items

Issue: *Forest Practices Act Review and Climate Change*

The Forest Practices Act was developed before the implications of climate change were widely discussed by natural resource managers and is designed to evolve over time through adaptive management. As such there are no specific, climate-change informed goals included within the FPA. The Board has recently expressed a desire to develop more comprehensive policies on climate change. If such policies were developed, they would greatly enhance the ability to measure against Board policy and further to test rule sufficiency in light of climate change. Climate change is anticipated to have a variety of impacts in Oregon that relate to achieving desired future condition along streams and meeting stream temperature and other resource protection goals.

Products/Actions

The Board may choose to prioritize development of a comprehensive and clearly articulated set of climate policies and goals with which to evaluate the agencies authorities to address climate changes and assess all aspects of agency business, including a comprehensive review of FPA with respect to climate change impacts and/or uncertainty.

Estimate of Board Time

Dependent upon Board direction and prioritization of this work. Existing resources are not currently focused on this work within the Private Forests Division

Proposed Timeline Fit

Dependent upon Board direction. Currently estimated preliminary work to begin in July 2021.

Potential Topic Items

Issue: *Landslide and Public Safety Rulemaking*

At their November 2008 meeting, the Board reviewed draft permanent rule language for the intermediate risk category for landslide and public safety rules. The proposed rule was intended to maximize operational flexibility within the constraints of providing for public safety. The Department also sought to change the rule language for purposes of clarity, efficiency, and effectiveness. These changes included: (1) wording; (2) improving rule organization; and, (3) clarifying the roles of the operator and State Forester regarding shared responsibility, stated in OAR 629-623-0000(1).

The Department did not modify the intent and purpose of the rules, as stated in OAR 629-623-0000(3). The Board determined that the draft permanent rule implemented the provisions of ORS 527.710 (10) but did not result in new or increased standards for forests practices. Therefore, scientific-findings and economic-analysis under ORS 527.714 (5) and (7) were not required. However, given that analysis done in the process of developing the proposed rules indicated some potential for increased restriction and/or economic impact to landowners, the Board directed the Department to provide the Board with appropriate information on alternatives evaluated and economic impact prior to requesting formal rule making authority.

In the process of compiling information for the Board in response to this direction, staff conducted discussions within the Department and externally with stakeholders. This process, coupled with field visits to landslide sites in Oregon, raised issues regarding the direction and scope of the rule revision process. The primary issues involved the scope of rule changes and the Department's interpretation that the proposed draft rules did not result in new or increased standards for forests practices. Issues raised about the process and rule changes suggested that the draft permanent rules presented to the Board in November 2008 may not "improve the intermediate risk rules and ... improve the overall clarity, efficiency and effectiveness of the division rules" as was originally directed by the Board in November 2006. In order to ensure greater success at meeting this original direction, the Department determined that there was a need to broaden the scope of the rule revision process.

Products/Actions and Estimate of Board Time

Dependent upon Board direction and prioritization. No existing resources are focused on this work.

Proposed Timeline Fit

Dependent upon Board direction.

Private Forests Division Work plan – April 2020-March 2022

	2020					2021					2022			
	Apr	Jun	July	Sep	Nov	Jan	Mar	Apr	Jun	July	Sep	Nov	Jan	Mar
WORK IN PROGRESS														
Water Quality Topics														
<i>Milestones</i>														
• Western Oregon Streamside Protection Review				i			D							
• Siskiyou Streamside Protection Review			D											
• ODF-DEQ Sufficiency Review Alignment														
Forest Practices Act (FPA) Rule/Policy Review														
<i>Milestones</i>														
• Specified Resource Sites Rule Analysis: Marbled Murrelet					i									
• Specified Resource Sites Rule Analysis: Coho			i						i					
Implement Legislative Direction														
<i>Milestones</i>														
• HB 3013 Wildlife Food Plots										D				
Board Updates														
<i>Milestones</i>														
Operator of the Year Award						i							i	
Committee for Family Forestlands Report and Appointments			d							d				
Forest Practices Agency Meeting Report							i							i
Forest Health Report				i							i			
Forest Practices Monitoring Report				i							i			
Urban and Community Forestry Report				i							i			
Non-industrial Forest Landowner Report				i							i			
Regional Forest Practices Committee Appointments				d							d			

POTENTIAL TOPICS													
Implementation Study review													
Implementation Study (reforestation)													
Specified Resource Sites Policy Review													
Forest Practices Act Review –Climate Change													
Landslides and Public Safety Rulemaking													

Matrix Key:

- i** – Informational item
- d** – Preceding Decision item
- D** – Final Decision item

ODF State Forests

Background

The Oregon Department of Forestry, State Forests Division, manages approximately 730,000 acres of forestlands across Oregon. These state forestlands are actively managed to provide economic, environmental, and social benefits to Oregonians. Timber sales on these forests create jobs and generate revenue that fund counties, local districts, and schools throughout the state. These forests also offer recreation and educational opportunities, and provide essential wildlife habitat and clean water. Management costs associated with managing these public forests are funded primarily through the sale of timber off of these lands.

The Division's core businesses include financial accounting and log tracking, timber sale contracting and administration, fish and wildlife surveys and implementation of conservation measures. We collect, manage, and analyze data and report outcomes. Field and Salem staff conduct and coordinate reforestation activities, road construction and maintenance, collaborate with local communities and other organizations on habitat improvement projects, maintain recreation facilities and opportunities, and provide educational programs to schools and the public.

It has become increasingly difficult to support all priority work and core business. Unanticipated legal actions have further impacted workloads, are costly, and often displace other priority work. We are addressing these issues on multiple fronts. We modernized our organizational structure to better meet the current social and political climate and deliver greatest permanent value to Oregonians now and into the future. We continue to make significant improvements in our business processes. We are revisiting policies and are seeking to diversify funding streams so we can sustainably manage state forests to provide the range of social, economic, and environmental benefits. This includes potential changes to Forest Management Plans and the development of a Habitat Conservation Plan, both of which are intended to achieve financial viability and improve conservation outcomes within the context of the Greatest Permanent Value mandate.

Work in Progress

Issue: Habitat Conservation Plan for Western Oregon State Forestlands

Goal: Compliance with the Endangered Species Act

Objectives: Develop a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) to achieve programmatic Endangered Species Act (ESA) compliance.

Title: Western Oregon State Forests HCP

Products/Actions:

Phase 1: HCP Initiation/Scoping

- Completed

Phase 2: HCP Draft Development

- Development of an administrative draft HCP that includes conservation measures and mechanisms to provide operational certainty into the future.

Phase 3: National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) process and Companion FMP development.

- Submit the draft HCP into the Federal National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) process.
- Concurrently draft a Companion FMP that takes the best elements of the current FMPs, the Draft Revised Western Oregon FMP and parts of the HCP.

Stakeholder/Public Involvement/Tribal Engagement

All standing stakeholder committees (State Forests Advisory Committee, Oregon Forest Conservation Coalition, Conservation Ad Hoc, Industry Ad Hoc, Forest Trust Land Advisory Committee, and Oregon Forest & Industries Council) have been invited to participate in the HCP scoping process. Some members of the Forest Trust Lands Advisory Committee have expressed concerns and the Oregon Forest & Industries Council does not support an HCP on state forestlands. Despite these reservations, no committee or stakeholders have actively declined participation.

The Department recognizes the importance and value of reaching out to all Oregon's federally-recognized Tribes on issues related to managing Oregon's state forests. We will pursue opportunities to meet with Tribal Chair Council and Tribal staff directors to listen and learn from the Tribes, seek opportunities for input and collaboration, and build relationships.

Timeframe with Milestones

- October 2020: Administrative Draft HCP to Board of Forestry (BOF) for decision to go into NEPA process. If BOF decides to continue working on the HCP then submit HCP into the NEPA process that will take approximately 18 months.
- November 2021: Present the Draft Companion FMP to BOF for decision to go into rulemaking process. FMP rulemaking: approximately 6 months.

Work in Progress

Issue: The dominant management plan for State Forests is the NW Forest Management Plan (FMP) which includes 650,000 acres, about 75% of the total state forest land base, and generates over 90% of the revenue from Board of Forestry lands. The Board of Forestry approved the original FMP in January 2001 as the first integrated resource management plan for the state and approved a plan revision in 2010 to improve financial outcomes. The foundation of the FMP is an approach called “structure based management” under which the forest is managed to produce a range of forest conditions across the landscape. The plan was intended to be coupled with a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). However, the state was not able to acquire an HCP. The lack of an HCP combined with costs associated with take avoidance and some challenges with implementing structure based management are impacting State Forests Division financial viability.

Goal: Evaluate potential changes to the FMP that will improve financial viability and conservation outcomes.

Objectives: Draft a revised forest management plan for Western Oregon State Forests

Title: Draft Revised Western Oregon Forest Management Plan

Products/Actions:

The Division will provide two products to the BOF in April of 2020.

- Draft Revised Western Oregon Forest Management Plan.
- Summary of input from Forest Trust Lands Advisory Committee and public engagement.

The Draft FMP serves two purposes. First, should the BOF decide not to seek an HCP, the Draft Revised FMP will be the basis for continued exploration of a plan revision to improve financial viability and conservation outcomes. Alternatively, should the BOF decide to move into the NEPA process, elements of the Draft Revised FMP will be used to develop the companion FMP.

Stakeholder/Public Involvement/Tribal Engagement:

The eventual success of the FMP project will largely depend on developing sufficient understanding, acceptance, and support from stakeholder groups. Providing accurate and timely information to stakeholders will be of critical importance, and the Division is committed to an open, equitable, and transparent stakeholder engagement process. Additionally, counties within which we manage Board of Forestry lands have a statutorily established relationship with the Board through the Forest Trust Lands Advisory Committee (FTLAC). The Division will provide accurate and timely information to ensure FTLAC has the information they need to advise the Board of Forestry and the State Forester. The Division will seek public engagement and convene informational meetings for all interested stakeholders with the purpose of providing the

information in a clear and transparent manner and allowing sufficient time for the stakeholders to prepare their input for the Board of Forestry meeting.

The Department recognizes the importance and value of reaching out to all Oregon's federally-recognized Tribes on issues related to managing Oregon's state forests. We will pursue opportunities to meet with Tribal Chair Council and Tribal staff directors to listen and learn from the Tribes, seek opportunities for input and collaboration, and build relationships.

Timeframe with Milestones:

- April 2020: Present the Draft Revised Western Oregon FMP and summary of input from FTLAC and public engagement as informational item.
- Pause work on the Draft Revised Western Oregon FMP until October of 2020 when the BOF will decide if we will continue to work on an HCP.
- As long as there is positive progress on the HCP: (a) suspend efforts on the Draft Revised FMP and (b) shift focus to the development of a companion FMP to be coupled with the HCP.

State Forests Division Workplan: April 2020-June 2022

WORK IN PROGRESS	2020							2021							2022			
	Apr	Mar	Jun	July	Sep	Oct	Nov	Jan	Mar	Apr	Jun	July	Sep	Nov	Jan	Mar	Apr	Jun
Item 1: HCP for Western Oregon State forestlands																		
<i>Milestones</i>																		
Habitat Conservation Plan	i			i		d					i							D
Companion FMP											i			d				D
Item 2: Draft Revised Western Oregon FMP																		
<i>Milestones</i>																		
Draft Revised Plan & Summary of Input from FTLAC and Public Engagement	i																	

Matrix Key:

- i** – Informational item
- d** – Preceding Decision item
- D** – Final Decision item

BOARD OF FORESTRY WORK PLAN

ODF Fire Protection

Background

Purpose & Objective

The Protection from Fire Division is the oldest (since 1911) and largest (397 FTE) program of the Department of Forestry. The authorizing statute for the Division is ORS 477.005 stating, “The preservation of the forests and the conservation of the forest resources through the prevention and suppression of forest fires hereby are declared to be the public policy of the State of Oregon.” The program’s mission is to protect Oregon forestlands from fire, through a complete and coordinated system with our cooperators, including fire prevention, suppression, investigation and cost collection. The overarching programmatic goal is to minimize acres burned, the cost of suppression and the value of loss to resources through aggressive wildland fire initial attack, secondary only to the protection of human life.

Current Issues and Focus

There are several policy issues affecting the Protection Division that warrants the Board’s attention this coming year. Maintaining a complete and coordinated protection system requires periodic review and revisions of policy ensuring a dynamic and sustainable program that encourages participation by stakeholders and cooperators. Fire Protection financials will be reported as part of the agencies routine financial reports

This plan outlines key policy work that the Board has already committed to and/or anticipates making decisions on through 2022.

Work in Progress

Overview

Approve Protection Budgets: As directed by statute, at the June Board of Forestry meeting, “The State Board of Forestry shall annually review the forest protection district and rangeland protection budgets, make any changes in the budgets that are proper and consistent with law, and pass final approval on all protection budgets and the prorated acreage rates therein.”

Association Letters: In each of the agreements with the non-operating forest protective associations, there is a requirement that each association will provide “...an annual letter from the Association to the Forester providing input on Department operations affecting the District or the Association (to be transmitted to all members of the Board)...” (State Forester letters).

Fire Season Reports: Staff will provide fire season reports annually, during the fire season.

Emergency Fire Cost Committee: As vacancies occur, the Board makes appointments to the Emergency Fire Cost Committee.

Forest Protection Association Agreements: Periodically, agreements are updated and Board approval of updated agreements are necessary under OAR 629-041-0100.

Rangeland Protection Association formation: Periodically, a request for a public hearing on the possible formation of a Rangeland Protection Association (RPA) will come before the Board for approval. Based on the outcome of the hearing, the Board may receive a request for approval on the formation of an RPA.

Board Deliverables with Timelines

At each June Board meeting, the budgets for the forest protection districts and rangeland protection associations, and copies of the State Forester letters will be presented to the Board for consideration as directed in statute and the association agreements. Fire season reports will be presented to the Board annually from June through September and as requested. All other ongoing topics will be presented to the Board on an as-needed basis.

Outreach and Public Involvement

- Prior to the June Board meeting, the forest protection district budgets are developed through local budget committees made up of landowners, reviewed and discussed at the forest protective association meetings, and required to go through a public hearing at district and unit offices.
- Public comments may be accepted on all annual and ongoing topics at Board meetings.

Resources Required

Fire Protection Division Staff

Potential Topic Item

ISSUE: Governor's Council on Wildfire Response

Overview

Following the 2013-2015 fire seasons, two parallel review processes were initiated: Secretary of State (SOS) Audit and the Fire Program Review. Both of these efforts are aligned to help continue a highly functioning wildfire protection system for Oregon into the future. The Department has fully embraced the findings and recommendations from both final reports. The 2017-2108 fire seasons experience reinforced the need for the agency to continue efforts on these recommendations. Additionally, The Governor issued Executive Order 19-01 creating the Governor's Council on Wildfire Response.

- The SOS Performance Audit has offered a third-party review of the Agency's ability to sustain its multiple missions, where an increased demand for the fire protection effort has been required from the entire agency.

- The Fire Protection Response Committee (FPRC) was coordinated with all agency partners through a transparent process including legislators, governor’s office, forest landowners, and cooperators to reach for continuous improvement in Oregon’s complete and coordinated fire protection system
- The Governor’s Council on Wildfire Response offers 37 recommendations to improve Oregon’s wildfire protection system. Implementation of these recommendations is expected to be guided through legislative committee and the governor’s office.

Purpose

These reports have provided a roadmap for ongoing Fire Protection policy work regarding fire funding, achieving a sustainable workforce across all programs and divisions in support of the agencies fire protection mission, and providing for wildfire prevention and mitigation. This item remains on the Board’s work plan as an awareness item, maintaining the Protection Division’s focus on: “Protecting Oregonians, our Forests and Communities from Wildfire” through implementation of the recommendations from the 2016 Fire Program Review, SOS performance audit and the Governor’s Council on Wildfire Response.

Board Deliverables with Timelines

The Board will be updated and when appropriate, asked to approve any policy level work and/or significant agency action planned to address the recommendations of the Secretary of State audit, Fire Program Review Committee and Governors Council on Wildfire Response.

Outreach and Public Involvement

- Staff will work directly with internal and external partners and provide updates as necessary at meetings that include a broader range of landowners and stakeholders.
- Public comments may be accepted on topic at Board meetings.

Resources Required

To be Determined

Fire Protection Division Workplan – April 2020-March 2022

	2020			2021						2022				
	Apr	Jun	July	Sep	Nov	Jan	Mar	Apr	Jun	July	Sep	Nov	Jan	Mar
WORK IN PROGRESS														
Annual and Ongoing Topics														
<i>Milestones</i>														
• Approve Forest Protection District and Rangeland Protection Association Annual Budgets		D							D					
• Review Letters from FPA’s to State Forester		i							i					
• Fire Season Reports		i	i	i					i	i	i			
• Appointment for Emergency Fire Cost Committee (As Needed)														
• Approve Forest Protection Association Agreements (As Needed)														
• Rangeland Protection Association Formation (As Needed)														
POTENTIAL TOPICS														
Governor’s Council on Wildfire Response														
To Be Determined														
As Needed														

Matrix Key:

- i** – Informational item
- d** – Preceding Decision item
- D** – Final Decision item

Administrative Work Plan

Background

Purpose & Objective

Agency Administration provides leadership and management, policy development and assessment, public outreach and communications, and administrative support to the Board of Forestry and the agency's key operating programs.

Current Issues and Focus

The administrative issues that regularly require the Board's attention include: securing the Board's input and approval of the Department's legislative concepts and the Agency Request Budget that is submitted to the Governor and the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) every two years; assisting the Board with its governance performance self-evaluation each year; reporting on the agency's annual Key Performance Measures; and periodic reports on the agency's financial status and human resource metrics.

WORK IN PROGRESS FOR THE BOARD OF FORESTRY 2020-2021

1. Development of Legislative Concepts
2. Agency Budget Development and Request
3. Board Governance Performance Self-Evaluation
4. Key Performance Measures Review
5. Ongoing Financial Status Check
6. Human Resources Dashboard

POTENTIAL TOPICS

1. Review of Board Self-Evaluation Criteria
2. Review of Projected Financial Dashboard Design
3. Report on Facilities Capital Management Plan
4. Report on Agency Public Information Requests

ISSUE: Development of Legislative Concepts

Overview

Development of legislative concepts for bills that may be introduced during the 2021 Legislative Session represent an important opportunity to advance Board and Department goals, objectives and priorities, to help shape statewide policy, and to address barriers

Purpose

The legislative concept development process involves interactions among multiple groups, including the Board, Department leadership, stakeholders, and the Governor's Office.

Consistent with past cycles, it is expected that the 2021 concepts will be due to DAS and the Governor’s Office in April 2020. Review at those levels generally focuses on alignment with agency and statewide budget and policy considerations, and with the Governor’s priorities.

Board Deliverables with Timelines

Review proposed guiding principles and initial list of potential concepts January 2020
Approve the concepts for submission to DAS March 2020

Outreach and Public Involvement

Public comments and input will be taken at Board of Forestry meetings and in meetings with stakeholders.

ISSUE: Agency Budget Development and Request

Overview

Biennial budget development begins in the fall of odd-numbered years as one component of the Department’s strategic planning effort. To be effective with budget development over the course of the next 13 months through the finalization of the Governor’s Recommended Budget, joint engagement by the agency leadership, the Board, and stakeholders is necessary and is a part of the operating model of leadership at the Board and agency levels.

Purpose

The first steps involve assessing the current and expected situation, establishing development principles and guidelines, and creating initial focus areas for further consideration as the process moves along. These steps guide preliminary budget concept development, and may adjust due to changing environments over the course of the next nine months as the Agency Request Budget is completed. This combination of assessment, principles and guidance, and initial focus areas sets the foundation for final budget development during 2020.

Board Deliverables with Timelines

Review proposed guiding principles and provide direction January 2020
Review and provide input on initial budget concepts April 2020
Review and provide input on the budget concepts June 2020
Approve the 2021-23 Agency Request Budget and approve in concept the Board
letter of transmittal to the Governor..... July 2020

Outreach and Public Involvement

Public comments and input will be taken at Board of Forestry meetings and in meetings with stakeholders.

ISSUE: Board Governance Performance Self-Evaluation

Overview

The governance performance measure for state boards and commissions, “percent of total best practices met by the board” was enacted by the Oregon State Legislature in 2005 and adopted by

the Board in 2006. The measure included fifteen standard best practices criteria and flexibility for Boards and Commissions to develop additional criteria to meet the Board’s specific needs and interests.

In 2007, the Board appointed an ad hoc Board Performance Measure Implementation Subcommittee consisting of Chair Steve Hobbs and members Barbara Craig and Larry Giustina to “tailor and fine tune” the Board’s specific approach for the performance measure. The Subcommittee completed their work and the Board adopted a tailored set of best practices criteria that included descriptive text to assist in a shared understanding of the measure, one additional criteria relating to public involvement and communications, and key summary questions added to the evaluation. The measure is included in the agency’s annual Key Performance Measures and has been conducted every year since 2008.

Purpose

Board members complete individual self-evaluations of board governance performance and a summary of the self-evaluations is presented to the board for approval in meeting the sixteen best practices criteria. The performance measure information is then included in the Department’s Key Performance Measures Report submitted to the Department of Administrative Services and Legislative Fiscal Office.

The Board of Forestry collectively discussed the results of their 2019 Board Governance Performance Evaluation at the October 2019 Board Planning Retreat. During that time, interest was expressed in further review of the best practices criteria and tailored descriptions adopted by the Board of Forestry in 2007.

To facilitate the Board’s review of the evaluation criteria prior to this coming year’s process, the Department is recommending the Board consider additional milestones in the preliminary stages that would include individual collection of Board member feedback on the criteria throughout January 2020, this feedback would then assist the Department in tailoring a discussion with the full Board in March, and provide timing for a final set of evaluation criteria to be presented for Board approval at the April meeting as an initiation to the self-evaluation period that annually occurs in May (see Work Plan Appendix 2020 Preliminary Review and Proposed Changes Input Form).

Board Deliverables with Timelines

[NEW] Review board performance self-evaluation criteria	January 2020, March 2020, 2021
[NEW] Approve final evaluation criteria and initiate self-evaluation process.....	April 2020, 2021
Board members complete individual self-evaluations.....	May 2020, 2021
Summary evaluation presented for approval of best-practices criteria metrics.....	July 2020, 2021
Collective discussion on board governance performance.....	October 2020, 2021

ISSUE: Key Performance Measures Review

Overview

Through the biennial budgeting process, each Oregon state agency is required to develop key performance measures consistent with joint direction from the Legislative Fiscal Office (LFO) and DAS Chief Financial Office (CFO). Key performance measures proposed by state agencies must be approved by the Legislature along with their respective agency budgets. The Department is required to submit an Annual Performance Progress report to LFO and CFO each year.

Purpose

A summary listing of the agency’s key performance measures, an executive summary on the Department’s performance for the year based on these measures, and individual summaries for each of the current biennium’s 14 measures is provided to the Board for informational purposes.

Board Deliverables with Timelines

Key Performance Measures Report September 2020, 2021

ISSUE: Ongoing Financial Status Check

Overview

The Board has requested regular updates on the Department’s financial status.

Purpose

The Department is revising the previous financial dashboard to incorporate additional elements of interest relative to the agency’s fiscal health. Review of the projected dashboard design is anticipated for the March 2020 meeting with the Board where discussions can further inform dashboard elements and timing for regular reporting intervals. An additional deliverable reflected on this work plan is relative to agency finances includes the Board’s annual review and approval of the State Forester’s financial transactions as required by statewide policy.

Board Deliverables with Timelines

[NEW] Financial Dashboard Projected Design Review March 2020

Financial Dashboard Report TBD

Annual Approval of the State Forester’s Financial Transactions March 2020, 2021

ISSUE: Human Resources Dashboard

Overview

The Board has requested regular updates on the Department’s human resources and safety-related metrics.

Purpose

The Department has developed a human resources dashboard providing valuable information about the agency’s human resource trends and safety-related metrics.

Board Deliverables with Timelines

Human Resources Dashboard March 2020, 2021

POTENTIAL TOPICS FOR THE BOARD OF FORESTRY 2020-2021

ISSUE: Review of Board Self-Evaluation Criteria

Overview

During the Board’s annual self-evaluation discussion at the October 2019 Board planning retreat, a request was made for a collective review of the evaluation criteria and descriptions contained within.

Board Deliverables with Timelines

This request has been integrated into the existing work plan with additional milestones recommended in the preliminary stages of this coming year’s process.

ISSUE: Review of Projected Financial Dashboard Design

Overview

As the agency continues to modernize its financial systems and build an integrated reporting framework, the Board has requested review of the projected dashboard design to ensure it presents the appropriate financial information desired from across the agency, including but not limited to review of large fire cost recoveries, accounts receivables, revenue, cash flow and budgetary streams.

Board Deliverables with Timelines

This request has been integrated into the existing work plan with review of the projected dashboard design anticipated for March 2020 and subsequent reporting intervals to be determined by the Board.

ISSUE: Facilities Capital Management Plan

Overview

During the Board’s October 2019 planning retreat, interest was expressed in reviewing the Department’s facilities capital management plan and alignment with district budgets and committees. The Department manages over 400 structures in a network of Salem and Field office buildings, storage warehouses, housing facilities, communication sites, and miscellaneous infrastructure.

Board Deliverables with Timelines

A preliminary discussion could be held with the Board regarding current status and condition of our facilities statewide, recurring and deferred maintenance needs, and investment strategies to manage this extensive network of facilities in Salem and the Field.

ISSUE: Public Information Request Report

Overview

During the October 2019 Board planning retreat, interest was expressed in tracking the number of public information requests based on workload and number of FTE's with a report back to the Board. The agency is actively tracking our public record requests and can report on the number of requests, those requests fulfilled within specific timeframes, waivers requested and granted, and dollars collected for fulfilling records requests.

Board Deliverables with Timelines

An initial report on our public records requests could be presented to the Board with presentation to include further information on the varying complexity of fulfilling requests, statutory references, and broad recognition of regular information provided through public inquiries outside of formal public record requests.

Administrative Division Work Plan	2020							2021						
	Jan	Mar	Apr	Jun	July	Sep	Nov	Jan	Mar	Apr	Jun	July	Sep	Nov
Development of Legislative Concepts														
<i>Milestones</i>														
❖ Review proposed guiding principles, list of potential concepts	i													
❖ Approve the legislative concepts for submission to DAS		D												
Agency Budget Development and Request														
<i>Milestones</i>														
❖ Review proposed guiding principles and provide direction	i													
❖ Review and provide input on draft budget concepts			i											
❖ Review and provide input on final budget concepts				i										
❖ Approve the 2021-23 Agency Request Budget and approve in concept the Board letter of transmittal to the Governor					D									
Board Governance Best Practices Self-Evaluation														
<i>Milestones</i>														
❖ Review the annual Board governance self-evaluation criteria	i	i							i					
❖ Approve final evaluation criteria and initiate process			D							D				
❖ Approve summarized evaluation report and metrics of Board governance best practices criteria					D							D		

Key Performance Measures (KPM) Review														
<i>Milestones</i>														
❖ Review the <i>Annual Performance Progress Report</i> summarizing the agency's 14 key performance measures							i						i	
Ongoing Financial Status Check														
<i>Milestones</i>														
❖ Financial Dashboard Projected Design Review		i												
❖ Financial Dashboard Presentations			TBD						TBD					
❖ Annual Approval of the State Forester's Financial Transactions		D							D					
Human Resources Dashboard														
<i>Milestones</i>														
❖ Human Resources Dashboard		i							i					
POTENTIAL TOPICS														
<i>Milestones</i>														
❖ Facilities Capital Management Plan					i				TBD					
❖ Public Information Request Report						i			TBD					

Matrix Key:
TBD – To be decided
i – Informational item
d – Preceding Decision item
D – Final Decision item

WORK PLAN APPENDIX
Oregon Board of Forestry | Governance Performance Measure
Best Management Practices Self-Evaluation Criteria
2020 Preliminary Review and Proposed Changes Input Form

Oregon Boards and Commissions Best Management Practices Performance Measure Criteria (2005) (Standard – Not Subject to Change)	Best Practices tailored by the Board Performance Measure Implementation Subcommittee and adopted by the Board of Forestry (2007)	Board of Forestry Preliminary Review and Proposed Changes on tailored Best Practices descriptions (2020)
1. Executive Director’s performance expectations are current.	<i>The Board understands this to mean that the State Forester’s Position Description is current.</i>	
2. Executive Director’s performance has been evaluated in the last year.	<i>The Board understands this to mean that the State Forester’s Position Description is current and that the annual performance appraisal has been completed.</i>	
3. The agency’s mission and high-level goals are current and applicable.	<i>The Board understands this to mean that the Board’s <u>Forestry Program for Oregon and Oregon Forest Practices Act/Rules</u> are current.</i>	
4. The Board reviews the <u>Annual Performance Progress Report</u>.	<i>The Board understands this to mean that the Board reviews the report annually as a meeting agenda item.</i>	
5. The Board is appropriately involved in review of agency’s key communications.	<i>The Board understands this to mean agency and Board communications at a policy level, versus a day-to-day operating level.</i>	
6. The Board is appropriately involved in policy-making activities.	<i>The Board understands this to mean those policy activities that particularly have a statewide perspective, including holding Board meetings at different geographic locations around the state.</i>	
7. The agency’s policy option packages are aligned with their mission and goals.	<i>The Board understands this to mean the packages included in the biennial budget process as part of the Agency Request Budget.</i>	

WORK PLAN APPENDIX
Oregon Board of Forestry | Governance Performance Measure
Best Management Practices Self-Evaluation Criteria
2020 Preliminary Review and Proposed Changes Input Form

Oregon Boards and Commissions Best Management Practices Performance Measure Criteria (2005) (Standard – Not Subject to Change)	Best Practices tailored by the Board Performance Measure Implementation Subcommittee and adopted by the Board of Forestry (2007)	Board of Forestry Preliminary Review and Proposed Changes on tailored Best Practices descriptions (2020)
8. The Board reviews all proposed budgets.	<i>The Board understands this to mean the Department of Forestry’s biennial budget at the Agency Request Budget level.</i>	
9. The Board periodically reviews key financial information and audit findings.	<i>The Board understands this to mean significant financial issues and as audits are released.</i>	
10. The Board is appropriately accounting for resources.	<i>The Board understands this to mean critical issues relating to human, financial, material and facilities resources by providing oversight in these areas. This means that the Board receives briefings on such issues as succession management, vacancies, the budget, and financial effects of the fire program.</i>	
11. The agency adheres to accounting rules and other relevant financial controls.	<i>The Board understands this to mean the receipt of the annual statewide audit report from Secretary of State which highlights any variances in accounting rules or significant control weaknesses.</i>	

WORK PLAN APPENDIX
Oregon Board of Forestry | Governance Performance Measure
Best Management Practices Self-Evaluation Criteria
2020 Preliminary Review and Proposed Changes Input Form

Oregon Boards and Commissions Best Management Practices Performance Measure Criteria (2005) (Standard – Not Subject to Change)	Best Practices tailored by the Board Performance Measure Implementation Subcommittee and adopted by the Board of Forestry (2007)	Board of Forestry Preliminary Review and Proposed Changes on tailored Best Practices descriptions (2020)
12. Board members act in accordance with their roles as public representatives.	<i>The Board understands this to mean that they follow public meeting rules, the standard of conduct for Board members, and the public input process. Members received training and information from the Governor’s Office upon appointment.</i>	
13. The Board coordinates with others where responsibilities and interests overlap.	<i>The Board understands this to mean other public agencies and boards with statutory authority connections or overlaps, e.g. the Forest Trust Land Counties, the Oregon Environmental Quality Commission/Department of Environmental Quality; the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission/Department of Fish and Wildlife; the State Land Board; local fire districts; the United States Forest Service; the Bureau of Land Management..</i>	
14. The Board members identify and attend appropriate training sessions.	<i>The Board understands this to mean the workshops, symposia, and field tours that accompany some Board meetings, and that the Board receives adequate technical information.</i>	
15. The Board reviews its management practices to ensure best practices are utilized.	<i>The Board understands this to mean carrying out this self-evaluation on an annual basis, conducting the annual Board work plan status check, and by conducting the periodic scan of issues on a biennial basis.</i>	

WORK PLAN APPENDIX
Oregon Board of Forestry | Governance Performance Measure
Best Management Practices Self-Evaluation Criteria
2020 Preliminary Review and Proposed Changes Input Form

Oregon Boards and Commissions Best Management Practices Performance Measure Criteria (2005) (Standard – Not Subject to Change)	Best Practices tailored by the Board Performance Measure Implementation Subcommittee and adopted by the Board of Forestry (2007)	Board of Forestry Preliminary Review and Proposed Changes on tailored Best Practices descriptions (2020)
Listed below is an additional best practice for the Board of Forestry; not included in calculating the percentage adherence to best practices.		
16. The Board values public input and transparency in conducting its work through outreach to and engagement of stakeholders and by using its work plan communication tools. The Board also values input and communications with its standing advisory committees, special ad hoc committees and panels and external committees with board interests. (2007 – Board of Forestry)	<i>n/a</i>	
Board of Forestry Preliminary Review of Best Practices Criteria – New Criteria Proposed for 2020		
17.		
18.		
Summary Questions from Prior Evaluations	Board of Forestry Preliminary Review and Proposed Changes to Summary Questions (2020)	
1. How is the Board doing?		
2. What factors are affecting the Board’s results?		
3. What needs to be done to improve future performance?		
New Summary Questions Proposed for 2020		
4.		
5.		

BOARD OF FORESTRY WORK PLAN

OVERARCHING ISSUES

Background

The Partnership & Planning Program (P&P) serves the Board of Forestry (Board), ODF Divisions, coordinates policy analysis and input to the Governor's Office and other state agencies, and partners with federal land management agencies to achieve cross-boundary restoration work. In 2017, ODF merged the former Resource Planning Program with the Partnership Development Program to combine these functions. P&P is within the Administrative Services Division

As it relates to policy development, P&P houses agency expertise in forest ecology, forest economics, and economic development. P&P also coordinates Board strategic planning and work plan development. Under this wing, P&P develops and delivers Board work that does not fit squarely into one of the three operating Divisions. P&P also coordinates the agency's legislative efforts. Operationally, P&P functions as the administrative house for all grants from the US Forest Service and houses the Federal Forest Restoration Program which includes the project oversight for the implementation of the Good Neighbor Authority.

The Board Work Plan items included in this draft work plan are proposed as Potential Topics for 2020-2021. Work to develop an Ecosystem Services Valuation Framework would continue work the Board explored during 2019-2020. Work to revise the Forestry Program for Oregon would be considered a new effort, although the document is due for review and consideration for revision by the Board.

Work in Progress

- Not available

Potential Topic Items

Issue: Ecosystem Services Valuation

Overview: Ecosystem Services include a broad spectrum of benefits of our forest. Non-timber related ecosystem services can be difficult to quantify and value without a proper framework. In 2017, the Board identified Ecosystem Services as an Emerging Issue. P&P staff worked with the State Forester and experts at Oregon State University (OSU) to bring two agenda items to the Board regarding the valuation of ecosystem services in policy making. Board discussion and interest centered on continuing to explore the potential development of a framework that the Board could use to value ecosystem services in future policy discussions.

The valuation of Ecosystem Services (non-timber) is of interest to the Board of Forestry and the agency as a whole insofar as it can help inform a spectrum of decisions ranging from forest management plans to rule changes for the Forest Practices Act. At current, there is insufficient

data around values of ecosystem services in Oregon due to the complexity and costs of studies, timelines, and failure to reach consensus on “what are ecosystem services?” much less which services should be prioritized for valuation. Over the previous year P&P staff have provided opportunities for Drs. David Lewis and Randy Rosenberger to address the Board regarding frameworks for valuing ecosystem services that Oregon State University had conducted and a specific study regarding Oregon Coastal Coho. The presentations reinforced the complexity and time consuming nature of these studies while also providing a cost estimate (approximately \$250,000/study). One of the suggestions that David Lewis provided to the Board in his most recent presentation (June 2019) was that they focus on a few key ecosystem services to value. These services should be specific enough that the studies can be conducted (e.g., realistic) but also be able to serve as proxies/umbrellas for multiple goods.

Products/Actions: It would be important that the Board, along with Staff and researchers (possibly David Lewis), narrow down ecosystem services to three possibilities for further development of methodologies for valuation. This effort could take a several meetings to synthesize what services make sense and assess feedback from researchers on feasibility. The Board selected key ecosystem services would be contracted for valuation studies (possibly OSU) and monitoring.

Department staff would accommodate providing the framework for the Board on presentations and synthesis for what Services should be chosen. This work includes pulling in the right researchers for presentations and materials. Staff would then accommodate the contracting process for valuations.

Estimate of Board Time

- Framework Development: 6-12 months (depending on availability of university partners)
- Rule change-specific Analysis: 2 to 3 years. *Not proposed as part of this work plan. Each analysis would require significant time and budget.*

Issue: Forestry Program for Oregon Revision

Overview: The Forestry Program for Oregon (FPFO) serves as the strategic plan for the Board of Forestry. The purpose of the FPFO is to institute a comprehensive sustainable forest management policy framework for discussing and measuring performance on all Oregon public and private forest ownerships. The FPFO was last updated in 2011 and is due for review and consideration for revision by the Board

The State Forester and agency Executive Team have identified several values missing from the current FPFO and the need to update to ensure alignment with the agency’s values. In addition, throughout 2019, the Board has called for increased focus and attention on climate change as an urgent topic for the Board to elevate in its work.

The 2011 FPFO relied heavily on the 2003 edition for its foundation. The Board updated its mission, vision, and value statements in 2011, though the seven strategies identified in the 2003

document were relabeled as goals and largely remained unchanged. The FPFO adopted in 2011 is a highly layered document with five Vision statements, eleven Values, and seven Goals, each with no less than seven Objectives.

The most significant change was the inclusion of ratings information for the new 19 Oregon indicators of sustainable forest management, based on Oregon Roundtable on Sustainable Forests input. These Indicators were intended as a metric to inform the Board on pertinent issues, to measure performance, and inform policy, regulatory, and management decisions. In order to ensure that Board members had up to date information in a timely fashion, the Indicators were intended to be updated and reported on a regular basis. In 2015, the Board de-emphasized this set of Indicators acknowledging that the Indicators framework when reported on in lump sum had multiple missing pieces and multiple points of redundancy. In November 2014, the Board moved away from the Indicators as a single framework. The Board recognized the importance of maintaining these data sets and in building relationships with partners that help maintain and provide data. Instead of annual Indicator reports, the Board asked that Department staff bring forward similar information on pertinent issues as they arise.

An initial discussion with the Board in October 2019 indicated there was interest in revising the current FPFO.

Products/Actions:

- The product and actions will be developed in response to Board discussion and interest. Questions to consider include:
 - Amend existing FPFO or initiate a wholesale revision?
 - What type of strategic plan? How in depth?
 - Use a Subcommittee approach?
 - Conduct outreach (e.g., focus groups) to ensure voices of all Oregonians (in addition to public comment at Board meetings)?

Estimate of Board Time

- Revision of the FPFO will require significant Board agenda time, likely requiring more than two years to fully develop. A phased approach that recognizes Board/Chair transition over the next year would focus initial effort on revising the Mission, Vision and Values. A second phase after Board Chair transition in 2021 would focus on development of Goals and Objectives.

Issue: Climate Change and Forest Carbon

Overview: Throughout 2019-2020, the Board explored various aspects of climate and carbon policy relevant to Oregon's forests. In particular, the Board reviewed the results in the Forest Ecosystem Carbon Report based on inventory data from Forest Inventory Analysis plots. This report showed that Oregon's forests sequester 30 million metric tons of CO₂e per year. In addition, the Board reviewed Board work dating back to 2015 on climate policy and reviewed how ODF Divisions have incorporated climate change into operations. Throughout 2019, the

Board continued to discuss climate change and forest carbon as an urgent policy topic for their work in 2020-2021, identifying several specific topics of interest, including, but not limited to:

- Impact of climate change on forest water quality, including riparian buffer widths.
- Review all of the FPA rules to determine which may need to be updated in light of new scientific information on climate change.
- Include climate change and adaptation/mitigation as a principle and goal in State Forests Management Plan.
- Policy choices and analysis tools to optimize long-term carbon storage, including forest management and wood products utilization.
- Development of a forest carbon offset protocol.
- Revision of the Forestry Program for Oregon climate goal and objectives.

Products/Actions:

- Review data from the Harvested Wood Products Analysis Report in June 2020 (companion to the Forest Ecosystem Carbon Report)
- Additional steps to be determined after discussion with the Board

Estimate of Board Time

- To be determined after discussion with the Board

Overarching Issues Work Plan – April 2020-March 2022

	2020					2021					2022			
	Apr	Jun	July	Sep	Nov	Jan	Mar	Apr	Jun	July	Sep	Nov	Jan	Mar
WORK IN PROGRESS														
Item 1														
<i>Milestones</i>														
• asdf														
• asdf														
• asdf														
POTENTIAL TOPICS														
Ecosystem Services Valuation			Framework Development											
Forestry Program for Oregon Revision	Mission, Vision, Values					Goals, Objectives (public outreach)								
Climate Change and Forest Carbon		i												

Matrix Key:
 i – Informational item

Agenda Item No.:	7
Work Plan	Administrative
Topic:	Legislative Concepts for 2021 Legislative Session
Presentation Title:	Legislative Concept Guiding Principles and Initial Ideas
Date of Presentation:	January 8, 2020
Contact Information:	Chad Davis, Director, Partnership & Planning Program 503-602-2130 or chad.davis@oregon.gov

SUMMARY

This agenda item seeks Board input and direction on:

- Draft guiding principles that guide the development of legislative concepts and
- Initial ideas for agency-led legislative concepts for the 2021 legislative session

CONTEXT

Legislative concept development, a part of the Board's and Department's strategic planning cycle, begins in the fall of odd-numbered years. Agency-led legislative concepts may result in bills that will be introduced during the 2021 legislative session. The development of legislative concepts serve to seek authority to advance Board and Department goals, objectives and priorities, or to address current barriers resulting from current or lack of existing statutes.

Development of legislative concepts is an iterative process that includes engagement with the Board, Department leadership, stakeholders and the Governor's Office. The 2021 legislative concepts will be due to the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) and the Governor's Office by in April 2020. Review at the highest level of the Executive Branch generally focuses on alignment with statewide budget and policy considerations, and with the Governor's priorities.

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Guiding principles for developing Legislative Concepts

The agency's executive team has utilized a set of principles to guide development of legislative concepts. These are submitted for the Board's consideration:

2021 legislative concept development will:

Seek input and ensure alignment. Key inputs for legislative concepts include alignment with other elements of the Board's and Department's strategic planning cycle, such as:

- Board and Department's strategic initiatives
- Board and Department work plans
- Governor's priorities
- Public input from Board meetings and other sources

Consider the political and economic environments. These factors may render some legislative concepts more viable, necessary or timely than others. This environment requires ongoing assessment as concepts are developed.

Consider feasibility / workload. The number and complexity of concepts should reflect the Department's capacity to engage in the necessary outreach and legislative interaction. Some concepts are relatively simple, non-controversial, and/or offer opportunities for "housekeeping" changes. Others are larger in scale, and may connect to or establish major statewide policy direction.

Initial Legislative Concepts for 2021 Legislative Session

The following list, presented for Board consideration and discussion, represents preliminary thinking about possible 2021 concepts.

Fire Protection Division

- None

State Forests Division

- The Division continues to explore legislative concepts. We are engaging in collaborative efforts with stakeholders and county commissioners to explore concepts that promote efficient management and continued investments in Oregon's State Forests. Examples include a forest land transfer and the ability to sell isolated parcels or conservation easements. To have the authority to sell lands with limited performance potential as revenue-generating assets and sell conservation easements that provide high-value recreational or conservation benefits, would provide greater financial stability over time. Currently, the Division can exchange and purchase property. The intent of new legislation would be to complement our existing authorities to optimize the management of these public forests to best achieve greatest permanent value for the people of Oregon.

Private Forests Division

- **Forest Products Harvest Tax Rate.** Historically, legislation has been introduced each session to set tax rates for Forest Practices Act administration, support of the Oregon State University (OSU) Forest Research Laboratory, and professional forestry education at the College of Forestry, OSU. For the Department of Forestry, when combined with public funds (General Fund), the bill maintains the concept of shared responsibility for the Forest Practices program delivery between the general public and program recipients.

Administrative Services Division

- None

RECOMMENDATION

The Department recommends the Board review the proposed guiding principles and initial draft list of legislative concepts, and provide direction on desired changes.

NEXT STEPS

Based on guidance received through this agenda item, staff will continue developing concepts and return to the March Board meeting for approval to submit the Department's Legislative Concepts.

STAFF REPORT

Agenda Item No.:	8
Work Plan:	Administrative Work Plan
Topic:	Executive Sessions
Presentation Title:	Executive Session
Date of Presentation:	January 8, 2020
Contact Information:	Oregon Department of Justice

SUMMARY

The Board will meet in Executive Session for the purpose of reviewing the State Forester's Annual Performance, pursuant to ORS 192.660(2) (i).

