



Committee for Family Forestlands Special Meeting Summary for November 6th, 2023



Under public notice made by news release with statewide distribution, a meeting of the Committee for Family Forestlands [an advisory body to the Oregon Board of Forestry with authority established in Oregon Revised Statute 527.650] was convened on November 6th, 2023 as a virtual online meeting. Meeting recordings constitute the official record.

CFF Committee members participating:

Wendy Gerlach, Citizen-At-Large (Voting)
Gary Jensen, Southern Oregon Landowner Rep. (Voting)
Kate McMichael, Landowner-At-Large Rep. (Voting)
Dave Bugni, Northwest Landowner Rep. (Voting)
Eric Kranzush, Industry rep (Voting)
Glenn Ahrens, OSU College of Forestry Ext. Ex-Officio
Julie Woodward, OFRI Ex-Officio
Rick Zenn, OSWA Executive Administrator Ex-Officio
Amanda Sullivan-Astor, Forest Policy Manager AOL Ex-Officio
Kaola Swanson, Conservation Rep. (Voting)

ODF Staff attending:

Heather Hendersen, Administrative Specialist
Mike Kroon, Deputy Chief – All Lands
Josh Hanson, SFISH Coordinator
Angela Malcolm-Stucker, SFO Implementation Coordinator
Abigail Spagle, Tax & RD Tracking Coordinator
Jessie Ebert, Implementation Support Manager
Tom Fields, Fire Prevention Coordinator

Members not in attendance:

Maurizio Valerio, EO Landowner Rep. (Voting)

Guests/Public:

Lynn McDonald, Small Landowner
Sharon Waterman, Small Landowner
Margaret Miller, Department of Environmental Quality
Ben Deumling, Board of Forestry

Chair Comments.

- Chair Gerlach calls the meeting to order.
- Asks for comments on the agenda/meeting minutes.
- Recognized a quorum was established.

Technical Guidance Document Review.

- Open up for comments on SFISH –
 - Kate McMichael – I have a general comment that could go for several of them, wondering what the final form will look like as there appear to be multiple versions, one was more of a picture version and the other more text.
 - There are 3 products, the technical guidance, a form which is to help landowners complete the assessment, and the how to guide which is more illustrated. All three are open to review.
 - Kate McMichael - Some things noted, there is the application form that follows the product development and completion but it came much earlier in the document, you had to read through to realize you only had to complete it after you were confirmed that you met program requirements, maybe place it later in the document so that people do things in the correct order. There was also a form that says figure 10 but there is no figure 10, I believe it should be figure 9. Look at all these and place them in order.
 - Especially for the SFISH documents the only thing landowners have to do on their own is the application form, but everything else you see is all going to be done by the forester/Oregon

- Department of Forestry unless a landowner wants to try and do it themselves or hire a consultant.
- Wendy Gerlach – I had the same thought that Kate did as far as the order, there is a sentence that says the technical guidance does not address the project development process of grant recipient responsibilities, it's clear now what you meant, but maybe include another piece in that overview that encapsulates what you just said.
 - Josh – Early on this wasn't really intended to be an external document, but there is value in transparency and showing how we got there. As for your and Kate's comments there will be additional details and guidance for the grant recipients.
 - Kaola Swanson – As you finalize this, the more you can link when it references using the pages in the technical guidance to the actual guidance the better.
 - Eric Kranzush – I had a question for the term associated with parcel. I think there was mixed confusion on what a parcel is with the agency vs. individual. I view a parcel to be more associated with the harvest unit and the tax lots associated with where the harvest is occurring. I just want to go on record as an advocate for the small woodland community asking the community to do a Road Conditions Assessment for their entire ownership prior to harvest is a large undertaking. Some of those individuals may actually require some of the funding from the harvest to make the improvements required by the Road Conditions Assessment, want to make sure the definition of parcel matches the tax lots under which the harvest operation would be conducted.
 - Eric Kranzush – Number of places where use of the words maintenance vs improvement get confounded. If we could create some common language on how the rest of the world looks at road maintenance vs road improvements, there could be some value there.
 - Amanda Sullivan-Astor – For the technical guidance it seems very process oriented. Will there be additional resources for consulting foresters and operators that do consulting work that will be more geared to that audience as opposed to this which seems a little more focused on internal staff? For someone who may be looking to help a landowner apply for this.
 - This will be a public document.
 - Comments on the Road Conditions Assessment Document –
 - Charlie Waterman - In the Coos Bay meeting they indicated we didn't need to fill out the water crossing, but then later I was told that I do have to fill those out.
 - If it is a typed stream, we need the water crossing location and evaluation/status of that culvert. If it is simply a cross stream/ditch relief culvert, we do not need the evaluation. We can be sure to add that to the training to ensure that this information is covered and understood.
 - Wendy Gerlach – Relates to the section “When should I use the assessment”, to me where it says that it has to be submitted with a notification of operation that includes the harvest of timber or when applying for SFISH, it might be useful after this to put some examples of things that do not require an Road Conditions Assessment.
 - Josh – In terms of if someone is going into FERNs to notify, FERNs will tell them whether or not they need to submit an Road Conditions Assessment, if a landowner wants to complete an Road Conditions Assessment they can do that voluntarily. Doing this is different from SFISH, as they can do it independently from SFISH or FERNs, there will be a website where they can download the form and email that back to the Small Forestland Owner office. Can add the webpage to the guides.
 - Wendy Gerlach – This section could still be beefed up to provide additional information.

- Julie Woodward – Circling back to the comment that Eric made about the definition of a parcel, does Oregon Department of Forestry have a response to that about the path moving forward because this is a really big difference in the conversations from where we started, even when putting together the illustrated manual. Has there been any resolution on the path forward we will be taking?
 - Josh Hanson – Parcel is the key word that is in the rule, the rule is clear that it is all the roads in the parcel where harvesting will occur, the rule also indicates it is encouraged that landowners assess roads in other parcels that they may own where the operation is not occurring.
 - Wendy Gerlach – How does that related to the transport? The road that is used to transport from a harvest parcel to another location.
 - Josh Hanson - If you have more than one parcel and your operation is in one parcel and then you are hauling through another unit and then back on your parcel, technically the way the rule reads, that does not need to be included in the Road Conditions Assessment however that road is still considered part of the overall notification process, it is still subject to Private Forest Accord rules.
 - Eric – Encourage Oregon Department of Forestry to look at defining that rule differently to be less onerous to a small woodland owner, my fear is unduly burdening folks with larger Road Conditions Assessment analysis that are pertinent to their harvest unit, may push a few landowners to say I can't afford this so I just won't do it or walk away entirely from owning land which I believe we want to discourage from happening so I encourage you to look at interpreting that definition to make it less onerous to the landowner.
- Kate McMichael – Is the form in something that we got? I know that question has come up in other trainings.
 - Josh Hanson – Appendix A is the form, as of the date we submitted it.
- Kate McMichael – Thinking as a small landowner user, there are lots of links to the rules, but each link takes you to page 1, could be helpful even to just say what page to look at. If you haven't spent a lot of time with this version, it's a lot. The ordering of the sections, the PDF version was a great document but the ordering of each section didn't make much sense to me. Maybe look at the ordering.
- Julie Woodward – Get a little clarification, I have heard verbally there would be exceptions to the Road Conditions Assessment, where a forester could give a delay in the requirement. I have not seen this in any of the rules.
 - Josh Hanson – Have not heard anything regarding exceptions.
 - Mike Kroon – Will maybe need to circle back with Scott, as I have also not heard anything regarding any exceptions.
- Josh Hanson – To go back to Kate, is this more in reference to the illustrated version or the technical guide?
 - Kate McMichael - More regarding the illustrated version. The PDF version had more pictures.
- Eric Kranzush – There isn't a lot of discussion or awareness of instream work windows associated with when someone would have to do their culvert replacement project for fish or bridge, can this be added for small forestland owners who would have to time their harvest unit in time with instream work windows with SFISH.
 - Josh Hanson - In the workplan and the timing we have a second technical guidance that is in draft right now. We can reference it in the Road Conditions Assessment or SFISH technical guidance. SFISH is a grant program, going to try and make it as nimble as possible. Trying to be proactive to identify things, so a landowner will likely need to wait a certain amount of time so tying an SFISH project to a harvest operation, it likely will not happen that way, it's

- just not nimble enough to do that unfortunately. I can provide an email on the nuances in an email.
 - Wendy Gerlach - On Page 23 of the Road Conditions Assessment there is a reference to SFISH, could be helpful to add some of the things that you just said to this section.
 - Amanda Sullivan-Astor – (In chat) Links to rules should go to specific pages in the January 2024 rule book, not the July 2023 rule book : <https://www.oregon.gov/odf/Documents/workingforests/fpa-rule-book-2024.pdf>
 - Amanda Sullivan-Astor – The links to the rules should be updated in the how to guide. All SFISH links go to a 404-error page, those need to be updated. Looking at the layers list in the legend, it's not showing any of the stream layers on there, not sure if that's just an error but want to make sure people have access to the links for the stream typing.
 - Josh Hanson – Especially on the how to guide and some of the links they are earlier versions that had to be tied to this, the form that you see in the material provided will be changed based on the information provided in this meeting and make sure all the links are updated.
- Comments on Tax Credit Guidance –
 - Wendy Gerlach – Isn't there also a dry channel option that is for 50% of the timber value? I was wondering about that and didn't think it came across clearly in the document.
 - Abigail – There are a number of areas where some things got lost in the texts where I think that some visuals and call outs would be helpful, and that was one of them. Having something that would help clarify the stumpage value would be helpful.
 - Amanda Sullivan-Astor – Highlight on page 8, it has a heading called “Methods of Professional Foresters” I would suggest changing that title, there are Certified Foresters and Registered Foresters in other states, we don't have that here in Oregon. We have a lot of people who know how to cruise timber who may not consider themselves professional foresters who didn't go to school for Forestry may be a little degrading to people. Focus more on the methods for cruising/grazing vs. focusing on the title. And through the rest of the document suggest maybe looking at that.
 - Kaola Swanson – Unsure on where we are for the state of this document, as it becomes more public facing hoping it becomes more like the other technical guidance, it is a lot to get through and if we could maybe put more on how to follow along.
 - Abigail Spagle – The plan would be to add a few more visuals as we go along in this process. Based on some of the feedback, having a really short executive summary to really clearly outline what the process is could be helpful. We will also be adding a welcome letter after notifying their intent to be part of the program.
 - Wendy Gerlach – One way of avoid the problem of people not understanding could be to provide an example of the three situations to help people understand when it might apply to them or when they might want to use this.
 - Julie Woodward – Really like the draft workflow and summary, I do think there will be times when they are using a professional forester to use them, may be helpful to add in Oregon Department of Forestry Forester, or to put Stewardship Forester just to be really clear on if it is the landowner or a forester because especially with this process in particular there could be a lot of other foresters involved.
 - Abigail Spagle - We had a number of questions/concerns related with the actual text of the rule. I do feel it is important to provide the rule as currently written but taking the comments we have received into consideration to make some alterations and addressed in other ways while still keeping the actual rule language as written.
 - Wendy – Having good links could be useful.

- David Bugni – OFRI has always done an amazing job of creating an Illustrated Forest Practices Act User Guide, the graphics are well done and it is written in a way the common person can really understand what is going on without getting into the weeds too much. Is this something that OFRI would dovetail with?
 - Julie Woodward – We have been working on that closely with the department, cannot finalize until some of these conversations and rules are finalized. The technical guidance is really important for that piece, and then we can take those and bring those forward. Some of this is so technical compared to what we have had in the past so it will take us a little longer to get things finalized. Hoping to have it by early 2024, but don't make any promises as there are a lot of details still being worked through.
- Amanda Sullivan-Astor – Will there be anything in this specific technical guidance on the eligibility around the percentage of a watershed that is able to use the credit and how that works as far as the first come first serve?
 - Abigail Spagle - That will be added to this one, will be a section related to how the calculation will happen, how to be made aware of if that cap has been reached.
- Josh Hanson – For SFISH, I had one question on your written comments, the comment is on accountability metrics, wasn't sure if that meant what the program is actually funding vs. accountability metrics like when the project gets assessed and how many are determined to be eligible? What was the intent there on that comment?
 - Wendy Gerlach – Will follow up on this to get clarification.
- Julie Woodward – (in chat) The Eastside packet will be publicly available soon.
- Glenn Ahrens – Given how rapidly the technical guidance along with the rules have been developed what is the outlook for the possible revision to the guides over time and how you see that working, with how quickly these have had to be developed I would think there would be a need for that.
 - Josh Hanson – In terms of technical guidance, there are some things that may process wise on how frequently we update things, but for SFISH and Road Conditions Assessments these are new rules we will learn a lot here in the first year, I see a lot of things coming due to this that would require us to make some changes. I would envision SFISH and Road Conditions Assessment there will be some changes that will occur here next year, but there is a process that will be tied to this.
 - Abigail Spagle – It has been my attention at the 3-month mark and 6-month mark to reevaluate what we need in the guide. And then also looking at the year mark in 2025 at what other updates may need to be made based on the previous years findings.
 - Mike Kroon – We do have Nicole Stapp, who is our OPA4, who will be working on the updates as they come up. When you change 110 rules, there are bound to be issues with some of those rules as time goes on. She will be the one kind of spearheading it. Just keep in mind this tax credit officially kicks in in 2024 but you cannot claim in until 2025 so there will be stuff that comes up.
- Amanda Sullivan-Astor – On the SFISH, I assume that there will be a period in time that applications are being accepted for SFISH, and then a period of review, and then notification. Is this what you are working on now with how that process will work?
 - Josh Hanson – In the first year it will be fairly undefined and we will figure that out as we see the volume and frequency. As for applications as once the door is open, it is always open but yes, we will have to set some given time periods as far as we have this set in the program now, we are going to look at and review these and give them some money but other applications can still come in. As far as an actual cycle, it's probably going to be looking at this

first year, seeing how many applications we get and then have a little bit more defined cycles for future years.

- Amanda Sullivan-Astor – To clarify the advice would be get the applications done as soon as you can but at this time there is no set date for when they must be in by to be eligible for this year’s funding opportunity.

Forestry Program for Oregon Update.

- Ben Deumling provides update on the Forestry Program for Oregon.
- Oregon Department of Forestry’s formal process should take place in February where the draft will be taken for public comment.
- Name has been changed to Vision of Oregon’s Forests.
- Mike Kroon – If the Board would like the Committee for Family Forestlands to comment officially then we would need to leave it up to them to make that ask.
- Ben Deumling – This is a very informal conversation to help Ben when he goes into the next subcommittee meeting.

Forestry Program for Oregon Discussion.

- Rick Zenn – Make a suggestion that when we do a formal discussion bring Robin in to help us since she has been such a big help with all of this. Appreciate the lead time on this. My sense from attending the meetings and after the last Committee for Family Forestland report, the Small Forestland Owners are on the boards radar screen and they are thinking about us, do we have to keep pushing? Is there some work that we need to do?
 - Ben Deumling – Always, yes keep pushing. As an interest group, SFO’s are not as vocal sometimes as other interest groups, yet you make up a very significant chunk of Oregon’s forestlands so the more engagement at the board level is good.
- Kaola Swanson – Overall, one that I had is in the glossary of terms there should be a lot more, if this is a stand alone document don’t want people to have to go look at other documents for example. My take away is this is the Board of Forestry speaking on the vision of forest management for Oregon and it’s directed I think the ultimate user is the Oregon Department of Forestry and their staff, and if I am reading that correctly I think that when we are looking at the strategies than maybe we need to look at putting “Oregon Department of Forestry Staff” at the beginning of every sentence. If that is incorrect, I think this still feels bigger picture, and how do we take this to implementation? Can we talk about integrating data, the cycle it will be update, more about how we get from the vision to this document?
 - Ben Deumling – To answer who the audience is, Oregon Department of Forestry is one of them but we are looking more than that. This should be a both internal and external document. It is a way for the board and Oregon Department of Forestry to communicate with the outside world, this is how we envision forest management in Oregon. Want it to read plainly enough that a non-technical practitioner can read it and understand what is going on.
- Kate McMichael – Kudos to all of you that are part of the meetings/retreats. One question I have is, would the notes that I took from listening to the 4 hours on this topic at the Board of Forestry and also through reading through the draft, would these notes be helpful to you? There was a lot of discussion on passive and active management, passive is just neglect. A pitch that intentional is actually a nice word for this broad audience that you are envisioning. One of the big elephants in the room is that it’s a Vision for Oregon’s Forests but really it’s more focused on a third of Oregon’s forests that the state and private landowners have an active role they can take in making those choices. Not sure how this can be addressed, I know there is data out there

but I wonder how many Oregonians understand there are different jurisdictions responsible for the forests and not all forests are the same and that we can't tell everyone what to do.

- David Bugni – Going to provide a quick boot on the ground example of what I think needs to be done here, governments are famous for writing plans, but you have to be able to take this information and convey it to thousands of people. When you develop a program like this that includes public involvement, gets them educated, believes its not a big government ram down your throat kind of program, make sure to get the right advertising then it can be effective otherwise I just don't think this is going to happen.
- Amanda Sullivan-Astor – To piggyback a little bit on Kate's comments, I wanted to get clarity. I thought there had been discussion that there would be a call out box on the different types of landowners and jurisdictions. Is that still going to happen?
 - Ben Deumling – Yes, I believe the plan is still to create this.
- Julie Woodward – Encourage to look at the Oregon Forest Facts booklet. There is some easy public consumption available to help look at the story of what is going on. Also, would like to mimic that talking with the public on forestry right now the word "plan", with this really being more of a vision that you want people to grab onto this maybe just be aware of how the word "plan" is being viewed. Look at this as this isn't a requirement, this is just a vision for a bigger goal.
- Rick Zenn – Something we bring to the table is the word voluntary, this is something we believe strongly in. If you set something up and it is good and valuable then people will make good decisions. Voluntary vs regulation and prescription is something we believe works well without community. The other thing is incentives, how can we incentivize landowners who are currently doing something or those who aren't doing anything to do better or something different.
- Kaola Swanson – (in chat) Do we want to minimize forest loss and conversion in the state? maintain forestlands for all of their many benefits to the climate, habitat, economy, drinking water, etc. Maybe some goals that are more measurable to sit on top of resilience and wildfire?
- Eric Kranzush – To piggyback on some of what Rick said, from the perspective to this committee the strength of the small landownership is in its variety of management styles. Regarding the resilience comment I think it's too look for incentives that we keep our working forests working, currently the biggest challenge we face is passive ownership in both large landowners and small.
 - Ben Deumling – Could you provide specific examples of passive ownership and the challenges that come with that?
 - Eric Kranzush – Provided examples of various passive ownership.
 - Kaola Swanson – Want to minimize forest loss and conversion. There are some ways even at a higher level, we need to say Oregon is a state that is heavily forested that provides many opportunities and we value them.
- Wendy Gerlach – Thinking of the condition of the forest and the eco system health could help determine how the forest should be managed. I believe the comment about management being a somewhat problematic term could be true. The tool that can be used really depends on the forest and how it's being used. The management tool isn't really the goal, the health of the forest is. Big picture, thinking about the document, I would say in a cautionary way, I like having a vision but in order to get to a vision sometimes you start using very vague terms. I hope in the document when there ends up being different ways to achieve a goal, instead of trying to discuss a lot of which is best and then maybe compromise it as vague maybe say that there are these way to achieve goals of resilience.
- Kate McMichael – One of the parts of the conversation that the group on the retreat was talking about is there incentivizing a group of species? There is a bit of a complicated dance that can happen with maintaining forest status, but if the push is to reforest with a specific set of species. Looking at how it can help diversify to help with climate resilience.

- Amanda Sullivan-Astor – There should be more of a focus on why we need a Vision for Oregon’s Forests. Will there be additional work on this? Or would this group be able to provide additional input/comments when we do more formal comments?
 - Ben Deumling – That could be helpful.
- Ben Deumling – The fire goal, is a little squishy still, I would be curious to hear from the group how you think of fire, if you were writing this document, what would you like to see when it comes to fire? How do we frame our relationship with fire?
 - Kate McMichael – Thought it was a really interesting part of the conversation. How do we educate on the different ways we interact with fire on the landscape, understanding how fire is fought, how it can be a management tool, how it is paid for. All of this is important for understanding how it can be linked to resilience.
 - Kaola Swanson – To piggyback on Kate’s comment there could be a section on fire education and on wildfire in the forest. Lots of people have limited idea of what is actually going on. Being able to really see how everything interacts as an all Oregon all Westerners issue, how do we set up the conversation?
 - Amanda Sullivan-Astor – I sit on the environmental justice counsel so with how it relates to wildfire and thinking about smoke burdens and the health effects of smoke, and the way wildfire effects communities, is this something that could be added in there?
 - Wendy Gerlach – If the draft document there are areas where it talks about the forest being a threat, that doesn’t seem right to me because a resilient forest is not a threat. Fire in the forest especially in areas that are not well placed, is a recipe for disaster, so part of the vision should be avoiding conversion in the sense of not having development happening away from forestry uses into communities that are remote and not effective defensive communities. This relates to the smoke burden and other things like that.
- Margaret Miller – (in chat) Oregon Department of Forestry, OHA and DEQ are already working together on smoke issues both for Rx Burning and wildfires. Ryan Miller and Tim Holschbach are key Oregon Department of Forestry contacts.
- Julie Woodward – Encourage looking more into collaborative/community response in what they can do together. Argue this is really important to encourage and fund those, we saw this a lot in Senate Bill 762 and being able to use those funds for some really important projects.
- Eric Kranzush – Oregonians are starting to get that good fire is good for us, and using good fire we can prevent bad fire. I think the vision should be highlighting some of the good things that are being done through the department. Look at fire as how we use it as a tool, how we use it to help the health of our population.