



Committee for Family Forestlands Special Meeting Summary for May 20, 2024



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 May 20th, 2024, as a virtual online meeting. Meeting recordings constitute the official record.

CFF Committee members participating:

Wendy Gerlach, Citizen-At-Large (Voting)
Kate McMichael, Landowner-At-Large Rep. (Voting)
Rick Zenn, OSWA Executive Administrator Ex-Officio
Glenn Ahrens, OSU College of Forestry Ext. Ex-Officio
Amanda Sullivan-Astor, Forest Policy Manager AOL Ex-Officio
Dave Bugni, NW Landowner Rep. (Voting)
Maurizio Valerio, EO Landowner Rep. (Voting)
Eric Kranzush, Industry rep (Voting) Hampton Family Forests
Julie Woodward, OFRI Ex-Officio

ODF Staff attending:

Heather Hendersen, Administrative Specialist
Mike Kroon, Deputy Chief – All Lands
Miriam Miller, Administrative Specialist

Members not in attendance:

Gary Jensen, Southern Oregon Landowner Rep. (Voting)
Kaola Swanson, Conservation Rep. (Voting)

Guests/Public:

Ben Deumling, Board of Forestry Member
Ann Walker, Private Consultant
Laura Wilkeson, Hampton
Randy Hereford, Starker Forests

Chair Comments.

- Chair Gerlach calls meeting to order.
- Quorum established.

Vision for Oregon’s Forests Comments.

- Wendy Gerlach – Because it is a very big picture document, I think we can just go through each member and go over our big picture thoughts on the document.
- Ben Deumling – I mostly just want to listen but I’ve really appreciated all of the time we have spent on this document. We are a little bit at the 11th hour, this comment period came quite late but I think that whatever you as a committee come up with and forward to Joy would be the right process. I will do my best to see if we can shoehorn and of these comments into the document before we vote to approve the first part of June. This is sort of a two-part document, there is the Vision and then the Strategies, there will be a lot more work on the second half so I just want to be sure that people don’t get hung up on the strategies as they still have a lot of work to go.
- Dave Bugni – On page 8 and 9 which is on resilient communities I think that’s where I was thinking more deeply about that section, and I think you’ve got a placeholder there for environmental justice strategy. That’s really something that needs to be tackled by more than just us, but then I think for resilience, the first time I read it I missed the last bullet point which is a carry over on page 9, but when I think of resilient communities I think of resilience to natural disturbance, particularly wildfire. I see that you’ve got that there, but I think that’s

probably, to me, a big deal. It's always great to write visions and goals. We as a committee there are a lot of things in this document that we could help with if we assigned tasks when appropriate.

- Kate McMichael – By the time I got to the end and saw the appendix, I wonder if that should be a prefix vs an appendix. If you are hoping this document will be broad and include people who are not in the loop, you need to do everything you can to get them in the loop.
- Maurizio Valerio – Very well written document, clearly many hours have gone into making it. I have a few things to point out, many times the words rural, suburban, and urban have been used in the same sentence implying the same burden, when in reality the vision should convey the burden on forestry has been historically and currently been tilted substantially on the rural populations. The second thought was about resilient communities the word place based has been used as part of the vision, this point is great however, at the end of the day it requires very specific strategies on how decisions are going to be conducted. Place based is only as good as we really practice the inclusion not in the room as we talked about it but later on as decisions are made at the end of the process.
- Eric Kranzush – Wanted to point out my concern overall, I'm hung up over the first paragraph of the document. I don't like the idea that we are starting out a vision for Oregon's forests claiming that our forests are in decline and that's due in large part to in essence a component of that being historic forest management. I think this is very cruel to landowners who are committed to their property and its management. If it were my choice, I would cut the entire first paragraph. I don't think it really has a place and sets a bad tone for the rest of the document. In this document it feels like the economic side is completely missing. But I think one of the things we are seeing across the West is, especially in states like Montana, where they are now in a restoration role on a lot of their lands, they don't have any manufacturing facilities or economic systems that can support those efforts. So, it seems to me, that what's in here is almost our manufacturing conversations and our economics are basically in here by force, as opposed to being an equal balance of social and environmental.
- Rick Zenn – First, Maurizio mentioned the place-based approach and that really resonates for our members. I think the document really needs to define what the space is. I like the idea of the place based, but what's the place who is it based on? Second, On page 21 towards the end, Forest Resource Division has Urban Forests and has nothing on Small Forestland Owners/Private Lands, and they need to be included in there. Third, is sort of overall is the value of private lands. There are people that we run into all the time that don't know there is private forestland, and they don't know it is owned by private forestland owners and they are responsible for it. On page 3, on the first page, it is one of the few places I could find it, it's called forest products infrastructure and I can't think of any owner who would call themselves that. So again, that was an opportunity to ease out the value of this very large number of stewards of the state's forests on social, economic and environmental. Fourth, the economic contribution of the Small forestland owners is important, and this role is missing in this document. Fifth, I agree with Eric that that first paragraph is a negative and should be taken out. The last one and number six, the financial model of how all this works is complex, we are struggling with this wildfire funding issue and who pays for it. I wish the document had more of a section on the funding model for the department.
- Amanda Sullivan-Astor – One of the things that I noticed, there is technically a difference between resilience and adaptation when it comes to climate change. We tend to focus on resiliency throughout this document, so from a technical perspective, there is a difference between the two and I don't think it's bad that we talk about both but we might want to be consistent in our language and what we are addressing. In the goals for the resilient forest, the last sentence says "The Department of Forestry has the tools to incentivize and support this work" not sure if that should be worded differently to show it is a goal? If it's a statement, not sure that I agree. If it's a goal that we are striving to achieve, then maybe re-wording it as such would be better. I don't want the department to get into a situation where we are basically telling the legislature we have everything we need; I don't think that's where we currently find ourselves. At the end under strategies, the third bullet point on page 6, there's one of the strategies that talks about engaging with the governor's office and legislature on potential

incentives. I would maybe put before that landowners to identify what those incentive structures should be. One thing I wanted to highlight, perhaps the inclusion somewhere around partnering with the Oregon prescribed fire council. I think it would be appropriate as a call out within the section under the strategies as a key partner.

- Julie Woodward – Two things I haven't heard from the group yet, one of the goals of this committee has always been about infrastructure and especially east side infrastructure. There is a small paragraph on page 3 about infrastructure, but I don't see anything reflected in any of the strategies related to infrastructure. Just thinking that might have been missed or it may be an opportunity for the Board to think about some strategies for actual practice to come into play around infrastructure. My other comment, on page 6 for example, there's sometimes reference about rules for incentives, and we have seen a lot of research that for landowners, more rules don't incentivize people, so I would caution using that verbiage. We have incentive programs, and we have rule programs, and we don't often find the rules lead to incentives I would just put it out there to think about. I also agree that the terminology used for the historic forest management may not fit the vision you want to put in people's heads.
- Eric Kranzush – Forgot to mention, I'm a little concerned about the idea of balancing a climate smart forestry with a carbon plan with our wildfire program and our resilient forests. Those toe a tight line in Oregon. If we are going to incentivize people to add more biomass to the landscape, that creates a challenge with regard to our resilient forests. Concerned that tying those three together through the department with objectives, it's going to make a very tough rule making progress as all three of those come to a head.
- Amanda Sullivan-Astor – Ben – I see under the new version under the shared values, I know there was some discussion during the board meeting around the people centric vs forest centric, that that got removed. But under the ones that were previously people centric that I think the intent of those is that they are ODF centric, so maybe make some adjustments there to clarify that. Getting back to Julie's point that there doesn't seem to be many strategies around those pieces to tie into that shared value that got added around forestry infrastructure. One thing I had highlighted in my comments is around wildfire. Addressing the wildfire crisis, but could be relevant to resilient forests as well, is something around maintaining vibrant forest workforce, including loggers, builders, forest operators. You could expand that milling infrastructure as well to ensure mitigation efforts can be achieved and the complete and coordinated system can continue to function with its intimate benefits to Oregonians. Thinking about that to tie in to the complete and coordinated system and that if we don't maintain those workforces, it's not just forest health that might be compromised but our wildfire fighting apparatus as well and I don't think Oregonians at large quite understand that.
- Amanda Sullivan-Astor (in chat) - Maintain a vibrant forest workforce (loggers, road builders, and other such forest operators) to ensure mitigation efforts can be achieved and the complete and coordinated system can continue to function with its in-kind benefits to Oregonians.
- Wendy Gerlach – It would be nice to have more economic and funding details. It would have made sense to me to mention the Private Forest Accord because it is such a key part. There must have been a strategy to leave it out but would like to see it in there. I would like to see a reference to how that can be work that's already been done that will promote this vision that you've developed. My mind also stuck on the resilient communities language, which was a place where I was expecting there to be references to small forestland owners and their role in stewardship for many different benefits including public benefits and their private economic benefits. I would have liked to see more of the role of small forestland owners in avoiding conversion. Others have talked well about resilience being a little more specific about what that's going to me on the ground, I would like to see that added and a bit beefed up in some of the strategies that are currently there. I was expecting this document to get a little deeper into implementation. I look forward to seeing what the next steps are in terms of fleshing those out and coming with some practical and more economic and funding related next steps.

- Dave Bugni – When you pull up the plan there was a highlighted text in yellow that flags for subcommittee work in May so that’s where I spent my time. If we were to review the whole report, I probably would have echoed most of what was said here. I think what I would have started off with was that Oregon’s forests are owned by a variety of entities and really that’s not brought out in the document, small forestland owners deserve a more upfront presentation in this document.
- Rick Zenn – Registering some concerns about the timeline for reviewing this document and being an advisory committee to the Board.
- Dave Bugni – Could we have additional time to really look at and review the document and provide more detailed comments?
- Amanda Sullivan-Astor – There should be more call out or recognition of strategies for federal lands. There is a lot of implicit recognition throughout the document, but nothing that specifically calls it out. Looking at the climate portion and there’s a strategy around transitioning an equitable transition to climate smart forestry, climate smart civil culture there needs to be more of a call out that this is an all-lands vision.
- Chair Gerlach calls the meeting to a close.