



**Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF)**  
**Senate Bill 762 Forest Resiliency and**  
**Restoration Investments Work Group**  
**October 5<sup>th</sup>, 2021**

**Work Group Members:** Amanda Astor, Chris Chambers, Emily Jane Davis, Dylan Kruse, Dana Skelly, Jason Simmons, Andrew Owen, Pete Caligiuri, Dallas Hall Defrees and Chandra LeGue

**Technical Advisors:** Dr. Christopher Dunn, Mari Kramer, Eric Hartstien and Colin Beck

**ODF Staff:** Jeff Burns, Ryan Gordon, Alex Rahmlow and Megan Ehnle

Ryan Gordon opened the meeting with proposing an evening listening session for October 25<sup>th</sup> 6:00pm – 8:00pm. Emily Jane Davis posed the questions of how to engage informed stakeholders and what is expected to be the outcomes of a listening session, as well as noted more time to digest information and findings to the internal and external partners was also suggested. Chandra mentioned it would be important to clarify the how this body of work intersects with other aspects of SB 762, and how building the criteria can be informed by including those intersections. Ryan mentioned that could be addressed during the listening session. Amanda mentioned the public notice piece and asked how the department will provide the public input notice. Ryan mentioned it would be noticed through our public affair's normal avenues and provided the public with the opportunity to provide public input.

Jeff Burns shared a map and walked the group through a fruitful discussion on the strategic landscapes and had a conversation with the group on “tagging and extending projects.”

Chandra asked about the projects to be selected, Jeff reiterated that the projects the would be selected through a rigorous vetted process. As well as a call to the project manager and ground truthing the project accomplishments to date.

Emily Jane raised two questions: What is a select location versus another location and how was that decided? Some of the select locations are not actually within the four highest classes?

Dylan/Chris Dunn asked if projects not selected though the Eboard, FIPs, and NRCS, projects/landscapes overlapped in the process or those that were in the que for other grant programs were also on the table? Dana asked if a list of target fuels investments that are prioritized within each forest, could be tapped into? Other members also mentioned underserved geo regions being considered and including rangeland undeveloped components.

Chandra noted that WUI is mentioned. It would be good to add to the map (once zoomed in to certain areas), and consider how the definition of WUI might change through current process. Alex pointed out the purple indicates structures and generally approximates WUI. As you know, a couple types of WUI classes and the RAC at ODF is currently working on a new map/definitions.

Jeff responded that there are constrictions in budgets, funding, and timelines and utilizing general funds to extend projects that started with general funds.

Amanda asked about tagging and extending projects and if there would be a competitive process and how to going about applying for these projects, as well as engaging on the BLM lands.

Dana asked about digging into data needs: i.e., sustainability and capacity needs to be set up better for the longer term to be proactive for future opportunities. Chandra stated that monitoring will be important as well as data collection within the projects. Pete mentioned strategically treating within the strategic landscapes. Chandra called out the language to support projects that "evaluate varying types of fuel treatment methods". that says we should be figuring out what works best. Dylan agreed stating he thinks this is why work within designated CIS landscapes, OWEB FIPs, and other priority areas should be our emphasis. Those monitoring plans are much more robust and established than what applicants will be able to put together for new projects. Jeff mentioned the funding with EWP and working with Heidi Hubner-Stearns.

Alex shared the [Headwater Economics Map](#) which gets at some of those social dimensions of Wildfire impacts.

Ryan posed the question if the groups scope is focusing on resilient landscapes, focused on reducing fuels, or taking a broader look in forest health in general. Jeff asked the group to provide the department with marching orders to move forward on projects that could be tag and extended.

Chris Chambers asked about the directions laid out in SB 762. Amanda brought up that the language in SB 762 came from some of the finding from the Governors Wildfire Council and stated that this group does not need to start from square one.

Prescribed fire conversation led to Dana saying the contractor community needs stable funding. Treating the land for fire, be it, prescribed or wildfire, the best thing is to treat the land to prepare for the fire.

Chandra stated she thinks we should have all projects meet at least the same criteria and Amanda agreed.

The group shifted the conversation into a strategic landscape discussion.

Major takeaways that came from the overall conversation:

- A need for data management including reporting & monitoring
  - More than is currently allotted to the Ecosystem's Workforce Program

- Interest in planning projects that evaluate fuel treatment methods & barriers to prescribed fire
- Interested in the ability to fund projects outside priority areas
  - Strategic projects outside of strategic landscapes
- NEPA and WUI
- Program designed to capture existing capacity, partner planning and investment areas

Next steps:

Update [FRRIP webpage](#)

Next Meeting – October 21<sup>st</sup> 9:00am – 11 am

Listening Session – October 25<sup>th</sup> 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm

Homework for the Work Group: List of existing projects

Collect geospatial data from the group

Review draft Request for Projects (RFP) developed by ODF